

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2007](#) > Dec

UFO UpDates Mailing List Dec 2007

Dec 1:

[Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs](#) - Bruce Hutchinson [16]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [99]
['Dorito UFO' Seen In Skies](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [43]
[Maritime UFO Files](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?](#) - Brian Ally [11]
[Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?](#) - Katharina Wilson [8]
[Re: Question Of ET Life May Be Resolved Soon](#) - Nick Balaskas [63]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Eleanor White [11]
[What's The UFO Outreach Tally?](#) - Greg Boone [60]
[Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?](#) - Vincent Boudreau [44]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Greg Boone [41]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Kathy Kasten [11]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Kathy Kasten [8]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Bruce Maccabee [52]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [78]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Eleanor White [39]

Dec 2:

[Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research](#) - Katharina Wilson [46]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Jay Nelson [35]
[Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?](#) - Brad Sparks [37]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Brad Sparks [108]
[LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [89]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Ray Dickenson [16]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [15]

Dec 3:

[UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [12]
[Readers Call In On 'Dorito' UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [44]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Greg Boone [88]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Steve Sawyer [63]
[Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter](#) - Greg Boone [18]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Greg Boone [13]
[Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research](#) - Rick Nielsen [20]

[Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs](#) - Jan Aldrich [83]
[Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs](#) - Jan Aldrich [45]
[Dean Adams?](#) - Will Bueche [14]
[Robert Emenegger Enjoys Retirement](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [142]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Peter B. Davenport [26]
[Strange Sightings Over Canada](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [64]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Nick Pope [16]
[Probable UFO Video From Costa Rica](#) - Scott Corrales [74]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Richard Hall [14]
[Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter](#) - Richard Hall [9]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Richard Hall [9]
[LA Times - Say What You Mean](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [53]

Dec 4:

[Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter](#) - Bruce Maccabee [28]
[Scary Moment In Izamal Mexico](#) - Scott Corrales [50]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [67]
[Latest Edition # 137 Brazilian UFO Magazine](#) - aj@gevaerd.com [16]
[Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean](#) - Greg Boone [8]
[Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[11/12/07 NPC Press Conference DVD On Sale](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [12]
[Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs](#) - Brian Ally [11]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [50]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Eleanor White [6]
[Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean](#) - Jeri Jahnke [11]
[Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied](#) - Gerald O'Connell [19]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [112]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?](#) - Katharina Wilson [48]
[Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III](#) - Katharina Wilson [18]
[Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs](#) - Ray Dickenson [31]
[Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News](#) - Katharina Wilson [19]

Dec 5:

[Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada](#) - Chris Rutkowski [14]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [20]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [57]
[Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?](#) - Vincent Boudreau [38]
[Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III](#) - Rick Nielsen [19]
[A Perspective On The UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [146]
[Brazilian Ufology Center Interviews Greg Boone](#) - Milton Frank [174]

Dec 6:

[Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada](#) - Don Ledger [34]
[Re: Edward Condon \[was: Newly Released CIA\]](#) - Don Ledger [10]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [35]
[Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter](#) - Lan Fleming [29]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [50]
[NASA To Use Balloon Flotilla](#) - Don Ledger [74]
[UFOs Are With Us Again](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [75]

[Condon & David R. Saunders \[was: Newly Released\]](#) - Donald Johnson [61]

[Re: Edward Condon \[was: Newly Released CIA\]](#) - Brad Sparks [73]

[Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied](#) - Brian Ally [22]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Brad Sparks [19]

[Re: Edward Condon](#) - Richard Hall [23]

Dec 7:

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [58]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [43]

[Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied](#) - Gerald O'Connell [16]

[Origins Of The Grays](#) - Frank Fields [26]

[The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - John Rimmer [37]

[Re: Edward Condon](#) - Vincent Boudreau [51]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Nick Balaskas [35]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Richard Hall [13]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Steven Kaeser [14]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [57]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Steve Sawyer [41]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [84]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [20]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Stan Friedman [13]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Don Ledger [39]

[Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Joe McGonagle [59]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Greg Sandow [20]

Dec 8:

[Russia Learns To Make Money On UFOs](#) - Frank Fields [32]

[Russian Tour Companies Hope To Make Fortunes On](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [112]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - David Rudiak [45]

[Warminster](#) - Geoff Richardson [27]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Kevin Randle [14]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Jerome Clark [14]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Joe McGonagle [11]

[Re: Origins Of The Grays](#) - Rick Nielsen [12]

[Are They Out There?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [82]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Martin Shough [40]

Dec 9:

[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Nick Pope [33]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Martin Shough [10]

[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - David Rudiak [20]

[Bel Air Man Writes Of UFOs In Wartime](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [96]

[Gary McKinnon Radio Drama](#) - Dave Haith [12]

Dec 10:

[Origins Of The Grays](#) - Katharina Wilson [24]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Jim Deardorff [9]

[Aliens Apart](#) - Diana Cammack [109]

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Michael Tarbell [27]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [17]
[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [119]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Nick Balaskas [41]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [95]
[Re: Aliens Apart](#) - Ray Dickenson [16]
[Frequent CE Factor \[was: NASA To Probe Self For\]](#) - Ray Dickenson [15]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Martin Shough [15]
[Re: Origins Of The Grays](#) - Bert Reijersen van Buuren [28]
[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Don Ledger [16]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [14]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [26]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Don Ledger [55]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Nick Pope [31]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [33]
[Re: Origins Of The Grays](#) - Frank Fields [13]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Jerome Clark [10]
[Re: Aliens Apart](#) - Eleanor White [8]

Dec 11:

[My UFO Book And Journal Collection Must Go](#) - Marc Davenport [33]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [55]
[Re: Edward Condon](#) - Vincent Boudreau [156]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Eleanor White [12]
[Re: Frequent CE Factor](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [19]
[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - David Rudiak [65]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Nick Balaskas [40]
[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - David Rudiak [27]
[Sighting Draws UFO Research](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [51]
[Re: Aliens Apart](#) - Stan Friedman [22]
[Re: Origins Of The Grays](#) - Stan Friedman [9]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Brad Sparks [26]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Nick Balaskas [34]
[The Tenacity Of An Old System](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[Money For Nothin' Chicks For Free?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [54]
[New Document Reveals Military Mystery's Powers](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [90]
[How Advanced Are We As A Civilisation?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [162]
[Saturn's Rings](#) - Diana Cammack [9]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Nick Pope [13]
[Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape](#) - Frank Fields [146]
[Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?](#) - Steven Kaeser [22]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Eleanor White [24]
[UFO Sighting Over notloB?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Jerome Clark [16]
[Aliens And UFOs In Contemporary Art](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [140]

Dec 12:

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [46]
[NASA Booster In Rain Of Fire Off Nova Scotia](#) - Don Ledger [53]

[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Nick Balaskas [27]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Don Ledger [57]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [26]
[Hillary Rockefeller & 'The Book'](#) - John Chambers [21]
[UFO Sighting In West Sussex](#) - Nick Pope [16]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Jerome Clark [37]
[UFOs In Mexico City During Recent Blackout?](#) - Scott Corrales [62]
[Re: Gary McKinnon Radio Drama](#) - Dave Haith [512]

Dec 13:

[Great Beasts Peppered From Space](#) - Diana Cammack [143]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James Smith [128]
[Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape](#) - Bruce Maccabee [14]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [35]
[Ely UFO Crash Cover-Up In Chapter Of 'Weird' Book](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [62]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [110]
[Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex](#) - Dave Haith [33]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [51]
[Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex](#) - Martin Shough [17]
[Did UFO Encounter Cost Woman Her Life?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [77]
[A 'Follow The Energy' Approach for Astrobiology](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [78]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Nick Balaskas [76]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [32]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [47]
[Re: Edward Condon](#) - Bruce Maccabee [92]
[Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape](#) - Kathy Kasten [9]
[About Those Rocky/Hillary Chats...](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [66]

Dec 14:

[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Brad Sparks [14]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Richard Hall [50]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Dave Haith [18]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [32]
[Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences](#) - Jerome Clark [12]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - James_Smith [45]
[Re: Great Beasts Peppered From Space](#) - Michael Tarbell [28]

Dec 15:

[Who Speaks For Earth?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [265]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Richard Hall [35]
[Planetary Politics](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [146]
[New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Michael Woods [19]
[Re: Who Speaks For Earth?](#) - Ray Dickenson [15]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [225]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [67]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Santiago Yturria Garza [22]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Vincent Boudreau [11]
[Re: Zamora & Hynek \[was: Penniston NP Conference & \]](#) - Ray Stanford [118]
[Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [54]

Dec 16:

[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Richard Hall [39]
[Re: Who Speaks For Earth?](#) - Stan Friedman [15]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Richard Hall [49]
[Re: Who Speaks For Earth?](#) - Eleanor White [8]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - Bruce Maccabee [20]
[Re: Skylab 3](#) - Bruce Maccabee [16]
['The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review](#) - Terry Colvin [30]
[When Saucers Came To Earth](#) - Maurizio Verga [40]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [50]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [12]

Dec 17:

[Re: Who Speaks For Earth?](#) - Ray Dickenson [29]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - Don Ledger [32]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - John Velez [35]
[Re: 'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review](#) - Eleanor White [11]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [63]
[Don't Call The Aliens They Might Not Be Friendly](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [348]

Dec 18:

[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Nick Pope [25]
[Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial](#) - Ray Dickenson [11]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - Bruce Maccabee [23]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [267]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [167]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [133]
[Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial](#) - Gerald O'Connell [39]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [16]
[Inexplicata's UFOs In Latin America 2007](#) - Scott Corrales [8]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - Stan Friedman [37]
[A Mexican Schoolteacher's Alien Encounter](#) - Scott Corrales [122]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Eleanor White [25]
[UFO Believers Pursue Case](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]
[UFOs Do Exist Government Spokesman Says](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [21]
[An NGO Solution For UFO Study](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [54]

Dec 19:

[More On Japanese 'UFOs Exist' Story](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - Brian Ally [12]
[Spy Planes To Recharge By Clinging To Power Lines](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [50]
[Ending The UFO 'Giggle Factor' Once And For All](#) - Greg Boone [47]
[Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial](#) - David Rudiak [45]
[PRG Media Notice - December 18](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [23]
[Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For](#) - David Rudiak [27]
[Larry Hatch News](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [28]
[Who's Your Favorite Alien?](#) - Greg Boone [28]
[Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI \[was: Kaku...\]](#) - David Rudiak [64]

[Sandia National Laboratories On Tunguska](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [51]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Kathy Kasten [17]

Dec 20:

[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI \[was:](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [17]
[Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?](#) - Carol Buckallew [8]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [20]
[Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?](#) - Michael Woods [14]
[UFO Observers/Abductees Linked To Medical](#) - Rick Nielsen [18]
[Fawcett Releases New UFO Book For 2007](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [52]
[On Lacking The Guts To Squeeze The Trigger](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [52]
[Minister Troubled Over Legal Issues If UFO Arrives](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [40]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Joe McGonagle [22]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI \[was:](#) - Bill Chalker [19]

Dec 21:

[Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [7]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Greg Sandow [19]
[Lord Hill-Norton Rendlesham Papers](#) - Nick Pope [14]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Lan Fleming [20]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Vincent Boudreau [19]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Robert Morningstar [30]
[Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space](#) - Eleanor White [16]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [35]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [11]
[Alien Worlds Magazine](#) - Stuart Miller [58]

Dec 22:

[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - ntl: McGonagle [16]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [68]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Steven Kaeser [24]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - David Rudiak [44]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Brian Ally [7]
[At Least NORAD Is Tracking Santa Claus](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [62]
[Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [34]
[Test - 01](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [3]

Dec 23:

[C-C-Christmas Ch-Ch-Changes](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [16]
[MoD To Release 160 UFO Files](#) - Joe McGonagle [111]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Richard Hall [34]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [20]
[The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Terry Groff [109]
['Alien' Seeks To Put An End To UFO Discussions](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [37]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Ed Gehrman [15]
[MoD To Open British UFO X-Files](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [65]
[Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI](#) - Greg Sandow [18]
[TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - Jan Aldrich [35]

Dec 24:

[Return Of The Giants?](#) - Barry Chamish [285]
[Strange Lights In San Diego Night Sky](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]
[All's Quiet On The UFO Front?](#) - Greg Boone [20]
[Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [18]
[Townsend-Brown](#) - David Iadevaia [10]
[Re: Walt Disney And The ETH](#) - Greg Boone [11]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - David Rudiak [14]
[Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - Jerome Clark [21]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Robert Powell [24]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - James Horak [11]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Jerome Clark [23]

Dec 26:

[And So This Is Christmas...](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [15]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Kentaro Mori [45]
[Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - David Rudiak [27]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [113]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Rick Nielsen [9]
[Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - Michael Tarbell [35]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - John Rimmer [8]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [25]
[Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Vince White [35]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Brian Ally [9]
[Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again](#) - Brian Ally [7]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Bruce Maccabee [8]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Bruce Maccabee [26]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Eleanor White [6]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Brad Sparks [222]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Jerome Clark [15]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Jerome Clark [10]
[Truth Is In There For 'Ufologists'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [32]

Dec 27:

[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - David Rudiak [39]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Brian Ally [27]
[Re: The Fermi Death Sentence](#) - Michael Tarbell [44]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Stan Friedman [22]
['UFO' Hits Orbiting NASA Satellite](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [96]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Ray Dickenson [31]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Greg Boone [76]

Dec 28:

[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Ed Gehrman [16]
[From Roswell To Rose Bowl](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [52]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [458]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Nick Pope [17]
[How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Joe McGonagle [11]

Dec 29:

[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Don Ledger [10]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - Joe McGonagle [76]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Ray Dickenson [22]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Brian Ally [8]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [12]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Gerald O'Connell [9]
[SDI #452 Twenty Questions](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [74]
[Aeroshell Flying Saucer](#) - Kevin Randle [10]
[But Hey I'm Big In Japan](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [34]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Lan Fleming [88]
[Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements](#) - Lan Fleming [34]
[Couple Videos Mystery Dark Spiral](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [32]
[Space Invaders On The Campaign Trail](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [30]
[Berwyn UFO Pzzle To Be Solved At Last](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [55]
[Giant ETs?](#) - Greg Boone [20]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Nick Pope [20]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Brad Sparks [244]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Greg Boone [29]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Gerald O'Connell [32]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - James Horak [20]
['Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - James Molesworth [19]
[Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last](#) - Don Ledger [6]
[Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last](#) - Nick Pope [15]
[Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last](#) - Joe McGonagle [17]

Dec 30:

[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - Nick Pope [10]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Ed Gehrman [18]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - James Horak [32]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Ed Gehrman [18]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - Ed Gehrman [13]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Joe McGonagle [41]
['UFOs Seen As Joke But Absolute Certainty They](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [83]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - Michael Tarbell [21]
[Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports](#) - Chris Rutkowski [31]
[Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions](#) - Richard Hall [12]
[Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham](#) - Brad Sparks [37]
[Re: Penniston NP Conference & King](#) - Martin Shough [164]
[Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting](#) - Paul Scott Anderson [18]
[UFO Reported On Waikato NZ Farm](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release](#) - Vince White [91]
[What Did Reagan Know About UFOs?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [136]
[Active SETI And The Public](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [131]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - James Horak [19]
[Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports](#) - Don Ledger [50]

Dec 31:

[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - Ed Gehrman [23]

[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Joe McGonagle [28]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Gerald O'Connell [35]
[Re: What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release](#) - Nick Pope [38]
[Re: Giant ETs?](#) - Eleanor White [6]
[Pope Condign And UAP](#) - Joe McGonagle [37]
[Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions](#) - Eleanor White [22]
[MoD To Publish 2007 Reports On-Line](#) - Joe McGonagle [23]
[Re: MoD To Open British UFO X-Files](#) - Nick Pope [32]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - Robert Powell [44]
[Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham](#) - Lan Fleming [15]
[Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports](#) - Nick Balaskas [54]
[UFO Awareness Group Really Isn't So Far Out](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [103]
[Mystery Over UFO Sighting](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]
[NASA Mars Images Reveals A 'Doorway' Structure](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [58]
[Parallel Universes Beguile Science](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [86]
[Seeing Things Is Perception Everything?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [307]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - James Horak [37]
[Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'](#) - James Horak [27]
[Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports](#) - Jim Deardorff [29]
[Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?](#) - David Rudiak [55]
[Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports](#) - Chris Rutkowski [24]
[Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?](#) - Eleanor White [7]

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

[Previous Month](#)

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:05:31 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 09:57:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 13:51:00 -0800
>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

List-

...and round and we round we go!

Seeing that David's latest rebuttal essentially repeats his earlier statements that I rebutted, we are now just going in circles. I see no sense in boring the list with endless repetition.

For those List members with military experience, I think David's responses speak for themselves, and in reality no further comments are needed. For those of you without military experience, well... you'll just have to make up your own minds about this bit of Roswellian minutiae.

Regards,

Bruce Hutchinson

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:00:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2007 15:53:10 -0500
>Subject: Skylab 3

>Alan Bean, Jack Lousma and Owen Garriott (the first scientist in
>space). It was more than 30 years ago, and it has taken me a
>long time (!) to complete the analysis and post this. But the
>data are still good.

>If you want to find an astronaut sighting of an unidentified
>space object - USO; this one was not submerged - then here you
>are.

>Comments welcome

><http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SKYLAB3.html>

The Skylab images seem peculiar and a relatively long duration
intersecting orbit with a satellite not very close to the Skylab
inclination would be highly unlikely.

Regarding your webpage, I have some comments...

Prior to Skylab, there were no launches we know about to 50
degrees inclination +/- .05 degrees. However, there are a number
of satellites that were launched near that inclination
(excluding rocket bodies and debris): COSMOS 139 at 49.7 deg,
EXPLORER 8 at 49.88 deg, ANNA 1B and EOLE 1 (CAS-A) at 50.14
deg, EXPLORER 7 at 50.29 deg, COSMOS 546 at 50.65 deg, EXPLORER
44 (SOLRAD-10) at 51.06 deg, COSMOS 359 at 51.12 deg, COSMOS 50
at 51.23 deg.

Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence,
according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not
immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred
attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed
at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The
subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds",
a much later time. I doubt the images actually are of the laser
beam (although the laser was tested at red wavelengths),
mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up
their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser
beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973,
which does not correspond with when they reported photographing
the odd object. One point of interest is that an interview of
the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used
the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood
they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

Trash should be considered as a possible cause although it would
be small in size. Skylab had a trash jettisoning device/port
which was used frequently. Existing tracking data lists "debris"
for Skylab which could be trash, but it seems unlikely since the
trash bags would not have radar reflective material in/on them.
There were also reports of items being jettisoned from the much
larger scientific airlock which definitely were tracked.

Regarding the time period of the photos, it is odd that the crew

debriefing as shown in your web page lists the event occurring 7 to 10 days prior to landing, while Oberg was able to see from transcripts that it was 5 days. Since the transcripts are not available in electronic form for us to look at (only microfilm, do you have a copy Mr. Sparks?) then we have to take Oberg's word for it (who may be right, but it would be nice to get a double check on this critical data). The transcript would seem to be the best estimate for time. Even so, the statement in the transcript indicates Lousma was not sure if it was 3 revs or 2 or 4 revs since Owens made no confirmation, so we can't state definitively it is 16:30-16:40 GMT.

Space-Track has the orbital elements for a set of trackable debris for Skylab as well as lots of other satellites during that Sept 1973 time period. Such orbital elements have limitations. You can calculate the position of a satellite using this data, but if the date of the orbital elements are far from the date you are interested in, the results may be very inaccurate. This is especially true for very low, soon-to-re-enter objects. Simply running what is available for objects +-5 degrees in inclination using Oberg's time period (+- 90 minutes) show no objects within 100 km. If one looks at a period of +-7 days, then objects do get within 20 km occasionally for respectable time periods.

The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sunlight, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match going in shadow.

I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they enter the atmosphere with usually).

The size of the re-entering object is not clear. It was stated to be a camera, which sounds small.

However, careful reading of the mission reports imply that there was more to the object than a camera. They apparently jettisoned on day 8 both a camera and its experiment out of the scientific airlock. One would have to view TV coverage of the event (reported to have been shown at the time) to know the size and whether these objects were connected. The airlock is relatively large.

The only way to check the possibility/narrow the timing would be to get the raw tracking data used by NORAD to generate the orbital elements, which would consist of data over many orbits which are analyzed/converted into the elements. However, I would guess that they have thrown out this old data or not want to share it in any event with the public.

Examination of the photo guidebook for Skylab 2 shows the description for two photos to be "UFO" (SL2-102-893, SL2-102-897). I have never seen them but have heard that the existing copies are pretty dark and scratched so nothing may be viewable on them.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

'Dorito UFO' Seen In Skies

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:03:43 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:03:43 -0500
Subject: 'Dorito UFO' Seen In Skies

Source: The Express & Star - Wolverhampton, UK

<http://www.expressandstar.com/2007/11/30/dorito-ufo-seen-in-skies/>

30 Nov 2007

'Dorito UFO' Seen In Skies

A UFO, described by witnesses as looking like a huge "Dorito" crisp has been filmed over the skies of the Black Country, according to a paranormal group.

See also: Readers call in on Dorito UFO

A flurry of calls has been made to Stourbridge-based UFO Research Midlands (UFORM) from those claiming to have witnessed the flying object in the sky.

Witnesses say they spotted it in Halesowen heading towards Stourbridge on Wednesday at around 7pm.

UFORM is now appealing for anyone else who saw it to get in touch to help it compile its X-files. Steve Poole, UFORM chairman, said one man filmed more than 30 seconds of footage of the craft travelling in a westerly direction from Halesowen to Stourbridge. He said: "The object has been described as looking like a huge Dorito and had distinctive red lights on its underside, which moved position while the craft was flying."

Another witness reported seeing it while looking out from the Lickey Hills towards the Sutton area of Birmingham.

The witness says he watched the UFO through binoculars as it moved "very quickly" across the skyline. Two other independent collaborators came forward within hours of the sighting, according to UFORM.

UFORM operates a 24-hour hotline for the public to report UFO incidents. Steve Poole said: "This could turn out to be a pretty substantial sighting, especially given that one of the witnesses has filmed the event. We would like to hear from anyone else who may have seen this object. They can remain anonymous if they like."

UFORM was set up in 1995 by Steve Poole to coincide with the massive increase in UFO sightings in the West Midlands.

Now with dozens of members, the group holds monthly meetings in Stourbridge with internationally renowned guest speakers, hosts sky-watches and acts as the leading research organisation in the area for anyone interested in the UFO phenomenon.

1 Did you see the UFO? Have you taken any photographs or video footage? Contact the Express & Star newsdesk on 01902 319410.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Maritime UFO Files

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 13:01:45 -0400
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:05:27 -0500
Subject: Maritime UFO Files

Dear List,

My book Maritime UFO Files - 6x9inch trade paperback - has been re-released-much to my surprise as the publisher, Nimbus, did not inform me that they would be doing so; I found out when royalties were paid to me on my last statement for sale of same. Publishing - is there a weirder business than that?

Those interested in some 135-140 cases dealing with UFO cases from the east coast of Canada taken from military and RCMP documents or investigated by myself and other local investigators can go here for details.

<http://www.donledger.com>

My apologies in advance if you get this blurb more than once as I post to various lists.

Best,

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 13:21:50 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:07:04 -0500
Subject: Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

>From: Stephen G. Bassett <PRG.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 14:51:47 -0500
>Subject: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

>Will those with Google Earth and some knowledge of photography
>please check out Greenland and let me know what the hell that
>image in the middle of this island could be? Just curious.

That's an artifact of the stitching process. Note the pattern resembling sand dunes to the southwest of the dark band. This, too, is a stitching artifact, caused by the way the data is spliced together to create the satellite view on this particular map projection. Note, then, that there's a similar patterning to the west of the black strip and that one of the darker gray bands curves precisely into it.

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 13:04:35 -0600
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:08:28 -0500
Subject: Re: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

>From: Stephen G. Bassett <PRG.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 14:51:47 -0500
>Subject: What In The Hell Is In The Middle Of Greenland?

>Will those with Google Earth and some knowledge of photography
>please check out Greenland and let me know what the hell that
>image in the middle of this island could be? Just curious.

Looks like it might be a ship's hull to me, but since it appears
to be miles wide, it's not likely the remnants of a sailing
ship... Maybe it's just an artifact of the imaging process?

K. Wilson
www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Question Of ET Life May Be Resolved Soon

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 15:06:21 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:10:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Question Of ET Life May Be Resolved Soon

>Source: Mike Ignatowski's Blog - Hudson Valley, New York, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/38jeh8>

>November 28, 2007

>The Question Of Extraterrestrial Life - It May Be Resolved
>Sooner Than You Think

>One of the important questions that we will almost certainly
>answer this century, one way or another, is the question about
>the existence of life elsewhere in the universe. Actually, we
>might answer that in the next 10 months or so.

>It turns out that there is a tremendous amount of life existing
>below the surface of the Earth. By some estimates the total mass
>of living organisms below the surface is as much if not more of
>the total mass of living organisms above the surface.

>When you look at another planet such as Mars where the surface
>conditions are rather harsh, many scientists believe that life
>is much more likely to exist below the surface of Mars than on
>its surface. This would also be consistent with surface life
>developing during a milder Mars climate billions of years ago,
>then spreading underground and surviving there as much of the
>Martian atmosphere slowly leaked away into space over the course
>of billions of years.

>If everything goes as planned, in about ten months the most
>advanced generation yet of spacecraft will land on Mars to look
>for life. NASA's Phoenix Mission will land on the northern
>plains and dig three-feet into the soil and ice looking for
>evidence of microbial life. Should it find any, and some experts
>think it is likely, then a tremendous set of questions open up.

>Could this Martian life have come from Earth, or visa-versa? We
>know that meteor impacts on each planet occasionally jettison
>rocks into space that eventually crash into the other planet. Or
>is it based on a chemistry that is total different from any life
>on Earth? Either way, the discovery of the first
>extraterrestrial life will put us at the dawn of a major new
>scientific journey that will eventually tell us much more about
>our place in the grand scheme of things in the universe.

>For an interesting discussion of this topic and its possible
>consequences, check out this article on Lonely Hearts of the
>Cosmos Revisited:

>http://www.dailygalaxy.com/my_weblog/2007/11/lonely-hearts-o.html

>[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Hi Everyone,

Any microbial life discovered on Mars; Jupiter's moon Europa;
Saturn's moon Titan or any of the millions of still undiscovered
worlds orbiting the billions of stars in our Milky Way galaxy,
would certainly be an important discovery. If these ET microbes

have the same DNA that is present in all living things found on Earth, this discovery would NOT be the long sought proof for our popular belief that extraterrestrial life can independently come into existence from non-living matter and thus must be common throughout the universe since Earth could have seeded these other worlds over a period of billions of years.

An even more important discovery would be the announcement we all really want to hear - the finding of an advanced ET civilization, either their home planet (through radio SETI?) or possibly a hidden outpost somewhere in our solar system near Earth made through observations by the growing number of international planetary probes.

Myself and a fellow space scientist at York University are continuing work on a hypothesis based on the later senerio - evidence from planetary probes - that there is a vast ET outpost in the south polar region of Mars. There is a location near Mars' south pole where one finds some very unusual and unique geological features that are very densely packed on the Martian snow/ice covered surface which are known simply as dark spiders and dark spots. According to a paper published in 'Nature' (Vol. 442, pages 793-796, August 17, 2006) the authors suspect that this region of densely packed spots which they compare to the size of "Manhattan" (a hint by the authors that these spots can be better understood if they were artificial rather than natural?) is where violent eruptions of carbon dioxide gas jets mixed with sand like particles of soil take place. See URL below for a summary and an artist's representation of these CO2 gas jets.

<http://themis.asu.edu/discoveries-polarjets>

The only direct comparisons on Earth to these dark spots on Mars, many with dark streaks radiating from them, would be heavily industrial areas with smoke stacks or vast underground facilities with thousands of air vents. Since this region with the dense array of dark spots in the south polar region of Mars does not change with the seasons, are not distributed in a natural fashion and are located over what seems to be a gridded underground pattern from the thermal images taken by the still orbiting Odyssey spacecraft, it is easy to deduce that these are permanent structures and possibly of artificial origin.

Further study and new observations will determine whether our working hypothesis that a large outpost on Mars is currently occupied, not by microbes, but by intelligence ET "macrobes" is correct. If the dark spots and streaks prove to be carbon particles as I suspect since I don't have reason to believe that Martian underground sand deposits are that dark, then these dark spiders and dark spots are vents for oxygen extracting machinery from the underground deposits of frozen CO2 that the ETs need for their continued existence at this outpost in the south polar region of Mars.

In the meantime, I think we made the correct decision to have the Phoenix Mars mission, the reflight of the 1999 Mars Polar Lander which landed in the south polar region of Mars but mysteriously fell silent, land in the less interesting (but less threatening too?) north polar region of Mars.

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 16:14:18 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:11:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 16:37:24 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>There's no telling what else has gone on that we don't know
>about. One thing for sure is that Linda Moulton Howe's "Strange
>Harvest" video, the scariest thing you could watch is tame
>compared to the stories I'm getting.

>We need to take a double take on this issue. If these stories
>don't get the public to start a fire under official asses
>nothing will.

Greg, with your media and other experience, and with your
obvious motivation on this topic, I can't help wondering if
you're not being called to launch the book.

I agree, this damn censorship, especially if it originates
within the ufology community where there is no "national
security" excuse, is repulsive.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

What's The UFO Outreach Tally?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 17:55:32 EST
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:12:59 -0500
Subject: What's The UFO Outreach Tally?

I've been taking the stand that we don't need the mainstream press nor Federal Government for credibility anymore in this UFO pursuit.

I say that because working in the media for 30 years now in one form or another, especially working on the internet for going on 20 years almost, I look at the rise in our reach and what I'm seeing is astounding.

Compare to UFOlogy's reach in 1980. An occasional news article or tv news segment or reruns of the classic "In Search Of" series.

I recall 10 years ago working for the online Parascope Magazine on AOL that one day I mentioned to my supervisor that after hosting two chats that day regarding UFOs, a total of 4 hours, then listening to Jeff Rense, another 3 hours, and then Art Bell, another 4 or 5 hours, I realized the web was giving mass media coverage of the UFO scene for half a day!

That wasn't including all the other websites, chat rooms, radio shows worldwide.

Now we have all the above and YouTube, GoogleVideo, a thousand times the number of websites, chat rooms, video and podcasts, etc. I wouldn't be surprised if combined worldwide in all languages, that the people are reaching UFO related venues by a couple hundred million per day. That may be generous or conservative so I'm asking here has anyone taken a tally?

How many radio and websites in Japan? I'm sure when a hot UFO story hits there at least 100 million read or hear about it. China? India? Heck, India Daily has been running some extensive articles daily about UFOs that most western sites and papers won't quote but that paper must reach tens of millions daily as well. S. America? Russia? I've got some new colleagues in Russia and they work in computers and art and animation. I took the chance one day to ask them about UFOs and a tidal wave started. They get all the American videos and they have their own versions of our radio and tv shows devoted to UFOs.

The sheer numbers must be astounding and to be reckoned with and it's the public coming to us, not the other way around that is doing this and the internet is the key.

How many times a week now do we see YouTube videos garnering more audience than top mainstream television shows or radio shows? It's getting so common that I myself find myself watching more YouTube than regular or cable tv!

I'm starting to think the mainstream channels with all their censorship and black budget and intelligence community connections have finally met their rightly doom as the people are fending for themselves and that shows a greater sense of responsibility and courage.

Recent queries by me regarding certain scary aspects of this field of study sure showed me why the officials are shy about the subject.

I'm hoping some pals in mainland China will be done with some research they've been doing for some time now. So far they're saying their government is doing more for them in research than expected. Who knows, maybe China will dish out the truths we've all been waiting for whether we like those truths or not.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 23:53:09 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:17:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 15:15:49 -0500
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 18:54:29 EST
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

Hello Brian, Brad and List,

Thank you gentlemen for the enlightenment.

So there are unfortunately no new CIA documents.

Still, I got to the CIA website and checked their FOIA library on UFOs with new eyes and found this pearl:

UFO Briefing For Dr. Edward Condon, 5 MAY 1967

I discovered in Edward Condon an honest man who, in the end, had to bend to ! his employers. It must have been very difficult for him.

What he must have gone through!

On May 5 1967, Dr. Condon and his group conferred on the Zanesville (Ohio) UFO pictures:

"... Dr. Condon and his colleagues <snip> were most enthusiastic. They were impressed with the scope and the analysis [blanked out] had conducted which included ground survey techniques and densitometric traces. Dr. Condon stated he had for the first time a scientific analysis of a UFO that would stand up to investigation...

<snip>

3. There was discussion held concerning methods of interesting the American public in participating in UFO photography. No specific conclusions we drawn, but it was suggested to review all photography NICAP holds, and conduct photogrammetric analyses on any that have appropriate and necessary information available. This would put Dr. Condon in a position to say that he had received and analyzed all ! the photography in NICAP files, and was now depending on the Ameri can public to furnish his new photography. Also discussed was the possibility of making available to police officers, on military posts, airline pilots, and such people, polaroid cameras for instant use. No conclusions we arrived at, but some interesting thoughts we tabled. It was, however, felt by all that more publicity was needed.

4. [Blanked out] report on his analysis of the Zanesville photography will be forwarded to [blanked out] in the near future for distribution to Dr. Hatchford and Dr. Condon."

This is probably old knowledge for the seasoned ufologists on the List (and old suppression for the seasoned debunkers).

This was some revelation to me.

The magnitude of the implications leaves me speechless. Most of the text could have been capitalized.

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:37:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 16:14:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 16:37:24 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

><snip>

>>There's no telling what else has gone on that we don't know
>>about. One thing for sure is that Linda Moulton Howe's "Strange
>>Harvest" video, the scariest thing you could watch is tame
>>compared to the stories I'm getting.

>>We need to take a double take on this issue. If these stories
>>don't get the public to start a fire under official asses
>>nothing will.

>Greg, with your media and other experience, and with your
>obvious motivation on this topic, I can't help wondering if
>you're not being called to launch the book.

>I agree, this damn censorship, especially if it originates
>within the ufology community where there is no "national
>security" excuse, is repulsive.

Eleanor, right on regarding that censorship! We've got wolves in
the fold for sure. With the number of emails I've gotten off-List
containing horror stories I have finally discovered the true
meaning of hair-tingling.

The stories are so horrifying I can't repeat them. Gut
wrenching, mind-numbing, spine-chilling would all be
understatements to the second power. I had no idea there were so
many ways to torture people. These stories make Torquemada look
like bake off pastry chef. No wonder abductees are so quiet and
reserved. After experiencing things I'm reading I'd be locked up
in a mountain with enough firepower to take on the 7th Fleet.

This has got to be the worst experience a human being can endure
and there's no telling how long it's gone on and how widespread.
I'm learning that again there are people this has happened to
and somehow, somehow they pick themselves up and go on to try to
live a normal life with this and in many cases repeat life-long
abductions.

This is far too grisly for me to handle. Some people said they
tried to get hold of folks like Budd Hopkins to help them but to
no avail. Can you imagine undergoing this stuff and having no
one to turn to? It's un-fathomable to me.

Several people like you have suggested a book but I don't think
I could stomach it and if it came out there'd be chaos in the
streets. Just three of the stories I've received if publicly
known would send people into unresolving panic. The only thing
keeping me together right now is something I can't mention here

on the List. Let's just say growing up in tough neighborhoods has it's advantages.

Dr. Jacobs book The Threat, just became more important in my opinion.

The next guy making with the benevolent space brothers, they're older and wiser than us, they're aliens so they're more benevolent nonsense is gonna get the works from me.

Sorry I even asked the question in the first place.

Our history on this world needs a revamp.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 18:11:28 +0000
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:52:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Sergey Shpakovsky <sergejsh.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 17:47:45 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Kathy Kasten
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:22:50 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

><snip>

>>You mean like being forced to watch as a strange entity cut
>>open your young daughter's chest as she lay unanesthetized on a
>>flat surface in a domed room? After the operation, the daughter
>>would never be able to stand up perfectly straight.

>>The mother hearing herself screaming at the top of lungs to
>>stop. And, the entities pretended not to hearing the mother.

>>You mean reports such as that? Yeah, I noticed nobody wants to
>>hear about those reports. God no.

>>Those adorable, ETS of superior intelligence? They would never
>>do anything like that. Oh yeah, the mother is so stupid she
>>really does understand the ETs are "teaching" her a lesson.

>>Some lesson.

>Is it a real story or a joke?

>If it is real, can you tell more or to publish whole story here?

Sergey:

Interesting reaction from you. No, it is no joke. It is a reality. There will be no more details, as I believe most of the posters to this List are voyeurs who get their rocks off by reading horror stories of the cosmic kind.

Someday, when I have all the facts, I want to write about the psychological profile of ufologists.

KK

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 18:15:15 +0000
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:54:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 16:54:53 -0600
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Kathy Kasten <catraja.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:22:50 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 14:51:54 EST
>>>Subject: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>><snip>

>>>While perusing many documentaries and news stories I've noticed
>>>the real scary stuff hasn't been covered. I know, and many of
>>>you know some stories that if told would have people ready and
>>>up in arms.

>>>So where are the accounts? Has or is anyone willing to finally
>>>put together a series of accounts that get down and dirty
>>>regarding the even darker side of abduction?

>>You mean like being forced to watch as a strange entity cut
>>open your young daughter's chest as she lay unanesthetized on a
>>flat surface in a domed room? After the operation, the daughter
>>would never be able to stand up perfectly straight.

>>The mother hearing herself screaming at the top of lungs to
>>stop. And, the entities pretended not to hearing the mother.

>>You mean reports such as that? Yeah, I noticed nobody wants to
>>hear about those reports. God no.

>>Those adorable, ETS of superior intelligence? They would never
>>do anything like that. Oh yeah, the mother is so stupid she
>>really does understand the ETs are "teaching" her a lesson.

>>Some lesson.

>Maybe you have to be the emergency room doctor to understand
>the emergency room doctor's activities and behaviors. Many of
>these EMDs have superior intelligence, and I'm told that they
>can be quite adorable.

Alfred:

You are not responding from your own experience and I will have
to discount the above statements.

BTW: I am coming from a medical background.

KK

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 13:16:07 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:58:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:37:54 -0800
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

><snip>

>>Perhaps our pets have been the clue to this mystery all along.
>>It sure invalidates the headshrinker skeptibunkers who claim all
>>abductions are subjective delusions.

>>But the more close-range dog reactions of extreme fear - and
>>sickness - are puzzling.

>>>Oh, and the reason I'm partial to dogs and a great case-in-point
>>>is another classic tv show, The Twilight Zone and a great
>>>episode written by The Waltons creator Earl Hamner called The
>>>Hunt. If you've not seen that episode before you're in for a
>>>real treat and why we like dogs.>

>>Yup, think I understand; the story is here"

>><http://www.hotcakencyclopedia.com/ho.Hunt.html>

>Awesome Ray! I think you've saved the day!

>This data says it all for me. Dont' know how I could have been
>so thick headed not to have seen such important data. These
>stories of animals responding to sightings and abductions are
>priceless and not evidence but proof that what some, I say some
>abductions and sightings are indeed real events and not
>subjective delusions. I recall the late Dr. John E. Mack stating
>that some of the abductees he'd studied weren't pathological.

Only some abductees weren't "pathological"?

>Add to the animal responses and the trace cases you can't shove
>that data aside and it sure as heck isn't data to be sneezed at.

>I've raised dogs all my life. From shepherds to poodles to pit
>bulls. The most ferocious dogs I've ever seen are the small
>ones, the toy dogs and poodles. I've seen them back down cops on
>horseback in Manhattan! These critters fear not. However, even
>as a kid I'd heard stories of fierce hunting dogs and guard dogs
>cowering whenever a UFO situation occurred or of course those
>Sasquatch stories.

>Very interesting data, very interesting indeed!

Animal reaction stories are common. Read Hunt For The Skinwalker
if you want to read a 'gory' story of a something that caused a
herd of cattle to run in chaos.

Before Nov. 11 of this year I mentioned that Nov. 11 was the
beginning of the Gulf Breeze 'UFO Saga' that lasted several
years. That saga began at 2:30 AM (approx) with a dog!

The dog was whining and whimpering and the owner lady assumed it wanted to go out for the typical reason, although it was unusual for this to happen in the middle of the night (so unusual that it may not have happened before or since). Anyway, she followed the dog out the back door and it ran a few feet from the doorway and stopped and looked up and started barking. The lady was surprised it didn't go running around the yard like dogs do, so she looked up and (to paraphrase a "presently in season" poem) "what to her wondering eyes should appear, but.." (no, not a sleigh and tiny reindeer) a UFO, with a ring of light at the bottom and a blue beam coming down which made a blue circle on the dock just behind the house.

Her first thought was that they were coming to take her dog, so she grabbed the dog and took it back into the house.

Another animal reaction story involving a dog is one I investigated back in 71 or 72. In that case a young man was in a field by himself with his dog. It was late at night. What certainly appears to have been an AFC (Alien Flying Craft) landed in the field (not far from high tension power lines, I might add) and a doorway opened and a stairway came down and a "creature" that was (quote)"powerful huge" walked down the stairs. It was walking like a robot holding a glowing ball in one hand (a detail reports in some other sightings after this one). The young man (17 or so at the time) was frightened and told his dog to "sic him". Now, the dog was a large German Shepard and was standing next to the boy and barking. Unfortunately we do not know what happened because as the dog approached the creature the boy blacked out. When he awoke the dog and the craft & creature were no longer there. Don't know where the dog went. But if it's Zeta 2 Reticulum, then at least, he wasn't there for a long time because he did show up at the farmhouse a mile away quite a while later (day later? I don't recall). This sighting was reported in the NICAP bulletin as the Case Of The Virginia Giant. It was the first of a 'sighting complex' that involved several teenage witnesses who lived in Passapatanzy, Virginia. Another event of this 'complex' involved a car stop when an AFC hovered over it and the car radio was permanently damaged - had to replace one or more transistors to make the radio work.

It seems to me that in years past there has been compiled by someone - can't think of his name - a catalogue of animal reaction cases.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 14:27:36 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 16:01:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2007 15:53:10 -0500
>>Subject: Skylab 3

>>Alan Bean, Jack Lousma and Owen Garriott (the first scientist in
>>space). It was more than 30 years ago, and it has taken me a
>>long time (!) to complete the analysis and post this. But the
>>data are still good.

>>If you want to find an astronaut sighting of an unidentified
>>space object - USO; this one was not submerged - then here you
>>are.

>>Comments welcome

>><http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SKYLAB3.html>

>The Skylab images seem peculiar and a relatively long duration
>intersecting orbit with a satellite not very close to the Skylab
>inclination would be highly unlikely.

Thanks for your extensive comments. What you have discussed is mostly related to the orbital mechanics and the question, could there have been some manmade object in an orbit so close to that of the Skylab as to be seen for up to ten minutes and which would make an image with the angular size as large as in the last photo (assuming a 300 mm lens) and which would disappear from view about 5 sec after the Skylab went into shadow (an event that led Garriott to conclude that the object was about 38 km behind the Skylab) yet which would not be observed during any other orbit or would not be detected by any of the radar tracking stations?

You have made only a brief comment on the most photographically obvious aspect of the images obtained, namely that they are red. (In one frame the light was bright red enough to overexpose the film causing a yellowish center of the red "dot" image.) According to Garriott this object was first seen (and photographed?) as much as 10 minutes before Skylab went into orbit, in other words, before Skylab and the object were in the "thin" orbital region where atmospheric reddening of the sun could make a reflection look red (although I doubt that such a reflection would be as clearly red as shown in the photos). Therefore if it was "anywhere near" skylab 10 minutes before the shadow its red could have come from only two possibilities: (a) it was painted red and reflected only red light or (b) it was a source of red light.

You have addressed this color issue briefly as follows:

>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three
>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are

>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>going in shadow.

>I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing
>could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some
>time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than
>how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they
>enter the atmosphere with usually).

It seems to me that one big problem with assuming that a the
object was a source of red light by virtue of being heated by
the atmosphere is that this "meteor" version of the hypothesis
does not explain how Skylab could have seen it for ten minutes
before Skylab crossed the shadow boundary. If it were seen as it
reentered, it would have been below the Skylab and there should
have been some evidence of an earth background unless it was
seen after both it and the Skylab had gone into the shadow so
that the background was the unilluminated earth as opposed to a
black background, which is consistent with the camera pointing
away from the earth. Also, the size plays a role in this. If it
were a meter sized object, for example it had to be within 1
m/(.0029 rad) = 345 m of the Skylab as it glowed and that would
place the Skylab in a "crash and burn" orbit some 6(?) years
before it actually did Crash and Burn (where 0.0029 is the
angular separation between the furthest separated red "blob"
images of the fourth photo). Also, being that close to the
Skylab would mean that it would enter the shadow at essentially
the same time.

>Regarding your webpage, I have some comments...

>Prior to Skylab, there were no launches we know about to 50
>.degrees inclination +/- .05 degrees. However, there are a number
>of satellites that were launched near that inclination
>(excluding rocket bodies and debris): COSMOS 139 at 49.7 deg,
>EXPLORER 8 at 49.88 deg, ANNA 1B and EOLE 1 (CAS-A) at 50.14
>deg, EXPLORER 7 at 50.29 deg, COSMOS 546 at 50.65 deg, EXPLORER
>44 (SOLRAD-10) at 51.06 deg, COSMOS 359 at 51.12 deg, COSMOS 50
>at 51.23 deg.

>Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence,
>according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not
>immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred
>attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed
>at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The
>subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds",
>a much later time. I doubt the images actually are of the laser
>beam (although the laser _was_ tested at red wavelengths),
>mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up
>their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser
>beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973,
>which does not correspond with when they reported photographing
>the odd object. One point of interest is that an interview of
>the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used
>the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood
>they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

Strange that they would attempt to photograph the red laser
while the earth was in sunshine. The red beam would have a lot
of light to compete with. The photo you mention does not look
like a red filtered image which would likely be used if one were
to try to detect a red laser beam against a bright background. I
could imagine them trying the Goddard laser experiment when the
earth surface was dark. Then they wouldn't need a red filter.
But then there would also be no image of the surface such as we
see in 2137.

>Trash should be considered as a possible cause although it would
>be small in size. Skylab had a trash jettisoning device/port
>which was used frequently. Existing tracking data lists "debris"
>for Skylab which could be trash, but it seems unlikely since the
>trash bags would not have radar reflective material in/on them.
>There were also reports of items being jettisoned from the much

>larger scientific airlock which definitely were tracked.

Trash would have to be close - within hundreds of meters - if the disappearance was a result of going into shadow. But in this case there would be no 5 sec time lag, or even a 1 sec time lag. An alternate hypothesis explored on the web site is that the object was initially close and all four photos were taken at that time and then it drifted away and became progressively smaller and dimmer and then was about 38 km behind when it went into shadow. But if this were trash, as presumed, why wouldn't the astronauts have realized they were looking at something they had recently ejected?

And why would it appear red?

<snip>

>The size of the re-entering object is not clear. It was stated >to be a camera, which sounds small.

>However, careful reading of the mission reports imply that there >was more to the object than a camera. They apparently jettisoned >on day 8 both a camera and its experiment out of the scientific >airlock. One would have to view TV coverage of the event >(reported to have been shown at the time) to know the size and >whether these objects were connected. The airlock is relatively >large.

Again, if this was trash and if it disappeared by going into shadow then one has to explain

(a) the color

(b) the time lag of 5 or more seconds reported by Garriott who counted out the seconds until the object disappeared. (Evidently he had the impression that the object was following and not leading the Skylab)

>The only way to check the possibility/narrow the timing would be >to get the raw tracking data used by NORAD to generate the >orbital elements, which would consist of data over many orbits >which are analyzed/converted into the elements. However, I would >guess that they have thrown out this old data or not want to >share it in any event with the public.

>Examination of the photo guidebook for Skylab 2 shows the >description for two photos to be "UFO" (SL2-102-893, SL2-102- >897). I have never seen them but have heard that the existing >copies are pretty dark and scratched so nothing may be viewable >on them.

Amusing.

Don't know anything about them.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 16:30:24 -0500
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 17:00:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>The stories are so horrifying I can't repeat them. Gut
>wrenching, mind-numbing, spine-chilling would all be
>understatements to the second power. I had no idea there were so
>many ways to torture people. These stories make Torquemada look
>like bake off pastry chef. No wonder abductees are so quiet and
>reserved. After experiencing things I'm reading I'd be locked up
>in a mountain with enough firepower to take on the 7th Fleet.

I just received a glimpse from an abductee myself - possibly one
of the stories you've received. Illustrated.

I've always been of the opinion that life everywhere in the
observable universe is made of the same molecules we are, and
probably follows the same template, bilateral symmetry, arms,
legs, head, eyes, ears etc.

To me, that suggests that the same problem we have with the
'scum' element probably exists universe wide. So, I'm not all
that surprised about the story I've received, but I agree it is
horrible.

The average sheeple would simply reject it without giving any
credibility whatsoever. Period. Only a few who have been through
Hell on Earth, like some of history's most brutal prisons and
concentration camps, or child torture like the MKULTRA survivors
(forced to torture and kill babies and wildlife, for example,
raped endlessly,) would be able to grasp the stories and
realize that they are probably real.

<snip>

>This is far too grisly for me to handle. Some people said they
>tried to get hold of folks like Budd Hopkins to help them but to
>no avail. Can you imagine undergoing this stuff and having no
>one to turn to?

Oh, I can easily imagine it! Imagine having every aspect of
your life silently attacked and sabotaged, sleep electronically
prevented, your neighbours told you are a pedophile, electronic
pain, endless lies forcing a well qualified engineer out of
technical work and to then work as a security guard (and lucky
to have that!) for 28 years, and having people who could help
(like media people) laugh in your face!

Yes I can easily imagine that!

<snip>

>The next guy making with the benevolent space brothers, they're
>older and wiser than us, they're aliens so they're more
>benevolent nonsense is gonna get the works from me.

Me too. That one story has changed my attitude permanently!

>Sorry I even asked the question in the first place.

>Our history on this world needs a revamp.

Problem is, the people in power dictate what's written about history. There are no doubt plenty of scientists and historians who know very well what's in the books is largely lies, but who don't want to rock the boat because they would lose more than their careers!

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 16:44:18 -0600
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 08:56:44 -0500
Subject: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

Dear List:

I wanted to let everyone know that the Third Quarter publication of The Journal of Abduction Encounter Research has just been published. (Please note: The information below was taken directly from their latest e-mail announcement.)

Articles in this issue include:

Don't Apply for a job at the CIA - You might be interviewed by an alien.

An interview with Kevin Marks
By Elaine Douglass, MUFON SD, UTAH

In 1985, Kevin Marks interviewed for a job at the CIA and was given a lie detector test by a person "who wasn't human." Read this sensational story about the bizarre events that overtook an unsuspecting abductee at a CIA facility in northern Virginia. And the biggest mystery of all: How did the CIA know Kevin Marks was an abductee?

The Power of Hypnotic Recall
By Bill Konkolesky, MUFON SD, Michigan

What if you were two, and a skull "with a gaze deep and horrific" materialized out of the darkness? Years later, the author struggled to remember and found out a startling truth about hypnosis.

Aliens, Music and Me
By Katharina Wilson

Might the lyrics of America's most popular recording artists contain veiled descriptions of alien contact with the artist? Could there be messages and predictions of monumental events hidden in these lyrics?

OPUS: Organization for Paranormal Understanding and Support

June Steiner, OPUS President
Les Velez, OPUS VP and Founder

Book review of:

I Forgot What I Wasn't Supposed to Remember

"Candid, bold, emotionally-charged... dedicated to helping us all comprehend what is happening on this planet." Reviewer John Carpenter loved the new book by Katharina Wilson.

By John Carpenter
MSW, LCSW and JAR Board Editor

For more information, click on:

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

Thanks all -

Katharina Wilson

www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 09:23:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 16:14:18 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 16:37:24 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>><snip>

>>>There's no telling what else has gone on that we don't know
>>>about. One thing for sure is that Linda Moulton Howe's "Strange
>>>Harvest" video, the scariest thing you could watch is tame
>>>compared to the stories I'm getting.

>>>We need to take a double take on this issue. If these stories
>>>don't get the public to start a fire under official asses
>>>nothing will.

>>Greg, with your media and other experience, and with your
>>obvious motivation on this topic, I can't help wondering if
>>you're not being called to launch the book.

>>I agree, this damn censorship, especially if it originates
>>within the ufology community where there is no "national
>>security" excuse, is repulsive.

>Eleanor, right on regarding that censorship! We've got wolves in
>the fold for sure. With the number of emails I've gotten off-List
>containing horror stories I have finally discovered the true
>meaning of hair-tingling.

>The stories are so horrifying I can't repeat them. Gut
>wrenching, mind-numbing, spine-chilling would all be
>understatements to the second power. I had no idea there were so
>many ways to torture people. These stories make Torquemada look
>like bake off pastry chef. No wonder abductees are so quiet and
>reserved. After experiencing things I'm reading I'd be locked up
>in a mountain with enough firepower to take on the 7th Fleet.

>This has got to be the worst experience a human being can endure
>and there's no telling how long it's gone on and how widespread.
>I'm learning that again there are people this has happened to
>and somehow, somehow they pick themselves up and go on to try to
>live a normal life with this and in many cases repeat life-long
>abductions.

>This is far too grisly for me to handle. Some people said they
>tried to get hold of folks like Budd Hopkins to help them but to
>no avail. Can you imagine undergoing this stuff and having no
>one to turn to? It's un-fathomable to me.

>Several people like you have suggested a book but I don't think
>I could stomach it and if it came out there'd be chaos in the
>streets. Just three of the stories I've received if publicly
>known would send people into unresolving panic. The only thing
>keeping me together right now is something I can't mention here
>on the List. Let's just say growing up in tough neighborhoods
>has it's advantages.

>Dr. Jacobs book The Threat, just became more important in my
>opinion.

>The next guy making with the benevolent space brothers, they're
>older and wiser than us, they're aliens so they're more
>benevolent nonsense is gonna get the works from me.

>Sorry I even asked the question in the first place.

>Our history on this world needs a revamp.

Greg,

Having tried to bring the horrific reality of clergy sexual
abuse to the attention of the world for the past decade or so, I
must resoundingly agree with your assessment of the difficulties
involved in bring up these subjects.

Nobody wants to deal with this kind of stuff, whatever the
source. Not victims, not therapists, not the authorities. And
it's all understandably quite human.

And with abductees, the effects must be even worse, as you say.
Their utter powerlessness and isolation must be even more soul-
destroying.

Which makes me wonder about all that talk about us as 'soul-
containers'. If that's what we are, it seems the aliens have
little respect for the packaging...

Anyway, I just wanted to say that my experiences in exposing
such difficult topics show that _any_ such disclosure must be
done very gradually. It starts off with the least horrific and
advances by baby steps to the full truth. It takes time and
courage, both by the revealer and the listener, too.

And if the stories seem unbelievable, well, a friend who
survived the worst abuse I've ever heard about once said,
"Denial is our friend." It is a kindness that can keep us alive
and more-or-less functioning.

We are getting there, as this discussion proves, but it will
take awhile.

Sweet dreams!

Jay

"History is the lie
commonly agreed upon."
Voltaire

=====
www.renegadecatholic.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 09:27:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 23:53:09 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 15:15:49 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 18:54:29 EST
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>So there are unfortunately no new CIA documents.

>Still, I got to the CIA website and checked their FOIA library on UFOs
>with new eyes and found this pearl:

>UFO Briefing For Dr. Edward Condon, 5 MAY 1967

Yeah this was released in the 70's, nothing new.

>I discovered in Edward Condon an honest man who, in the end, had to
>bend to ! his employers. It must have been very difficult for him.

Oh please! You must be joking. Condon was not working for the
CIA just because he got a briefing there! He was working for the
far more insidious and hostile AF.

If you check around some more you'll find a memo by CIA NPIC
(National Photographic Interpretation Center) Director Arthur C.
Lundahl to his boss the DDI saying that Condon's visit and
contacts would give the CIA a "window" into the Colorado UFO
Project. Instead of controlling Condon they were having to use
him to spy on what the AF was up to with the Colorado Project,
unwittingly of course, just by Condon and colleagues keeping
NPIC posted on their work.

>On May 5 1967, Dr. Condon and his group conferred on the
>(Zanesville Ohio) UFO pictures:

>"... Dr. Condon and his colleagues <snip> were most
>enthusiastic. They were impressed with the scope and the
>analysis [blanked out] had conducted which included ground
>survey techniques and densitometric traces. Dr. Condon stated he
>had for the first time a scientific analysis of a UFO that would
>stand up to investigation...

<snip>

>This is probably old knowledge for the seasoned ufologists on
>the List (and old suppression for the seasoned debunkers).

Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

Saunders never breathed a word of his CIA NPIC visit and contacts to anyone, even after Condon fired him in Feb 1968 over the famous pro-UFO incident when he leaked the Low 'trick' memo to McDonald. Why not ponder the coverup involved with that?

>This was some revelation to me.

>The magnitude of the implications leaves me speechless. Most of >the text could have been capitalized.

Lots more than just this, and released in the 70's, but it would require an in-depth investigation of CIA organization and history to understand it, beginning with the fact the CIA is not a monolithic agency speaking and acting with one voice. Most UFO researchers cannot even keep up with the polarized 'covert' and 'overt' sides of the CIA, so everything that is 'CIA' is automatically attributed to spook assassins and James Bond types.

Brad Sparks

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 09:33:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2007 15:53:10 -0500
>>Subject: Skylab 3

>>Alan Bean, Jack Lousma and Owen Garriott (the first scientist in
>>space). It was more than 30 years ago, and it has taken me a
>>long time (!) to complete the analysis and post this. But the
>>data are still good.

A slight correction as I was reminded that Harrison Schmitt of
Apollo 17 was the first scientist in orbit, just a few orbits
before lunar orbit insertion. However, Garriott was the first
scientist on an orbital mission (Schmitt's was a lunar mission).

>>If you want to find an astronaut sighting of an unidentified
>>space object - USO; this one was not submerged - then here you
>>are.

>>Comments welcome

>><http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SKYLAB3.html>

The link to our article has been changed to:

<http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SL3.html>

>The Skylab images seem peculiar and a relatively long duration
>intersecting orbit with a satellite not very close to the Skylab
>inclination would be highly unlikely.

>Regarding your webpage, I have some comments...

>Prior to Skylab, there were no launches we know about to 50
>degrees inclination +/- .05 degrees. However, there are a number
>of satellites that were launched near that inclination
>(excluding rocket bodies and debris): COSMOS 139 at 49.7 deg,
>EXPLORER 8 at 49.88 deg, ANNA 1B and EOLE 1 (CAS-A) at 50.14
>deg, EXPLORER 7 at 50.29 deg, COSMOS 546 at 50.65 deg, EXPLORER
>44 (SOLRAD-10) at 51.06 deg, COSMOS 359 at 51.12 deg, COSMOS 50
>at 51.23 deg.

Thanks for the list but I'm not sure why it is really relevant.
For example, your first item Cosmos 139 was a Fractional Orbital
Bombardment System (FOBS) test that was de-orbited even before
finishing its first orbit on Jan 25, 1967, in order to avoid
violating the treaty banning the orbiting of space weapons. It
re-entered over Kapustin Yar. The associated upper stage and
adapter also re-entered on Jan 25, 1967. The Skylab 3 sighting
was in 1973.

The Cosmos 139 FOBS apogee was 130 miles so it would have been
over 140 miles below the Skylab 3 at 270+ miles height and thus
impossible to see, as well as never close enough to be the

measured 20-30 miles away as Garriott measured using the sun's shadow entry.

The tiny Explorer 7 was launched in 1959 and had a perigee of about 348 miles hence it could not have gotten closer than about 70 miles to Skylab 3 assuming the fairly high orbit had not decayed much by 1973. It was too small to even consider having been visible. The rocket upper stage was also launched into a similar orbit, and was a much larger object (a few feet), but was in a decaying orbit, re-entering in 1989. Maybe by 1973 its perigee had dropped to within range of Skylab 3, but that would not mean it was anywhere nearby.

Neither NORAD or NASA had any tracking projections of satellite objects in close encounters with Skylab 3. They had 14 years of orbital data and thus plenty of warning of any close approaches. It was not something launched just a day or two before Skylab's USO encounter on Sept 20, 1973.

Explorer 8 was the same size and launched in 1960 with a much lower perigee of about 258 miles as was its rocket upper stage, hence was within Skylab altitude range and again neither tracked nor projected by NORAD or NASA anywhere nearby. The rocket stage was decaying and re-entered in 1985.

Anyway, story is going to be the same in every case: Why didn't NORAD track or project any close approaches to Skylab 3 with its COMBO computer program and formal agreement with NASA to predict and warn of all close approaches of satellites and space debris throughout every manned NASA space mission??

>Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence,
>according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not
>immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred
>attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed
>at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The
>subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds",
>a much later time.

I'm not sure what significance "immediately before or after" and "a much later time" have as far as being able to use the camera lens data for the Nikon camera used. About an hour later at around 1800 GMT the Skylab 3 was over Ontario.

>I doubt the images actually are of the laser
>beam (although the laser was tested at red wavelengths),
>mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up
>their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser
>beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973,
>which does not correspond with when they reported photographing
>the odd object.

Well "doubt" is far too understated. "Ridiculous" would be more appropriate. The Skylab red USO photos show black space background and no trace of the earth background of Maryland from the Goddard Laser Experiment.

>One point of interest is that an interview of
>the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used
>the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood
>they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

Yet you were just before this protesting that the "before" the red USO and "after" shots were not "immediately before or after." Can you make up your mind please? If you say there "seems to be a good likelihood" that the astronauts kept the 300 mm lens on the Nikon from Sept 4 for two weeks till Sept 20 then you seem to be saying it does not matter how long "before or after." Please clarify.

There were 5 Nikons so how do you know that the Goddard Laser photos are from the same Nikon? Do they have same serial numbers (SL3-118-2136 and 2137??) or were they from a different series indicating a different camera?

>Regarding the time period of the photos, it is odd that the crew
>debriefing as shown in your web page lists the event occurring 7
>to 10 days prior to landing, while Oberg was able to see from
>transcripts that it was 5 days.

That is not a correct quote - Garriott said it was "about" a

week (<not> "7 ... days") or 10 days before the astronauts' return to earth.

>Since the transcripts are not
>available in electronic form for us to look at (only microfilm,
>do you have a copy Mr. Sparks?) then we have to take Oberg's
>word for it (who may be right, but it would be nice to get a
>double check on this critical data).

I don't understand. What difference does "electronic form" make? Bruce transcribed the transcript so the text is searchable on his website in our article, in "electronic form."

>The transcript would seem
>to be the best estimate for time. Even so, the statement in the
>transcript indicates Lousma was not sure if it was 3 revs or 2
>or 4 revs since Owens made no confirmation, so we can't state
>definitively it is 16:30-16:40 GMT.

"Best estimate"??? There is nothing in the transcript where astronaut Jack Lousma says he was not sure if it was "2 or 4 revs" ago. Lousma says it was "about 3 revs ago" in this transcript from about 2106 GMT of Tape 263-10/T-671 Page 9 of 14/5207. Day 263 of 1973 was Sept 20. I don't see how you can legitimately throw doubt on that.

From 2106 GMT "3 revs ago" or about 4-1/2 hours before, would be about 1636 GMT. Ten minutes before sun shadow entry at 1645 GMT makes the sighting from about 1635 to 1645 GMT. End of story.

>Space-Track has the orbital elements for a set of trackable
>debris for Skylab as well as lots of other satellites during
>that Sept 1973 time period. Such orbital elements have
>limitations. You can calculate the position of a satellite using
>this data, but if the date of the orbital elements are far from
>the date you are interested in, the results may be very
>inaccurate. This is especially true for very low, soon-to-re-
>enter objects. Simply running what is available for objects +-5
>degrees in inclination using Oberg's time period (+- 90 minutes)
>show no objects within 100 km. If one looks at a period of +-7
>days, then objects do get within 20 km occasionally for
>respectable time periods.

What software did you use and which NORAD Spacetrack elsets did you use? Which objects approached within 20 km of Skylab 3 within the week before and after Sept 20 and for how long? 10 minutes? If you have a list of such space objects and have the elsets we can tell how recent the elsets data were and get an idea how good the projected close approaches to Skylab 3. NORAD said there had been no close approach warnings to manned spacecraft as of 1973. A 12-mile close pass would be highly significant and potentially dangerous - because tracking and projection errors could mean the real distance was 0-km (impact).

>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three
>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are
>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>going in shadow.

Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos? Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles height.

The earth's limb was about 1,400 miles away from Skylab's height. The only way a 60-100-mile high re-entry could be viewed from Skylab against a black space background if it was about 1,400 miles away. But the earth's limb would be visible immediately below the re-entry about 2 to 4 degrees below and the burning object would be progressively falling still lower. Garriott said the red object was "well above the horizon."

>I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing
>could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some
>time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than
>how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they
>enter the atmosphere with usually).

Re-entries take 2-3 minutes, not 10 minutes, and travel nearly
horizontally about 600 to 900 miles - a movement not seen by the
Skylab astronauts or evidenced in the photos which do not show a
flaming streak.

>Examination of the photo guidebook for Skylab 2 shows the
>description for two photos to be "UFO" (SL2-102-893, SL2-102-
>897). I have never seen them but have heard that the existing
>copies are pretty dark and scratched so nothing may be viewable
>on them.

Can you post a link to the Skylab photo guidebooks or supply
copies?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 11:10:17 -0500
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 11:10:17 -0500
Subject: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

December 1, 2007

Editorial

Kucinich's Close Encounter

The presidential candidate's televised acknowledgment of seeing a UFO has put the issue back on the radar.

Although it's unlikely that voters will ever have anything resembling a close encounter with Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich (D- Ohio), the two-time presidential hopeless has helped revive an issue that means more to many Americans than any election: suppression of UFO evidence by the men in black.

You may recall that during a recent MSNBC Democratic presidential candidates' debate, moderator Tim Russert drew out Kucinich on the revelation (by Oscar-winning paranormal investigator Shirley MacLaine) that he had once spotted a "triangular craft, silent and hovering." Kucinich's reply, which was intriguing in its own right, came at a conjunction of - well, maybe not of UFO activity, but certainly of UFO aficionado activity.

This fall saw the first anniversary of the multiple-witness saucer incident over the United Airlines terminal at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, which is already shaping up as this decade's great sighting. In late October, a federal judge ordered NASA to search its records for information on one of two fabled UFO sightings from 1965.

And last month, the New York-based Coalition for Freedom of Information held a conference at which more than a score of pilots from around the world gathered to share their experiences with unidentified flying objects. Moderator Fife Symington (the controversial former governor of Arizona) summed up the conference by calling for the government to stop perpetuating "the myth that ALL UFOs can be explained away in down-to-earth, conventional terms" and reopen its official Blue Book investigation, which has been closed since 1969.

Are we on the verge of an alien breakthrough? Is this new critical mass of respectable UFO hawks about to rout the army of dissembling federal agents, driving around in their 1964 Chevy Malibus with their shades and fixed smiles?

Probably not. There have been high-profile flying saucer enthusiasts in the past, including astronauts Buzz Aldrin, who spotted a mysterious something during Apollo 11's return trip, and the late Gordon Cooper, who once informed the United

Nations, "I believe that... extraterrestrial vehicles and their crews are visiting this planet from other planets, which are a little more technically advanced than we are on Earth."

Kucinich mentioned in his own defense that President Carter was a UFO witness, and he might have mentioned that Ronald Reagan was as well. Then again, if you think presidents really run the country, well, that's what "they" want you to think.

If anything keeps the cult of the UFO alive, it's not the respectability of the witnesses but the clumsy, protesting-too-much denials of government agencies. The Federal Aviation Administration got caught in a fib about last year's O'Hare incident after the Chicago Tribune filed a Freedom of Information Act request. And it's somewhat perverse to call for reopening a federal UFO investigation given how universally hated the knee-jerk-skeptical Project Blue Book turned out to be.

John Podesta, the Clinton White House chief of staff who has never disguised his interest in flying saucers, makes the case that the government should declassify its UFO-related materials "and let people have at it," a demand that is as reasonable as it is unlikely to happen, given how easily this topic can be rerouted into japery.

In his debate reply, Kucinich made a point dear to respectable UFO investigators: "It was an unidentified flying object, OK?" he said. "It's like... it was unidentified. I saw something." There's a difference between saying objects in the sky are sometimes not familiar and claiming to have been probed by taciturn "grays," and people such as Coalition for Freedom of Information co-founder Leslie Kean express understandable frustration that UFO ridicule purposely blurs that distinction.

But with Kucinich as a central advocate, ridicule may be unavoidable. In the debate, Kucinich made a self-deprecating joke about moving his campaign headquarters to "Roswell, New Mexico, and another one in Exeter, New Hampshire." Roswell everybody knows about, but with the easy reference to the 1965 Exeter incident, Kucinich leaves the impression that he's not just a UFO witness, he's a buff.

Let him go on, and we suspect Kucinich will soon be expanding on the Kecksburg sightings, the Val Johnson incident, Lonnie Zamora, the 'Kaikoura lights' and countless other visitations from the sky that continue to sustain our nation's sense of mystery.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 14:32:24 -0000
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 11:51:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 13:16:07 -0500
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>Animal reaction stories are common. Read Hunt For The Skinwalker
>if you want to read a 'gory' story of a something that caused a
>herd of cattle to run in chaos.

>It seems to me that in years past there has been compiled by
>someone - can't think of his name - a catalogue of animal
>reaction cases.

Hi All,

Right, what's interesting to me is these extreme effects
sometimes reported in dogs.

Herbivores, even big ones, are relatively easily spooked, having
a history of being hunted by carnivores, whereas dogs are
carnivores with a strong pack-instinct - which means they'll
normally be very brave and territorial while with you: the dog
owner and 'pack-leader'.

To hear of an adult dog going 'crazy', hiding behind its owner,
or just yelping and running away - well, that's surprising and
seems to need an explanation.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:41:10 -0600
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2007 11:53:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Kathy Kasten <catraja.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 18:15:15 +0000
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 16:54:53 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Kathy Kasten <catraja.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:22:50 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 14:51:54 EST
>>>>Subject: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>><snip>

<sent>

>>>>Those adorable, ETS of superior intelligence? They would never
>>>>do anything like that. Oh yeah, the mother is so stupid she
>>>>really does understand the ETs are "teaching" her a lesson.

>>>>Some lesson.

>>Maybe you have to be the emergency room doctor to understand
>>the emergency room doctor's activities and behaviors. Many of
>>these EMDs have superior intelligence, and I'm told that they
>>can be quite adorable.

>Alfred:

>You are not responding from your own experience and I will have
>to discount the above statements.

>BTW: I am coming from a medical background.

Nonsense. Allowing that it still might be as bad as you say, a cultural kindergartener or precocious pre-schooler intellectually handicapped by the cant and bias of incomplete science, inadequate philosophy, and a crippling anthropomorphism may not be the best judge of her experience, even if she does have a medical background. Moreover, this is without regard to how horrific that experience is assessed, too.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>
U F O M a g a z i n e -- www.ufomag.com

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 06:58:50 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 06:58:50 -0500
Subject: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

Jose Escamilla's UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

is on-line at:

<http://tinyurl.com/yqbxzt>

"This is the best of the whole story of UFO investigation that we have today. It's an All in One, UFOs Prophecy and technology."

Its 1:34:04 in length.

ebk

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Readers Call In On 'Dorito' UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:06:09 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:06:09 -0500
Subject: Readers Call In On 'Dorito' UFO

Source: The Express & Star - Wolverhampton, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/25zjsd>

December 1st, 2007

Readers Call In On Dorito UFO

Readers have been calling in their droves to tell us they saw the huge "Dorito" UFO in the skies over the Black Country.

The orange triangle with its three lights was seen over Wednesfield and Dudley by scores of people who phoned the newspaper after an appeal for information.

A flurry of calls was made to Stourbridge based UFO Research Midlands, UFORM, from those claiming to have witnessed an unexplained aircraft in the sky.

The flying object was spotted over Halesowen heading towards Stourbridge on Wednesday at around 7pm. Katherine Hemmings, aged 13, of Beechwood Avenue, saw it at 4pm over Wednesfield High School in Lichfield Road. She was walking home with friends Tasmin Jones and Chelsea Smith when the three felt compelled to turn around. "It was weird because it wasn't making any noise but for some reason we turned around", Katherine said. "We all saw this big thing with lights in the sky.

"We didn't tell anyone other than our families at first because we thought everyone would laugh at us. Our families didn't know what to think until they saw it in the paper. I have never really believed something like that would be real. I always just thought people who say they have seen a UFO are seeing aeroplanes or birds." Pat Scotford and her husband Mick saw the UFO when they were in their garden in Devon Road, Wollaston at around 7.30pm.

Mrs Scotford, aged 61, said she too saw three orange lights in the sky. "It looked like it was heading towards Kinver", she said. "At first I thought it was three planes flying in formation but the lights were far too close together. I'm sure we're not alone in the universe."

Steve Poole, chairman of UFORM, said one man filmed over 30 seconds of footage of the craft.

Driver Lisa Timmins, aged 38, saw the object while at her boyfriend's house in Whitgreave Avenue, Bushbury, some time between 6.15pm and 6.40pm.

She said: "I haven't got a clue what it was, but it was quite big."

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 06:55:06 -0800
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:15:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>>The stories are so horrifying I can't repeat them. Gut
>>wrenching, mind-numbing, spine-chilling would all be
>>understatements to the second power. I had no idea there were so
>>many ways to torture people. These stories make Torquemada look
>>like bake off pastry chef. No wonder abductees are so quiet and
>>reserved. After experiencing things I'm reading I'd be locked up
>>in a mountain with enough firepower to take on the 7th Fleet.

<snip>

>>Dr. Jacobs book The Threat, just became more important in my
>>opinion.

>>The next guy making with the benevolent space brothers, they're
>>older and wiser than us, they're aliens so they're more
>>benevolent nonsense is gonna get the works from me.

>>Sorry I even asked the question in the first place.

>>Our history on this world needs a revamp.

>Having tried to bring the horrific reality of clergy sexual
>abuse to the attention of the world for the past decade or so, I
>must resoundingly agree with your assessment of the difficulties
>involved in bring up these subjects.

>_Nobody_ wants to deal with this kind of stuff, whatever the
>source. Not victims, not therapists, not the authorities. And
>it's all understandably quite human.

>And with abductees, the effects must be even worse, as you say.
>Their utter powerlessness and isolation must be even more soul-
>destroying.

>Which makes me wonder about all that talk about us as 'soul-
>containers'. If that's what we are, it seems the aliens have
>little respect for the packaging...

>Anyway, I just wanted to say that my experiences in exposing
>such difficult topics show that any such disclosure must be
>done very gradually. It starts off with the least horrific and
>advances by baby steps to the full truth. It takes time and
>courage, both by the revealer and the listener, too.

>And if the stories seem unbelievable, well, a friend who

>survived the worst abuse I've ever heard about once said,
>"Denial is our friend." It is a kindness that can keep us alive
>and more-or-less functioning.

>We are getting there, as this discussion proves, but it will
>take awhile.

Thank you so much for replying Jay!

It's been a rough few days going over this data. So much is coming back to me as to why I remained in this field of study when all logic said to ditch it and go on with a somewhat normal life.

I grew up in an area of so many abductions it was common place to see people bending an elbow to get away from it and worse. I kept denying and shrugging it off but no matter where I went in this country people would come up with the same stories.

When I asked folks in other countries I would get similar stories but from different viewpoints. It seems in the old countries and cultures these beings are referred to as the 'ancient ones' or 'manufacturers' or some such.

Even the Armenians in my neighborhood have a 'so-what' attitude to the situation and their point is one of we're responsible and part and parcel to the problem. They didn't even bat an eye and if you've ever met Armenian folks they're some of the toughest people I've ever met. You could drop a planet on them and they'd shake it off and keep on keeping on.

Now that my memory is kicking in. I've realized I'm just as guilty of denial as our authorities. So much has happened over the past ten or twelve years I've been doing the Ufology thing in earnest via the web I didn't think people would believe me.

Now that I've studied more and met so many people via the Web including on the ground I've lost count how many people I've interviewed, I've got a pretty clear simple picture of what's going on and it's irking our visitors. For some strange reason it's 'hands off' on me and I now know why but that's a whole other story.

Bottom line is removing all the social things and just looking at the basics such as predator and prey, symbiosis etc. things even out.

Now, focusing on your point regarding help for abductees and harrassed witnesses, I recall spending lots of time and money trying to help folks out in the late 90s. Hold on to your hat for this one though, my error was in thinking the mental help professionals were the key but one day during our live chat show on AOL's Parascope Magazine I asked the guests what did they think about psychiatrists in helping in the abductee matter and you would think I had said a bad word.

In the years I had worked in that forum with thousands of people coming through it every day the chatters never totally agreed on anything and would fight tooth and nail over every issue, but when I mentioned psychiatrists you'd have thought I said the ultimate cuss word.

Men, women, black, white, Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist, tall, short, young, old, conservative, liberal, all piled in there and lambasted psychiatry like it was a snake in the yard!

I had never received so many e-mails and chat posts regarding the horror stories people had undergone in psychiatric hospitals.

They sounded like something from a Frankenstein movie but a thousand times worse.

I was totally caught off guard and realized abductees had nowhere to go and that's why they were visiting our magazine to support group one another.

One woman who had undergone brutality I'd never be able to conceive of told all of us and showed us documentation regarding what happened to her. I had to send her to a lawyer to get the situation taken care of.

Later, Jeff Rense and several of his colleagues straightened me out on psychiatry too. Even Dr. Mack gave us some tips on handling abductees during the 50th anniversary at Roswell and I'll dig that video up and post it. He was glad I asked him about bedside manner in regard to it all.

Eleanor mentioned the MKULTRA victims. Several of them came into our chat room and their stories were so out-there we almost fell out of our chairs. They even had documentation and I was able to confirm many things they said because I had the contacts to do that.

I should have known having grown up in the Hudson Valley of NY and there were huge psychiatric hospitals and institutions up there. I mean Ponderosa sized institutions.

I sure got a lesson how futile a lot of psychiatry is and the sinister deals done behind the scenes. After reading and watching testimony before Congress I didn't know who was worse, the aliens or the headshrinkers!

I've calmed down a bit and agree with you on handling things gradually. I'm going to get more data from foreign sources to back up some data and will pursue all of this. If the general public knew this stuff they would totally freak.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: **Steve Sawyer** <stevesaw.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:13:32 -0800
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:33:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
>To: UFOupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

Hi, Jay & Fellow Listerions,

I've been observing the essential back-and-forth on this issue.

How, apparently, absolutely horrifyingly some UFO abductees have been dealt with, both by 'abductors' and individuals who allegedly facilitate their coming to terms, or not, with their individual experiences.

The time has indeed now come to present a compilation of these stories and the research that, hopefully, underlies them, as just talking about the "horror that must not be named" (or described) in increasingly nebulous terms is very much less than either helpful or productive.

Despite the erstwhile comments of one List member recently who suggested List members, to some degree, are voyeurs or some kind of afficiandos of what might be termed 'alien porn', isn't it incumbent on those aspects of the UFO community, and related researchers, who are aware of the data and alleged details of these "all too-close encounters" to, in some way, or via some channel, document these stories?

How would one be able to discriminate between actual experiences and 'tall tales' told by those who may not be either telling the truth or may be delusional?

These issues seem to me, at least, to be going unanswered, and without any further, real substantiation or research study or at least an article or blog post somewhere which touches on the matters I'm suggesting continue to go 'wanting' in either detail or, dare I say, credibility, just what are we doing here going around in circles, again?

I say put some meat/facts on the table, or perhaps we should just retire to the smoking room of rumors and platitudes where we may prepare our precious post-prandial puffery and be done with the subject for now, as otherwise, time and energy is being wasted in lieu of some-thing more substantial than the requisite smell of smoke being circulated in the drawing rooms of our current 'wilderness of mirrors'. Sorry to sound so harsh, but these discussions are taking on Lovecraftian proportions, IMHO.

If you're talking about the really quite touchy and repellant subject of human mutilation, then that's already out there, on the web and elsewhere, but if it's something even more horrible

(which I find difficult to imagine), then shouldn't we know something, with some substantiation and detail, at least enough to be able to even come to some perspectives on the matter, let alone research, documentation, and scientific analysis thereof?

If what you're implying is as monstrous as it sounds, then we not only should know, we have a right to know, don't we? I don't care to add to this fray, but what are the facts that can really be established here?

To paraphrase the infamous poster on the wall of Fox Mulder on the X-files, I do not want to believe. Belief without fact is an error. I want to know the truth, no matter what it is. Only that will begin to even allow us to become free. Without it, we are only whispering in the dark, scaring the gullible and preaching to the faithful. Enough!

Some here need to either, to put directly, "put up or shut up." IMHO. The very title of this thread begs the question: "Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?" The answer is no, not if we can't even discuss this among ourselves in any realistic way.

What say you all?

Steve

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:21:22 -0800
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:36:31 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

>December 1, 2007

>Editorial

>Kucinich's Close Encounter

>The presidential candidate's televised acknowledgment of seeing
>a UFO has put the issue back on the radar.

>Although it's unlikely that voters will ever have anything
>resembling a close encounter with Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich
>(D- Ohio), the two-time presidential hopeless has helped revive
>an issue that means more to many Americans than any election:

<snip>

>In his debate reply, Kucinich made a point dear to respectable
>UFO investigators: "It was an unidentified flying object, OK?"
>he said. "It's like... it was unidentified. I saw something."
>There's a difference between saying objects in the sky are
>sometimes not familiar and claiming to have been probed by
>taciturn "grays," and people such as Coalition for Freedom of
>Information co-founder Leslie Kean express understandable
>frustration that UFO ridicule purposely blurs that distinction.

>But with Kucinich as a central advocate, ridicule may be
>unavoidable. In the debate, Kucinich made a self-deprecating
>joke about moving his campaign headquarters to "Roswell, New
>Mexico, and another one in Exeter, New Hampshire." Roswell
>everybody knows about, but with the easy reference to the 1965
>Exeter incident, Kucinich leaves the impression that he's not
>just a UFO witness, he's a buff.

>Let him go on, and we suspect Kucinich will soon be expanding on
>the Kecksburg sightings, the Val Johnson incident, Lonnie
>Zamora, the 'Kaikoura lights' and countless other visitations
>from the sky that continue to sustain our nation's sense of
>mystery.

Hey, no fair! How dare a mainstream newspaper put out a fair and
reasonable editorial regarding UFOs and it not contain
disingenuous remarks!

Why if this keeps up real journalism might break out all over
the place and we'd all be in for a world of hurt!

Somebody ought to write the LA Times and warn them if they don't
stop publishing thoughtful and level-headed editorials we'll be
out in the streets protesting!

Ruin our perceptions of cowardly lacky journalists will they?
Well we'll show them! We'll boycott their newspaper and...

Wait. Coffee just set in. Am I reading this article right?

Best ,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: **Greg Boone** <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:58:01 -0800
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:42:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 14:32:24 -0000
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

<snip>

>... what's interesting to me is these extreme effects
>sometimes reported in dogs.

>Herbivores, even big ones, are relatively easily spooked, having
>a history of being hunted by carnivores, whereas dogs are
>carnivores with a strong pack-instinct - which means they'll
>normally be very brave and territorial while with you: the dog
>owner and 'pack-leader'.

>To hear of an adult dog going 'crazy', hiding behind its owner,
>or just yelping and running away - well, that's surprising and
>seems to need an explanation.

My point all along Ray. It takes alot to back a dog down. I've
seen them whimper only at machines. Other than that, dogs will
take on bear and kinfolk stories go way back to when dogs would
take on wolverine and puma.

I'm wondering if any other carnivores, lions and tigers and
bears, are recorded as responding in kind.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 12:50:13 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:50:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 16:44:18 -0600
>Subject: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

>Dear List:

>I wanted to let everyone know that the Third Quarter publication
>of The Journal of Abduction Encounter Research has just been
>published. (Please note: The information below was taken
>directly from their latest e-mail announcement.)

<snip>

Katharina:

I have been interested in this endeavor, The Journal of Abduction Encounter Research, since it's first publication. But I have been reluctant to support JAR, due to its links with the Exopolitical movement.

I have to oppose current Exopolitics because of their fundamental flaws in policy, which center around assuming an eventual audience of equals with ETs that abduct and abuse victims.

Past behavior being the best predictor of future behavior, that it is, abducting ETs have no interest in an Exopolitical dialogue, or any other dialogue, with us.

If this assessment is in error, please correct it. In the meantime, I will continue to point those, who email me off-list, to folks who share the desire to end these abductions, and help the abductees to cope with the trauma.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 17:49:21 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:55:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 25 Nov 2007 17:31:11 -0400
>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>,
>>Date: Sat, 24 Nov 2007 21:02:50 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>
>>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Nov 2007 08:03:44 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 23 Nov 2007 12:05:03 EST
>>>>Subject: Melvin Brown And The MPs

><snip>

>My conversations with Melvin Brown's daughter indicate that he
>had a connection with some military intelligence function, as
>there were visits to such facilities as the Chicksands listening
>post in the UK, to which he had immediate access while the
>family waited outside.

>Have there been no instances of CIC or other people planted to
>check on scuttlebutt?

>As I recall Jan you falsely claimed that all TOP SECRET
>Documents had to have TOP SECRET Control numbers.

Stan,

No, Stan, you are falsely represented what I said about Top
Secret control number. My position stated simply so you can
easily follow it is and has always been:

1. Regulations after WWII required Top Document unique controls.
Message centers uses other than TS control numbers to control
messages distributed to users, however, the system used readily
identify the copies.

2. Declassified documents may not show evidence of TS control
numbers, due to the declassification and sanitization process so
examples plucked from National Archives or other publicly
available facilities are not necessarily proof that there is no
TS control numbers required.

3. Documents without TS control numbers? This indicates a
security violation. Laws against murder stop the crime from
being committed. (SOM 101 supposedly was an active document why
did not have such a number?)

4. The White House, although many historical documents state
that they will AR 380-5 (probably because of the Army White

House Communication Group), might have a different system. However, I allowed that the White House itself might have another unique system for tracking the TS documents consistent, as with message centers operations, the President's executive orders. I haven't research the White House aspect.

My position, same today as yesterday, if you don't believe that check the UpDates Archive.

Examples of TS documents with control numbers and control registers are available on the Project 1947 website.

What exactly is the source of your research which causes you to try to debunk the use of TS control numbers. Actual references please, not bluff and bluster. Do you believe that TS control numbers and control registers are done just for no reason?

Brown could have been a CIC agent or a CID agent or any other thing you want to think up. The problem here is proof. During WWII CIC agents were assigned to duty in civilian facilities as well as military facilities. Possibly uncover agents were assigned to Roswell.

Firstly conversations with Brown's daughter are not proof of anything, but assuming her story is true, maybe Brown during his career went from cook to intelligence. (The opposite of Doty who went from OSI agent to end his military career as a cook. Doty lost his clearance, but he contended that it had nothing to do with his UFO activity in letters to various ufologists.)

Any speculation on Brown's status, is just that speculation.

Let's clear up other things about clearances while we're at it. My arguments about MJ-12 cover many problems covering content, format, and doctrine etc. no just security problems

I cited over 50 problems in my critique of SOM 1-01. T

This is a very silly document in which the supposed finest minds in the country can't gives simple instructions as to how to conceal recovery operations from view of either people on higher ground or flying overhead.

Bill Hamilton and Ryan Wood have both claimed in writing that various critics of MJ-12 etc. may be conversant with current doctrine, they do not know what the doctrine and regulations in effect in early post security matters. I understand that you have also used this argument, but I have nothing in writing to show me that is the case.

In any case it shows that Hamilton and Wood are not only ufologists, but also mind readers. So I will answer this objection here.

In my training we covered all presidential orders concerning security information. Besides a number of formal courses while I was assigned to an intelligence position, I took nearly every correspondence course offered concerning intelligence, counter-intelligence, signal intelligence, communications security, etc. Also, while on active duty, I read extensive on the history of intelligence and my research continued after I left the Service especially at the US Army History Institute in PA, the Field Artillery School AJ Library at Fort Sill, the Air Force Historical Research Agency, National Archives and Library of Congress.

While on active I used several manuals issued in 1954, so I am familiar with formats and writing styles. Also during my assignment to the Directorate of Training Developments I was required to analyze in detail train requirements from such 1954 manuals still in use in the 1980s.

I am indeed familiar with security and manuals available in 1954.

Jan Aldrich

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 18:44:08 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:58:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>From: Kevin Randle <krandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 15:27:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>I think we have gotten a little deep into the weeds as we say in
>the Army. The point I was attempting to make was that Melvin
>Brown, simply because he was a cook was not disqualified from
>being assigned to guard duty at some point. I was suggesting
>that the MPs would be required to continue their normal duties
>whether it was patrolling in town, guarding the air base,
>guarding the bomb pits or hangars, or anything else that
>required it. Now, they were suddenly tasked with additional
>assignments which could have overwhelmed their ability to
>respond. Jan Aldrich didn't like my quoting doctrine about this,
>but this is where we turn in this circumstance. Doctrine tells
>us who would be pressed into service for these additional
>duties.

<snip>

>I have been quite interested in the take of everyone about this,
>and surprised at the tone of some of the responses. But I think
>we need to get out of the weeds at this point.

Kevin,

I do not dispute that all soldiers are basic infantry soldiers
due to basic training. As someone pointed out to me privately,
Westmoreland made many replacement infantry despite their MOS.

However, this is a garrison operation in the USA, not overseas
during WWII or RVN.

As a practical matter cooks do not go on guard duty. Of course,
you can always feed field rations, however, food keeps coming
into the installation unless it is stopped in advance due to
field training That is why cooks cook. Believe me I have sat
through numerous staff meeting where the mess hall head count
was a topic for discussion.

My question to you is when, if ever, have you seen cooks on
guard or other duties in a garrison situation?

Your comment that skeptics had objections to Brown's story was
what triggered my comment. Why did skeptics have to bring it up
at all? Why wouldn't an investigator question this himself?

As with the radar story at the beginning of your book. The whole
idea of Air Defense being able to take over operation of other
command's radar presents problems. Most of these radars at
White Sands were crew served and can't be operated by one
man...The idea that an explosion can be seen on radar presents
problems depending on the radar. McCoy tried to get interceptor
and radar support for Project SIGN but was rebuffed due to the
inadequate training, readiness or commitment of radar systems.

Hauling cargo in ambulance is contrary to policy, but am sure

you can get some fellow to jump in here with a thrid hand story that his grandfather used an ambulance to haul brandy for General Patton in his ambulance. Ambulances haul medical TOE equipment, medics personal gear, and patients. If there were debris it should have been on other vehicles.

Certainly these above problems that investigators should have recognized, and at the very least, commented on the problem instead of waiting for skeptics to bring up.

Kaufman's story didn't impress me either, someone running around with supposedly classified documents giving out little hints here and there, but not letting anyone see the documents. That seemed fishy. Great for a television program. The press at the 50th Roswell anniversary seemed to take Kaufman the most serious. I didn't.

Jan Aldrich

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Dean Adams?

From: Will Bueche <info.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 19:03:32 -0700
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:03:29 -0500
Subject: Dean Adams?

Does anyone know who Dean Adams was?

I know Dean Adams was active in the mid 1990s expressing skeptical viewpoints on alien related newsgroups.

I am trying to find any biographical material about him, such as whether he was a CSICOP member.

Thank you.

Will Bueche

John E Mack Institute
PO Box 7046, Boulder, CO 80306-7046
info.nul
www.JohnEMackInstitute.org

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Robert Emenegger Enjoys Retirement

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:14:59 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:14:59 -0500
Subject: Robert Emenegger Enjoys Retirement

Source: The Northwest Arkansas Times - Fayetteville, Arkansas

<http://www.nwanews.com/nwat/Living/59801/>

Sunday, December 2, 2007

Movie Man: Bob Emenegger Enjoys Retirement But Still Works
Casually On Film Pursuits

By Kevin Kinder
Northwest Arkansas Times

The ivories are mostly quiet in Bob Emenegger's home, but not always. If someone asks him nicely enough, in fact, he might play a quick tune on the little keyboard in the big office in his antique house.

If he does play, there is no telling what the ditty might be. Perhaps it will be an original number like those he has been writing for decades. A veteran of the southern California entertainment scene, Emenegger has written film scores, commercial jingles, the soundtrack to a television show about chimpanzees and movies during a career that spans four decades.

That the keyboard is mostly quiet is significant, as it reflects the life Emenegger now lives. He retired to Northwest Arkansas with his wife, Margaret, in 1994. It is especially rare that he composes, he said.

"If there's no way to see it through to the audience, I don't do it," he said.

But retirement doesn't mean that can't still produce a tune to two. Emenegger is also quite active with the North Arkansas Symphony Orchestra. On Saturday, the symphony will perform music from Christmas-themed movies while parts of the films are shown to the crowd. Emenegger, no stranger to editing film, is in charge of trimming the full-length features into self-contained clips that still tell a story. He will also contribute a short opening film, "Christmas Past," for Saturday night's performance.

In the spotlight Emenegger's grandfather was a bandleader while he served in the Navy, and the younger Emenegger decided to pursue music as well. It didn't start well. He got a D in his high school music class, primarily because he played by ear and his teacher preferred he actually learn notes. Undeterred, Emenegger enrolled in University of California, Los Angeles, which is near his hometown of Westwood, Calif. While majoring in motion picture studies and minoring in music, he began to participate in productions such as spring concerts and student musicals. It was through those programs that he befriended several other students, including Carol Burnett who would later star in many films and her own television variety show. As Burnett's star started to burn bright, the light was also cast on other students at the school, Emenegger included. A large

group of students =97 excluding Burnett, who had already taken another offer =97 were flown around the world to do shows. Many of the shows were to entertain troops serving in the Korean War, for which Emenegger was acknowledged by the Department of Defense.

Making melodies He returned to California to finish his degree and soon began working in Hollywood. In addition to working in several advertising agencies, he also began work in the film industry.

In the mid-1960 s, Emenegger began writing scores for such independent releases as "Passion Street, U. S. A.," and later, for the television series "Lancelot Link: Secret Chimp," which featured a cast of chimpanzees. Other films to his credit include "Time Warp," "Death: The Ultimate Mystery" and "The Killings At Outpost Zeta."

While many people saw the movies, perhaps Emenegger was better known for his behind-the-scene work, specifically in commercials. He worked for several notable southern California advertising firms, for which he handled television advertising campaigns for companies such as Gallo Wines, Mattel, Bank of America, Taco Bell, Honda and many more.

Later, with the assistance of Allan Sandler, his longtime film industry partner, Emenegger opened Pico Bronson Film Studios in Los Angeles. He thought it might be the end of his days as a composer. But the budget wouldn't allow them to hire one, so Emenegger again assumed the role.

"I did hours and hours of it on a Moog synthesizer," he said.

Using friends and connections he had made during his tenure in the industry, he and Sandler were able to secure performances by William Shatner, Tom Smothers, Adam West of Batman fame, and, one of Emenegger's closest friends, Bob Einstein, also known as Super Dave Osborne, with whom he still retains contact

All the while, Hollywood was growing around the Emeneggers, and life seemed to become more and more hectic. Margaret, who was raised in Searcy, especially wanted to leave California behind. It was the production of a film, first released on television in 1974, that led the couple to Northwest Arkansas.

Working with the U. S. Defense Department to help improve its image, Emenegger said, he stumbled on a much different story. He and Sandler were given unprecedented access to secret government projects, he said. His findings became the basis for the 1974 television special, "UFOs: Past, Present and Future," which the filmmaking duo wrote and produced. His research for the film made him a UFO believer, he said. That led him to be a featured speaker to the annual Ozark UFO Conference in Eureka Springs. After discovering they enjoyed the area, and reading statistics about how great the region was, the Emeneggers moved here in 1994.

In doing so, they left his life in Hollywood behind. Emenegger's only regret? That he didn't have more money to sink into some of the films he and his partner created.

Forging toward the 'Past' Although many of his Hollywood friends have described his tenure here as "voluntary exile," it's been anything but, Emenegger explained. Since arriving in Fayetteville, he has served as Community Access Television board president and also as president of the symphony's board of directors. His involvement with that organization started casually, Emenegger said. He and his wife first befriended North Arkansas Symphony Orchestra conductor Jeannine Wagar, telling her even before he was a symphony patron that he composed tunes.

"Why don't you write one for us?" Wagar asked. And so he did, drawing back on many of the themes he had used as a younger man. Specifically, the original he wrote for the symphony was a combination of a ditty for a Bank of America commercial and the main theme from his film about death. The piece features a piano solo, and at Emenegger's recommendation, local pianist Claudia Burson was asked to fill in.

It wasn't long before Emenegger expanded his role, offering to edit films for the symphony's first "Night at the Movies"

concert. In that concert, and the "Night at the Oscars" and "Christmas at the Movies" events that followed, Emenegger has been in charge of splicing movie clips into coherent =97 but abbreviated =97 segments.

"You can't just slice it up. You've got to slice it like an editor," Emenegger said. It's something, of course, that he is well suited for. He describes the process as tedious, but also as a puzzle =97 what scenes can be removed and not take away from the story ? This year's film will contain scenes from Christmas films such as "A Christmas Story, "Scrooge" and a version of "The Nutcracker." These films have been shortened into a presentation that will only be about 70 minutes in length. All the while, the symphony will play the music associated with the movies. Emenegger has asked each of the motion picture studios involved for permission to show the films. He makes no money on the endeavor, serving solely as a volunteer.

Saturday will also see the premier of his short film, "Christmas Past." The wordless piece features reminders of Christmas he's filmed recently, including a wealth of images from an antique shop in Prairie Grove.

As for what else might be seen during the concert, Emenegger is a bit like his piano keys =97 pretty quiet.

"You'll just have to come to our concert and find out what we're doing," he said.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: Peter B. Davenport <director.nul>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 20:23:45 -0800
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:17:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 14:32:24 -0000
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 13:16:07 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

<snip>

NUFORC has received several reports involving animal reactions.

The comment about large herbivores brings to mind the report I received about the adult female elk in Washington State that was reported lifted off the ground by a very strange looking craft.

The event occurred at 11:59 hrs. on Thursday, February 25, 1999, at a location a location west of Mt. St. Helens, and was investigated on March 05 of that year by me and Robert Fairfax of MUFON/Washington State. Bob and I examined a dead elk, found the day after the incident, and which lay in the forest for eight days without being touched by predators. Bob wrote the article about that incident, which appeared in the October (?) 1999 issue of The MUFON Journal.

Also, when I investigated the Incident At Exeter in September 1965, Officer Bertrand, from the Exeter Police Department, reported to me that when he, Officer Hunt, and Mr. Muscarello were standing, watching the disc they saw float over a nearby field, horses in a nearby corral, some 200 yards away, sounded severely agitated, and I believe they broke through the boards forming the periphery of the corral. The residents had to scamper about and retrieve the animals.

Peter
NUFORC

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Strange Sightings Over Canada

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:22:49 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:22:49 -0500
Subject: Strange Sightings Over Canada

Source: CanWest MediaWorks - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/3codv2>

Monday, April 09, 2007

Strange Sightings Over Canada
Allison Hanes
The National Post

A disc-shaped craft skimming the waters of a British Columbia lake and a blaze of white light that triggered a commercial airliner's collision avoidance system over New Brunswick are among 736 mysterious sights reported in Canadian skies last year and a handful that remain unidentified.

While the vast majority of the strange apparitions were later explained as meteors, planets, stars, planets, aircraft or other ordinary occurrences, the 2006 Canadian UFO Survey, made public yesterday, says that 12% are still an enigma. However, that number falls to just 1%, said Chris Rutkowski, director of Winnipeg-based Ufology Research, if only the most detailed reports are considered.

"The fact is that a small number of reports each year do not have explanations and the continued reports of UFOs by the general public combined with the large number of cases recorded each year suggest a need for further study of the phenomena by science," he said. "Popular opinion to the contrary, there is yet to be any incontrovertible evidence that some UFO cases involve extraterrestrials."

Most reports consist of odd lights in the dark seen at a distance. Daytime apparitions, close encounters and classic sightings of flying saucers are relatively rare.

The highest number of strange phenomena were detected in B.C., with 209 reports, followed by Ontario where there were 188 UFO sightings.

At 98, Saskatchewan broke its record for the most UFO reports in the province, while Nova Scotia saw 25 and Nunavut eight.

The total of 736 sightings - an average of almost two a day in Canada - was the third-highest number of reports since 1989 when Ufology Research began keeping track of tips made to civilian UFO-enthusiast groups and Web sites, as well as Canadian government and military incidents.

Among the strangest of last year's unsolved mysteries, was flying disk over Christina Lake, B.C., that was observed by two couples in the area at about 10:45 p.m. on April 18, 2006.

The witnesses described the craft as being internally lit, giving off a soft yellow glow, and having a string of blue

marquee lights at its midsection. They watched as it dipped low over the water's surface and rose up again repeatedly over the span of about a minute making a faint humming sound.

On May 3, 2006, six witnesses in Chilliwack, B.C., saw a giant, dark, pyramid-shaped object, the size of half a city block, pass overhead, blotting out the stars.

At 3:30 a.m. on June 9, 2006, a man driving alone down an isolated road near North Bay was approached by three blue lights moving up and down over the road. One flew away over the trees and disappeared. The second spun and moved from side to side, hovering above the road. The third zoomed by him, about a metre away from his car. On Dec. 16, 2006, in Fergus, 10 people observed a red-orange ball of light that shot up from the ground around 6:30 a.m., leaving a trail of smoke in its wake. When it ascended high in the sky, it paused, moved slowly from east to west in a circular pattern, blinked once and disappeared from view.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 11:11:47 -0000
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:24:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 19:52:44 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 08:58:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Paul Scott Anderson <paulscottanderson.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 25 Nov 2007 11:33:36 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 16:54:37 -0800
>>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>>"After ten minutes without any apparent aggression, I determined
>>>>the craft was non hostile to my team or to the base. Following
>>>>security protocol, we completed a thorough on-site
>>>>investigation, including a full physical examination of the
>>>>craft. This included photographs, notebook entries, and radio
>>>>relays through airman Cabansag to the control center as
>>>>required. On one side of the craft were symbols that measured
>>>>about 3 inches high and two and a half feet across."

>>>>Someone in another forum had posted this, purportedly a copy of
>>>>an earlier statement by Penniston, where he indicates that he
>>>>didn't come any closer than about 50 metres to the object.

>>>>Does anyone know anything about this or if it is legitimate? I
>>>>just hadn't seen it before and it seemingly contradicts his
>>>>later statements - to the debunkers certainly, at least - of
>>>>touching the object.

>>>>It is from an article by skeptic Ian Ridpath:

>>>>The statement by Penniston quoted above is absolutely correct.
>>>>I heard his presentation at the recent press conference and talked
>>>>with him at length. He has never said otherwise, and anyone who
>>>>says he did is either lying or badly confused.

>>>>Excuse me for butting in re. a case of which I know little, but
>>>>this appears to be incorrect if the scan of a typed statement by
>>>>Penniston is to be believed. This statement appears not to be
>>>>dated, and it isn't signed either, so I suppose its provenance
>>>>may be in question? However I don't believe I am confused about
>>>>this: It does indeed say that he got to within 50 meters and
>>>>that this was "the closest I was near the object at any point".

Penniston has confirmed (see page 183 of Georgina Bruni's book
You Can't Tell The People) that this typed statement "seems
original in content", though he said that his original statement
was handwritten. Halt told me on Saturday that he didn't know
who typed up the statement.

Penniston left many details out of his statement in the same way as Halt left details out of his memo. The reasons for this included concern at the official reaction and concern for their careers. Reference to this is made on page 220 of You Can't Tell The People.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Probable UFO Video From Costa Rica

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 07:28:24 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:30:05 -0500
Subject: Probable UFO Video From Costa Rica

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
December 3, 2007

Source: www.analuisacid.com
Date: December 2, 2007

Costa Rica: Probable UFO Video in Costa Rica

Malvin Badilla, a Costa Rican construction worker, managed to record a very compelling video of a possible disc-shaped unidentified flying object.

The object appears to spin on its own axis and makes maneuvers in a matter of seconds. The witness states that its apparent size was slightly larger than that of a tractor tire, adding that the time was 3:49 in the afternoon.

Luis Carlos Monge elaborated on this report for Telenoticias, which was broadcast over the three separate editions.

Some aspects of the video:

- Recorded on a Motorola cellphone in 3GP format.
- Duration of 15:06 seconds.
- There is a break at 3:19, when the zoom is applied, a situation that can be normal in some cellphone models when the zoom is used. This information must be checked against a similar phone.
- The object remains static and later changes position, tilting toward the left and the right in fractions of a second, showing other aspects such as: the upper, lateral and lower view, respectively.
- This copy of the video is from researcher Richard Sandi. The file was labeled "22-11-07-1550", leading me to suppose it is 22 November 2007. In Luis Carlos's report, dated 30 November, the witness claims to have recorded it : "some days ago" - therefore, the label could match the date of the sighting.

Mr. Badillo mentions being in the company of another person, his co-worker William Rivera, who pointed the flying object out to him. Badillo couldn't hear him it at first due to the noise of the drill he was using on the job.

Regarding audio, it should be noted that the copy I received appears not to have any. So I asked reporter Monge about it, and he replied verbatim: "Yes it does, but it is very low. You can hear the boy shouting William, William, then the drrill sound. According to him, the object made no sound whatsoever."

Ana Luisa Cid's Opinion

After reviewing the video several times, in slow motion and frame by frame, I believe that this could be genuine material and while it is true that "UFOs" can be created on the computer, it is nonetheless true that many people around the world have

reported and documented artifacts of this sort.

The witness seems sincere and I find it feasible that he should have experienced a sighting.

I extend this opinion in a preliminary capacity, as we still need to see the research of Costa Rican ufologists, who will doubtless have a more qualified opinion by virtue of interviewing the witnesses and visiting the site to conduct field work.

The video shall be transmitted as an exclusive in Mexico on 7 December on the "Con Claridad" program on Channel 3 of Pachuca Television.

It should be noted that the images are the property of Teletica - Canal -7 - Costa Rica. [translator's note- Prof. Ana Luisa Cid requests that this be honored].

My thanks to: Pilar Cisneros (Asst. Dir. for Telenoticias), Reporter Luis Carlos Monge, researcher Richard Sandi.

The Videos:

Ovnis en Acosta? Reportaje de Luis Carlos Monge

Analisis del video por Ana Luisa Cid - YouTube

Please note: All Images Are Property Of Teletica Canal 7 Costa Rica

[Images are here:

http://www.analuisacid.com/teletica_ovni.htm

--ebk]

Translation(c) 2007, S. Corrales - Institute of Hispanic Ufology IHU

Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:59:52 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:33:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:13:32 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
>>To: UFOupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>Hi, Jay & Fellow Listerions,

>I've been observing the essential back-and-forth on this issue.

>How, apparently, absolutely horrifyingly some UFO abductees
>have been dealt with, both by 'abductors' and individuals who
>allegedly facilitate their coming to terms, or not, with their
>individual experiences.

>The time has indeed now come to present a compilation of these
>stories and the research that, hopefully, underlies them, as
>just talking about the "horror that must not be named" (or
>described) in increasingly nebulous terms is very much less than
>either helpful or productive.

>Despite the erstwhile comments of one List member recently who
>suggested List members, to some degree, are voyeurs or some
>kind of afficiandos of what might be termed 'alien porn', isn't
>it incumbent on those aspects of the UFO community, and related
>researchers, who are aware of the data and alleged details of
>these "all too-close encounters" to, in some way, or via some
>channel, document these stories?

<snip>

I am sorry to be blunt about it, but this entire thread is as phony as a \$3.00 bill.

There is a vast published literature on abduction cases that gives all the gory details.

Has no one read David Jacobs' books, for example? Budd Hopkins reports all sorts of horrendous incidents, as have Ann Druffel and many other other lesser known abduction researchers.

People are shooting from the hip on this one, and merely displaying their ignorance of the literature.

- Dick

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:05:59 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:36:07 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:21:22 -0800
>Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>>Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

>><http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

>>December 1, 2007

>>Editorial

>>Kucinich's Close Encounter

>>The presidential candidate's televised acknowledgment of seeing
>>a UFO has put the issue back on the radar.

>>Although it's unlikely that voters will ever have anything
>>resembling a close encounter with Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich
>>(D- Ohio), the two-time presidential hopeless has helped revive
>>an issue that means more to many Americans than any election:

<snip>

>Hey, no fair! How dare a mainstream newspaper put out a fair and
>reasonable editorial regarding UFOs and it not contain
>disingenuous remarks!

What parallel universe do you live in, Greg? This is a standard
piece of wise-ass debunking and poking fun at UFO advocates
(a.k.a., "buffs")? Or are you being sarcastic?

>Why if this keeps up real journalism might break out all over
>the place and we'd all be in for a world of hurt!

>Somebody ought to write the LA Times and warn them if they don't
>stop publishing thoughtful and level-headed editorials we'll be
>out in the streets protesting!

You have got to be kidding!

>Ruin our perceptions of cowardly lacky journalists will they?
>Well we'll show them! We'll boycott their newspaper and...

>Wait. Coffee just set in. Am I reading this article right?

So, you are kidding.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: **Richard Hall** <dh12.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:09:14 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 09:37:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:58:01 -0800
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 14:32:24 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>>... what's interesting to me is these extreme effects
>>sometimes reported in dogs.

>>Herbivores, even big ones, are relatively easily spooked, having
>>a history of being hunted by carnivores, whereas dogs are
>>carnivores with a strong pack-instinct - which means they'll
>>normally be very brave and territorial while with you: the dog
>>owner and 'pack-leader'.

>>To hear of an adult dog going 'crazy', hiding behind its owner,
>>or just yelping and running away - well, that's surprising and
>>seems to need an explanation.

>My point all along Ray. It takes alot to back a dog down. I've
>seen them whimper only at machines. Other than that, dogs will
>take on bear and kinfolk stories go way back to when dogs would
>take on wolverine and puma.

>I'm wondering if any other carnivores, lions and tigers and
>bears, are recorded as responding in kind.

Greg and others,

Did you miss my post about the detailed study of animal reaction cases by Joan Woodward for MUFON? See the MUFON web site. It covers every kind of animal for which case material is available.

Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

LA Times - Say What You Mean

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:13:17 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:13:17 -0500
Subject: LA Times - Say What You Mean

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void

<http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

Monday, December 3, 2007, 9:39 am

LA Times - Say What You Mean
By Billy Cox

Will wonders never cease? On Saturday, the Los Angeles Times,

<http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

felt compelled to lower itself into commenting on recent developments in UFO-ville.

Slow news day? Temporary insanity? A sick, sinking feeling that growing numbers of Americans might actually be engaged by this stuff?

Maybe for that reason, the Times applied a slightly different MSM tack to an issue that's beginning to gain some long overdue traction. Well, yes, of course, it had to employ the old reliable "cult of the UFO" pejoration to describe people who'd like to know why the USA can't police its own skies. And they were obliged to take another formula swipe at the usual suspect ("with Kucinich as a central advocate, ridicule may be unavoidable"). And rather than puzzle over the evidence at hand, the Times cited "the clumsy, protesting-too-much denials of government agencies" as a major culprit in the credibility gridlock.

But in invoking former Clinton White House chief of staff John Podesta's call for UFO glasnost, the Times described it as a "demand that is as reasonable as it is unlikely to happen, given how easily this topic can be rerouted into japery."

Wait a minute. Freeze frame. "Reasonable"? Amid all the fancy footwork, did the LA Times just label Podesta's initiative as "reasonable"? Is that, like, an endorsement?

Better late than never, but where the hell have you guys been for all these years? An MSM editorial writer who mentions Kecksburg, Val Johnson, Lonnie Zamora, and the Kaikoura lights in the same sentence has been pulling his (or her) punches for a long time. The only way "disclosure is unlikely to happen" is if the self-proclaimed defenders of the public interest keep sitting on their hands and waiting for somebody else to step up.

Memo to the LA Times: Quit using Dennis Kucinich as a shield. Come out of the closet and do your job.

Please consider adding a link to Billy's Blog on your site or

Blog. His is, seemingly, the only visible mainstream media journalist who consistently covers UFO-related matters in depth... deserves to be read by all sides of the fence.

He is, after all and as his blog-banner says, "the mainstream media's lonely UFO web log".

Thanks. Spread the Cox words.

He'll be a guest on the next SDI PodCast and could probably be on yours...

ebk

[and thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 10:59:15 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 10:49:38 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:21:22 -0800
>Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>>Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

>><http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

>>December 1, 2007

>>Editorial

>>Kucinich's Close Encounter

>>The presidential candidate's televised acknowledgment of seeing
>>a UFO has put the issue back on the radar.

>>Although it's unlikely that voters will ever have anything
>>resembling a close encounter with Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich
>>(D- Ohio), the two-time presidential hopeless has helped revive
>>an issue that means more to many Americans than any election:

<snip>

>>In his debate reply, Kucinich made a point dear to respectable
>>UFO investigators: "It was an unidentified flying object, OK?"
>>he said. "It's like... it was unidentified. I saw something."
>>There's a difference between saying objects in the sky are
>>sometimes not familiar and claiming to have been probed by
>>taciturn "grays," and people such as Coalition for Freedom of
>>Information co-founder Leslie Kean express understandable
>>frustration that UFO ridicule purposely blurs that distinction.

>>But with Kucinich as a central advocate, ridicule may be
>>unavoidable. In the debate, Kucinich made a self-deprecating
>>joke about moving his campaign headquarters to "Roswell, New
>>Mexico, and another one in Exeter, New Hampshire." Roswell
>>everybody knows about, but with the easy reference to the 1965
>>Exeter incident, Kucinich leaves the impression that he's not
>>just a UFO witness, he's a buff.

>>Let him go on, and we suspect Kucinich will soon be expanding on
>>the Kecksburg sightings, the Val Johnson incident, Lonnie
>>Zamora, the 'Kaikoura lights' and countless other visitations
>>from the sky that continue to sustain our nation's sense of
>>mystery.

>Hey, no fair! How dare a mainstream newspaper put out a fair and
>reasonable editorial regarding UFOs and it not contain
>disingenuous remarks!

>Why if this keeps up real journalism might break out all over
>the place and we'd all be in for a world of hurt!

I must say I am flabbergasted...

Everyone knows about Roswell but probably many recall the 1965
Incident at Exeter or the geographically-related Betty and

Barney Hill.

Aficianados certainly know the story about Lonnie Zamora. But how many people would recognize the 'Kaikoura Lights'?

Kaikoura: a town/area on the east coast of New Zealand, of all places! Sure, it was a sighting of world-wide interest, but that was 29 years ago (happened Dec 31, 1978).

The writer of this editorial may have been 'just a kid' when that happened. And there were explanations galore at the time. Wasn't it just the planet Venus?

When I went to the NZ embassy to get a travel visa to investigate the sightings - this was in January 1979 - the lady at the embassy acted as if I was foolish to travel to NZ for that reason - "wasn't that squid boats?", she asked... or something like that!

And the Val Johnson case which I recently saw on the History channel: did the editorial writer know that this is one case that Phil Klass stumbled on - saying it was either the real thing or a "practical joke" by officer Johnson.

As Greg's comments suggest, if editors start treating this subject with some level of seriousness - seriosity? <LOL> UFO magazines may as well prepare to fold!

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Scary Moment In Izamal Mexico

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 10:50:32 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 10:55:07 -0500
Subject: Scary Moment In Izamal Mexico

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
December 3, 2007

Source: Fundacion Cosmos AC and www.poresto.net
Date: December 2, 2007

Mexico: A Scary Moment in Izamal

Loud Explosion In A Material Depot Caused By Helicopter
Crash... Or By A Saucer Crash?

IZAMAL, Yucatan, 29 Nov. - A loud explosion occurred yesterday at six o'clock in the evening, causing fright throughout the municipality of Izamal. The detonation was accompanied by strong vibrations and expectation from neighbors who could not imagine the source of the explosion.

Fear was heightened among locals by the fact that some witnesses claimed having seen a helicopter fall from the sky, while other claimed having seen a flying saucer plummet to the ground.

The event prompted the municipal police to mobilize under the command of Jesus Mukul Chimal. The director of public safety, Prisciliano Lujan, ventured into the wilderness near the Cuauhtemoc precinct in a search for the artifact. Elements of the judicial police, SPV and army personnel joined the investigation, but no trace of the vehicle was ever found.

According to local residents interviewed by POR ESTO, the explosion was heard in Izamal and in the precincts of Sitalpech, Cuauhtemoc and Xanaba as well as in the municipality of Sudzal, where panic spread among the locals. Some of them believed that the explosion had its origin at a small ranch to the east of the Cuauhtemoc precinct.

Subsequently, military elements under the command of General Casares of the 32nd Military District located a materials depot used for building a detour into the wilderness, located at Km. 4 of the Izamal-Sitalpech road, apparently belonging to the Construrama company.

Mayor Roberto A. Rodriguez visited the site to ascertain the origin of the explosion. The soldiers advised him that careless handling of a higher quantity of explosives than was required caused the explosion, resulting in the creation of a crater measuring approximately 30 meters in diameter, 14 meters deep, which cast rocks 200 meters away from the focus of the explosion.

According to the military, there were neither injuries nor dangers to human life. Only a sense of fear throughout the community, arising from a very unusual event in the municipality.

Story and photos by David Colli:

<http://www.poresto.net/content/view/3262/71/>

Translation (c) 2007, S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Leopoldo Zambrano, Fundacion Cosmos, A.C.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 10:58:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 11:11:47 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 19:52:44 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 08:58:35 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>>>The statement by Penniston quoted above is absolutely correct.
>>>I heard his presentation at the recent press conference and
>>>talked with him at length. He has never said otherwise, and
>>>anyone who says he did is either lying or badly confused.

>>Excuse me for butting in re. a case of which I know little, but
>>this appears to be incorrect if the scan of a typed statement by
>>Penniston is to be believed. This statement appears not to be
>>dated, and it isn't signed either, so I suppose its provenance
>>may be in question? However I don't believe I am confused about
>>this: It does indeed say that he got to within 50 meters and
>>that this was "the closest I was near the object at any point".

>Penniston has confirmed (see page 183 of Georgina Bruni's book
>You Can't Tell The People) that this typed statement "seems
>original in content", though he said that his original statement
>was handwritten. Halt told me on Saturday that he didn't know
>who typed up the statement.

>Penniston left many details out of his statement in the same
>way as Halt left details out of his memo. The reasons for this
>included concern at the official reaction and concern for their
>careers. Reference to this is made on page 220 of You Can't
>Tell The People.

Thankyou Nick.

So if I have this right, Penniston confirmed that in his original statement he did say 50 meters was "the closest I got at any point", but now claims that he just "left out some details"? I find this difficult to square with the believably consistent picture painted by the original statements of all five people involved. That picture doesn't seem to me to be a result of just passively "leaving out details". These accounts imply a conspiracy to actively invent an interlocking false story - and one done in a very subtle fashion. Perhaps they were subtle people. But if they did this for the purpose of suppressing the embarrassing fact that they really saw a mechanical device at close quarters, why did Penniston shoot them all in the foot by claiming to have "positively identified" the lights as a mechanical device? I find it much easier to believe that these original statements are ingenuous. If there

are good reasons not to think this, can you summarise what they are (other than Penniston's changed story I mean)? The relevant passages are quoted below for reference.

Martin Shough

Buran:

"Sgt Penniston reported getting near the 'object' and then all of a sudden said they had gone past it and were looking at a marker beacon that was in the same general area as the other lights. I asked him, through Sgt Coffey, if he could have been mistaken, to which Penniston replied that had I seen the other lights I would know the difference."

Chandler:

"When I arrived, Ssgt Penniston, AlC Burroughs and Amn Cabansang had entered the wooded area... On one occasion Penniston relayed that he was close enough to the object to determine that it was deffently [sic] a mechanical object. He stated that he was within approximately 50 meters... Each time Penniston gave me the indication that he was about to reach the area where the lights were, he would give an extended estimated location. He eventually arrived at a 'beacon light', however, he stated this was not the light or lights that he had originally observed."

Burroughs:

"We got up to a fence that separated the trees from the open field and you could see the lights down by a farmer's house. We climbed over the fence and started walking towards the red and blue lights and they just disappeared. Once we reached the farmer's house we could see a beacon going around so we went towards it."

Cabansang:

"While we walked each one of us would see the lights. Blue, red, white and yellow. The beckon [sic] light turned out to be the yellow light. We could see them periodically, but not in a specific pattern. As we approached the lights would seem to be at the edge of the forrest [sic]... As we entered the forrest the blue and red lights were not visible anymore. Only the beacon light was still blinking. We figured the lights were coming from past the forrest, since nothing was visible when we past [sic] through the woody forrest. We could see a glowing near the beacon light, but as we got closer we found it to be a lit up farm house."

Penniston:

"The area in front of us was lighting up a 30 meter area. When we got within a 50 meter distance. The object was producing red and blue light... At this point of positive identification I relayed... that it was defidently [sic] mechanical [sic] in nature. This is the closest point that I was near the object at any point. We then proceeded after it."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Latest Edition # 137 Brazilian UFO Magazine

From: **A. J. Gevaerd** (aj.nul)
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 13:46:48 -0300
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 11:42:14 -0500
Subject: Latest Edition # 137 Brazilian UFO Magazine

UFO 137
December 2007

Main Articles:

Villas Boas: After 50 years, a new investigation reveals details never disclosed about the most amazing abduction of all times.

Top UFO witnesses and researchers in Washington, USA, and Curitiba, Brazil, demand immediate actions to be taken to ensure UFO disclosure.

Interview: Out of body experiences investigator Wagner Borges explains the differences between physical and extraphysical abductions.

Editor: A. J. Gevaerd (aj.nul)

Site: www.ufo.com.br

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean

From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 10:20:20 -0800
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 12:22:33 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean

>Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void

><http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

>Monday, December 3, 2007, 9:39 am

>LA Times - Say What You Mean
>By Billy Cox

>Will wonders never cease? On Saturday, the Los Angeles Times,

><http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

>felt compelled to lower itself into commenting on recent
>developments in UFO-ville.

>Slow news day? Temporary insanity? A sick, sinking feeling that
>growing numbers of Americans might actually be engaged by this
>stuff?

>Maybe for that reason, the Times applied a slightly different
>MSM tack to an issue that's beginning to gain some long overdue
>traction.

<snip>

>-----

>Please consider adding a link to Billy's Blog on your site or
>Blog. His is, seemingly, the only visible mainstream media
>journalist who consistently covers UFO-related matters in
>depth... deserves to be read by all sides of the fence.

>He is, after all and as his blog-banner says, "the mainstream
>media's lonely UFO web log".

>Thanks. Spread the Cox words.

>He'll be a guest on the next SDI PodCast and could probably
>be on yours...

>ebk

Right on EBK, and kudos to you and Billy.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:34:37 -0400
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 12:39:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>Source: CanWest MediaWorks - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

><http://tinyurl.com/3codv2>

>Monday, April 09, 2007

>Strange Sightings Over Canada
>Allison Hanes
>The National Post

<snip>

>and a blaze of white light that triggered a commercial
>airliner's collision avoidance system over New Brunswick are
>among 736 mysterious sights reported in Canadian skies last year
>and a handful that remain unidentified.

Anyone have a date on this incident or where the report came from? It is easily checkable but my records show no indication of it ever happening.

Note that the newspaper report carries on with mundane reports of UFOs but one supposedly involving an airliner loaded with people having a TCAS alert which are required to be reported by law - because they are very serious - gets just the hyped blurb above.

I have a vague recollection of someone reporting an airliner swerving to avoid a UFO by someone on the ground near the Bay of Fundy. If a pilot says this happened and was reported and it didn't show up in the daily reports then I have something upon which I can base an AIA.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

11/12/07 NPC Press Conference DVD On Sale

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:23:14 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:23:14 -0500
Subject: 11/12/07 NPC Press Conference DVD On Sale

Source: Out Of The Blue The Movie.Com - San Francisco,
California, USA

<http://outofthebluethemovie.com/news/news.html>

December 3, 2007

11/12/07 NPC Press Conference DVD On Sale

The full, uncut DVD of the National Press Club event.

The DVD includes a presentation from all 12 of our panelists
plus Q & A with the media. US\$29.95 [via PayPal or Credit Card]

[Thanks to Frank Warren for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:35:49 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:25:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 18:44:08 -0500
>Subject: Re: Melvin Brown And The MPs

>My question to you is when, if ever, have you seen cooks on
>guard or other duties in a garrison situation?

We're not discussing a "garrison situation" here. That is, the reported events did not take place within the normal scope of a domestic military garrison. I'm sure you can agree that, if the events did take place, they were truly extraordinary, to say the least. As such, arguing that a witness' testimony doesn't mesh with the normal procedures of such a garrison misses the point, entirely.

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 14:08:31 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:21:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 14:27:36 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2007 15:53:10 -0500
>>>Subject: Skylab 3

>>>Comments welcome
>>><http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SKYLAB3.html>

>>The Skylab images seem peculiar and a relatively long duration
>>intersecting orbit with a satellite not very close to the Skylab
>>inclination would be highly unlikely.

>Thanks for your extensive comments. What you have discussed is
>mostly related to the orbital mechanics and the question, could
>there have been some manmade object in an orbit so close to that
>of the Skylab as to be seen for up to ten minutes and which
>would make an image with the angular size as large as in the
>last photo (assuming a 300 mm lens) and which would disappear
>from view about 5 sec after the Skylab went into shadow (an
>event that led Garriott to conclude that the object was about 38
>km behind the Skylab) yet which would not be observed during any
>other orbit or would not be detected by any of the radar
>tracking stations?

I have not gone through your photo analysis in detail. I can't
refute your work if that is what you mean and haven't tried to.

You mentioned the object in orbit and I tried to address as best
I could. No large/giant objects were in the orbital elements for
that inclination.

>You have made only a brief comment on the most photographically
>obvious aspect of the images obtained, namely that they are red.
>(In one frame the light was bright red enough to overexpose the
>film causing a yellowish center of the red "dot" image.)
>According to Garriott this object was first seen (and
>photographed?) as much as 10 minutes before Skylab went into
>orbit, in other words, before Skylab and the object were in the
>"thin" orbital region where atmospheric reddening fo the sun
>could make a reflection look red (although I doubt that such a
>reflection would be as clearly red as shown in the photos).
>Therefore if it was "anywhere near" skylab 10 minutes before the
>shadow its red could have come from only two possibilities: (a)
>it was painted red and reflected only red light or (b) it was a
>source of red light.

>You have addressed this color issue briefly as follows:

>>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three

>>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are
>>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>going in shadow.

>>I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing
>>could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some
>>time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than
>>how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they
>>enter the atmosphere with usually).

>It seems to me that one big problem with assuming that a the
>object was a source of red light by virtue of being heated by
>the atmosphere is that this "meteor" version of the hypothesis
>does not explain how Skylab could have seen it for ten minutes
>before Skylab crossed the shadow boundary. If it were seen as it
>reentered, it would have been below the Skylab and there should
>have been some evidence of an earth background unless it was
>seen after both it and the Skylab had gone into the shadow so
>that the background was the unilluminated earth as opposed to a
>black background, which is consistent with the camera pointing
>away from the earth. Also, the size plays a role in this. If it
>were a meter sized object, for example it had to be within 1
> $m / (.0029 \text{ rad}) = 345 \text{ m}$ of the Skylab as it glowed and that would
>place the Skylab in a "crash and burn" orbit some 6(?) years
>before it actually did Crash and Burn (where 0.0029 is the
>angular separation between the furthest separated red "blob"
>images of the fourth photo). Also, being that close to the
>Skylab would mean that it would enter the shadow at essentially
>the same time.

The Earth background being missing is a good point I failed to
consider. It seems to eliminate the re-entry glow idea, although
I still have to think about it.

>>Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence,
>>according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not
>>immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred
>>attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed
>>at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The
>>subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds",
>>a much later time. I doubt the images actually are of the laser
>>beam (although the laser _was_ tested at red wavelengths),
>>mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up
>>their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser
>>beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973,
>>which does not correspond with when they reported photographing
>>the odd object. One point of interest is that an interview of
>>the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used
>>the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood
>>they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

>Strange that they would attempt to photograph the red laser
>while the earth was in sunshine. The red beam would have a lot
>of light to compete with. The photo you mention does not look
>like a red filtered image which would likely be used if one were
>to try to detect a red laser beam against a bright background. I
>could imagine them trying the Goddard laser experiment when the
>earth surface was dark. Then they wouldn't need a red filter.
>But then there would also be no image of the surface such as we
>see in 2137.

All I know about this is the description of the scene in the
photo index and the laser experiment.

"Evaluation of SKYLAB Earth LASER Beacon Imagery"

"Experiment Debrief"

"Bean: The laser was the only thing that I saw during the
mission that had a neon-light look to it... This actually
radiated like a neon light that's on in the daytime outside. It
has a brilliance to it."

Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8. They were also blurry so there might have been some movement although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

Also,

"On Skylab 3, Astronauts Bean and Lousma confirmed the beacon size and shape manifested in the Skylab 3 imagery. They described the beacon as both a neon tube lying in the plane of the earth and as a searchlight coming up through the atmosphere. Strangely, the photographs were taken by Scientist-Astronaut Garriott who did not verify the beacon size and shape, but described the beacon as only a dot."

The second set were prior to the "UFO" set. I assume "neon" means red, but maybe not.

>>Trash should be considered as a possible cause although it would >>be small in size. Skylab had a trash jettisoning device/port >>which was used frequently. Existing tracking data lists "debris" >>for Skylab which could be trash, but it seems unlikely since the >>trash bags would not have radar reflective material in/on them. >>There were also reports of items being jettisoned from the much >>larger scientific airlock which definitely were tracked.

>Trash would have to be close - within hundreds of meters - if >the disappearance was a result of going into shadow. But in this >case there would be no 5 sec time lag, or even a 1 sec time lag. >An alternate hypothesis explored on the web site is that the >object was initially close and all four photos were taken at >that time and then it drifted away and became progressively >smaller and dimmer and then was about 38 km behind when it went >into shadow. But if this were trash, as presumed, why wouldn't >the astronauts have realized they were looking at something they >had recently ejected?

Yes, this is true.

>And why would it appear red?

Don't know. Kind of rules it out unless wrapped in some odd bag material prior to jettison.

><snip>

>>The size of the re-entering object is not clear. It was stated >>to be a camera, which sounds small.

>>However, careful reading of the mission reports imply that there >>was more to the object than a camera. They apparently jettisoned >>on day 8 both a camera and its experiment out of the scientific >>airlock. One would have to view TV coverage of the event >>(reported to have been shown at the time) to know the size and >>whether these objects were connected. The airlock is relatively >>large.

>Again, if this was trash and if it disappeared by going into >shadow then one has to explain

>(a) the color

>(b) the time lag of 5 or more seconds reported by Garriott who >counted out the seconds until the object disappeared. (Evidently >he had the impression that the object was following and not >leading the Skylab)

I doubt the camera plus odd maybe attached hardware was close, but given the poor orbital elements for that one particular debris item, it is somewhat possible. That was the one I suggested may have been heated up during some early phase of reentry. Otherwise, unless it selectively reflected red, I can't explain it. Review of the TV footage of the jettison of the camera+ experiment might explain how it was wrapped.

>>Examination of the photo guidebook for Skylab 2 shows the >>description for two photos to be "UFO" (SL2-102-893, SL2-102- >>897). I have never seen them but have heard that the existing >>copies are pretty dark and scratched so nothing may be viewable

>>on them.

>Amusing.

>Don't know anything about them.

I didn't mean to be amusing. It states it clearly in the photo index as UFO. That's pretty clear for us all to notice. I haven't seen anyone talk to the astronauts about this one, nor any mention in debriefs. Is it a satellite or trash jettison or what?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 16:26:51 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:24:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 06:55:06 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>If the general public knew this stuff they would totally freak.

I say "Bring it on!" It's about friggin' time!

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean

From: Jeri Jahnke <jeri.nul>
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:42:47 -0600
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:26:14 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times - Say What You Mean

Some readers may not be aware that in 2000, the Times-Mirror Company - L.A. Times - was purchased by the Tribune Company of Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune was the newspaper which broke the O'Hare UFO story, assigning it to their regular Transportation reporter, Jon Hilkevitch.

Jeri Jahnke
Chicagoland

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 10:53:44 +0000
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:29:27 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>Jose Escamilla's UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied
>is on-line at:

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

>"This is the best of the whole story of UFO investigation that
>we have today. It=E2=80=99s an All in One, UFOs Prophecy and
>technology."

>Its 1:34:04 in length.

>ebk

This production, whatever its ufological merits, is severely marred by unsympathetic 'incidental' music which obscures the soundtrack in many places. This is particularly irritating when applied to archive footage where the original sound is poor to start with. One is left with the impression that the director thought that the subject material lacked sufficient interest or drama, and felt the need to inject some creative excitement all of his own. Utterly Pathetic.

List members driven to the exit by this annoyance during the early part of the production might be interested to learn that during the second half of the show things do get better and interviewees do become audible.

Clearly, the director's lack of sensitivity (perhaps I should say 'everyday professionalism') is matched only by his lack of stamina.

--
Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 11:03:58 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:34:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 11 Nov 2007 15:53:10 -0500
>>>Subject: Skylab 3

>The link to our article has been changed to:

><http://brumac.8k.com/Skylab3/SL3.html>

>>The Skylab images seem peculiar and a relatively long duration
>>intersecting orbit with a satellite not very close to the Skylab
>>inclination would be highly unlikely.

>>Regarding your webpage, I have some comments...

>>Prior to Skylab, there were no launches we know about to 50
>>degrees inclination +/- .05 degrees. However, there are a number
>>of satellites that were launched near that inclination
>>(excluding rocket bodies and debris): COSMOS 139 at 49.7 deg,
>>EXPLORER 8 at 49.88 deg, ANNA 1B and EOLE 1 (CAS-A) at 50.14
>>deg, EXPLORER 7 at 50.29 deg, COSMOS 546 at 50.65 deg, EXPLORER
>>44 (SOLRAD-10) at 51.06 deg, COSMOS 359 at 51.12 deg, COSMOS 50
>>at 51.23 deg.

>Thanks for the list but I'm not sure why it is really relevant.

I was addressing the point that your web page made:

"Few satellites (if any) other than the Skylab have been
launched into 50 degree orbits."

My statement based on examining the launch data quantifies the
number. It was irrelevant if they were still on orbit during
Skylab since we are just talking about if they were launched
into that particular inclination. So, depending upon the
accuracy of the inclination you either have none or lots.

>Neither NORAD or NASA had any tracking projections of satellite
>objects in close encounters with Skylab 3. They had 14 years of
>orbital data and thus plenty of warning of any close approaches.
>It was not something launched just a day or two before Skylab's
>USO encounter on Sept 20, 1973.

>Anyway, story is going to be the same in every case: Why didn't
>NORAD track or project any close approaches to Skylab 3 with its
>COMBO computer program and formal agreement with NASA to predict
>and warn of all close approaches of satellites and space debris
>throughout every manned NASA space mission??

From what I have gleaned about this kind of data, the problems lie in the type of object and its orbit phase. If it is just typical large satellite in typical orbit, then it can be predicted fairly well. However, if it is some sort of object with only periodic orbital data (infrequent radar reflections due to object size or shape) then such predictions may be more difficult. If the object is not-radar reflective, then they could not predict anything. The radar fence is only in the U.S., so they can't monitor all satellites and debris positions continuously. They can only hope to get data during a pass through the fence. Also, predictions are really poor for the period of days before re-entry.

>>Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence, >>according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not >>immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred >>attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed >>at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The >>subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds", >>a much later time.

>I'm not sure what significance "immediately before or after" and >"a much later time" have as far as being able to use the camera >lens data for the Nikon camera used. About an hour later at >around 1800 GMT the Skylab 3 was over Ontario.

A point I was making here was that someone viewing the before and after pictures on the web page might get the impression that they were taken within minutes of the UFO pictures. Although Skylab 3 may have been over Ontario (I have not checked this) around 1800 GMT, it passes over that area many times. One would have to go through the photo index and match the scenes with the orbit track to be able to narrow the time frame down. Same goes for the laser experiment, although it would be nice if they had the times they tried to do it written somewhere.

>>I doubt the images actually are of the laser >>beam (although the laser _was_ tested at red wavelengths), >>mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up >>their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser >>beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973, >>which does not correspond with when they reported photographing >>the odd object.

>Well "doubt" is far too understated. "Ridiculous" would be more >appropriate. The Skylab red USO photos show black space >background and no trace of the earth background of Maryland from >the Goddard Laser Experiment.

The laser images I have seen from this experiment

<http://tinyurl.com/yw4pym>

[a .pdf]

are pretty wretched. But then it looks like a scan of a b/w copy. The originals probably looked nice but the copies look like a dark image with stars (city lights?). I already said it didn't make sense for them to make a big deal about filming an object when they really knew it was a laser. It just is an interesting coincidence.

Anyway, when I examined the Skylab Mission Report it says the laser observations were on Sept 19 and 20. So this confirms the UFO photo event as being Sept 20. Oddly, the separate laser experiment report definitely stated the Skylab 3 laser photos were on Sept 4, 1973.

>>One point of interest is that an interview of >>the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used >>the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood >>they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

>Yet you were just before this protesting that the "before" the >red USO and "after" shots were not "immediately before or >after." Can you make up your mind please? If you say there >"seems to be a good likelihood" that the astronauts kept the 300 >mm lens on the Nikon from Sept 4 for two weeks till Sept 20 then >you seem to be saying it does not matter how long "before or >after." Please clarify.

My intent on stating that the photos immediately before were taken not zero-2 minutes before the UFO sequence was to alert folk to the fact that they were not of the Earth near the orbital position of Skylab during the UFO sequence. If the two frames of a magazine of film from this laser experiment were supposed to use 300mm lens, then that would tend to imply the 300mm lens for the UFO frames. You are right though that given the period of time, it is still possible to change lenses. It is not conclusive, just suggestive.

>There were 5 Nikons so how do you know that the Goddard Laser >photos are from the same Nikon? Do they have same serial numbers >(SL3-118-2136 and 2137??) or were they from a different series >indicating a different camera?

I am assuming sequential frames of a magazine imply the same camera with the only option being different lenses. Correct me if I am wrong. The laser images are SL3-118-2136, 2137 (magazine CX-35). According to the photo guide the two SL3-125-2818, 2819 have the two successful laser images from magazine CX-34. Maybe the Skylab mission voice transcripts could elucidate.

>>Regarding the time period of the photos, it is odd that the crew >>debriefing as shown in your web page lists the event occurring 7 >>to 10 days prior to landing, while Oberg was able to see from >>transcripts that it was 5 days.

>That is not a correct quote - Garriott said it was "about" a >week (<not> "7 ... days") or 10 days before the astronauts' >return to earth.

I prefer the voice transcript confirmation to their time recollection. But since the mission report indicates the laser photos were taken on Sept 19/20, then that may be enough confirmation that it wasn't 7-10 days before return to Earth.

>>Since the transcripts are not >>available in electronic form for us to look at (only microfilm, >>do you have a copy Mr. Sparks?) then we have to take Oberg's >>word for it (who may be right, but it would be nice to get a >>double check on this critical data).

>I don't understand.

What I meant was the transcript of the actual crew voice data: "Air-to-ground voice transcriptions and on board voice transcriptions for Skylab 2, Skylab 3 and Skylab 4" NASA-TM-X-72205 Microfilm records. The data are contained on ten 16 millimeter reels.

What Bruce showed, and I appreciate, was the Post Mission De-Briefing.

>>The transcript would seem >>to be the best estimate for time. Even so, the statement in the >>transcript indicates Lousma was not sure if it was 3 revs or 2 >>or 4 revs since Owens made no confirmation, so we can't state >>definitively it is 16:30-16:40 GMT.

>"Best estimate"??? There is nothing in the transcript where >astronaut Jack Lousma says he was not sure if it was "2 or 4 >revs" ago. Lousma says it was "about 3 revs ago" in this >transcript from about 2106 GMT of Tape 263-10/T-671 Page 9 of >14/5207. Day 263 of 1973 was Sept 20. I don't see how you can >legitimately throw doubt on that.

When he says "about", then one needs to quantify "about". I assumed that since he did not know exactly the time then you must throw in a plus or minus error bar on it. His causal description of the time makes me want to add and subtract 1 rev. If he said "it was 3 revs", then that would be different. Likely it is less than +- 1rev but who knows? Earlier revs still place them above the Indian Ocean.

Also, as I said, while Oberg maybe did a great job on the transcript, I prefer to see the actual voice transcription for Skylab. Too bad it doesn't exist on the web.

Just a nit, but the Skylab landed on Sept 25, 1973 at 22:49GMT and the UFO photos according to Oberg were supposed to be at Sept 20 16:45. This is not "within 5 days of returning to

Earth".

>From 2106 GMT "3 revs ago" or about 4-1/2 hours before, would be
>about 1636 GMT. Ten minutes before sun shadow entry at 1645 GMT
>makes the sighting from about 1635 to 1645 GMT. End of story.

Not really the end of story. 3 revs +-5 minutes or 3 revs +- 1
rev? But it doesn't matter since I couldn't find any
satellite/debris that were near with either one, using the
elements available.

>>Space-Track has the orbital elements for a set of trackable
>>debris for Skylab as well as lots of other satellites during
>>that Sept 1973 time period. Such orbital elements have
>>limitations. You can calculate the position of a satellite using
>>this data, but if the date of the orbital elements are far from
>>the date you are interested in, the results may be very
>>inaccurate. This is especially true for very low, soon-to-re-
>>enter objects. Simply running what is available for objects +-5
>>degrees in inclination using Oberg's time period (+- 90 minutes)
>>show no objects within 100 km. If one looks at a period of +-7
>>days, then objects do get within 20 km occasionally for
>>respectable time periods.

>What software did you use and which NORAD Spacetrack elsets did
>you use?

Satellite Tool Kit.

Orbital elements are available at:

<http://planet4589.org/space/elements/>

You can use SpaceTrack too, the elements are the same for the
stuff that far back.

>Which objects approached within 20 km of Skylab 3
>within the week before and after Sept 20 and for how long? 10
>minutes? If you have a list of such space objects and have the
>elsets we can tell how recent the elsets data were and get an
>idea how good the projected close approaches to Skylab 3. NORAD
>said there had been no close approach warnings to manned
>spacecraft as of 1973. A 12-mile close pass would be highly
>significant and potentially dangerous - because tracking and
>projection errors could mean the real distance was 0-km
>(impact).

I'll have to pull together the list for you. Its the Skylab
debris that sometimes got "close" (but then would not be close
for a long while). The one re-entry debris I had mentioned had
pretty poor elements, it re-entered on Sept 20 but its last
element was 34 days prior to its re-entry (Aug 17)! Also, this
one object had the worse orbital elements, only 2, the others
had lots. The first element was for Aug 8, then the last Aug 17.
How they predicted re-entry for such a sparse orbital element
set is beyond my understanding.

>>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three
>>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are
>>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>going in shadow.

>Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos?
>Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at
>about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles
>height.

>The earth's limb was about 1,400 miles away from Skylab's
>height. The only way a 60-100-mile high re-entry could be viewed
>from Skylab against a black space background if it was about
>1,400 miles away. But the earth's limb would be visible
>immediately below the re-entry about 2 to 4 degrees below and the
>burning object would be progressively falling still lower.

>Garriott said the red object was "well above the horizon."

Yes, you make sense. I'll have to think about this. The other thing to consider is that the degraded re-entry orbit may place it near Skylab, but prior to actual burn-up/glow. No way to say.

>>I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing >>could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some >>time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than >>how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they >>enter the atmosphere with usually).

>Re-entries take 2-3 minutes, not 10 minutes, and travel nearly >horizontally about 600 to 900 miles - a movement not seen by the >Skylab astronauts or evidenced in the photos which do not show a >flaming streak.

Do you have a reference for this? I mean when does "glow" start and how long it takes till it hits the ground.

>>Examination of the photo guidebook for Skylab 2 shows the >>description for two photos to be "UFO" (SL2-102-893, SL2-102->>897). I have never seen them but have heard that the existing >>copies are pretty dark and scratched so nothing may be viewable >>on them.

>Can you post a link to the Skylab photo guidebooks or supply >copies?

<http://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?N=4294929300>

Skylab 3 Photographic Index And Scene Identification

Skylab 2 Photographic Index And Scene Identification

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:25:52 -0600
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:38:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:13:32 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
>>To: UFOupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>Hi, Jay & Fellow Listerions,

>I've been observing the essential back-and-forth on this issue.

>How, apparently, absolutely horrifyingly some UFO abductees
>have been dealt with, both by 'abductors' and individuals who
>allegedly facilitate their coming to terms, or not, with their
>individual experiences.

>The time has indeed now come to present a compilation of these
>stories and the research that, hopefully, underlies them, as
>just talking about the "horror that must not be named" (or
>described) in increasingly nebulous terms is very much less than
>either helpful or productive.

<snip>

>Some here need to either, to put directly, "put up or shut up."
>IMHO. The very title of this thread begs the question: "Will The
>UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?" The answer is no, not if
>we can't even discuss this among ourselves in any realistic way.

>What say you all?

>Steve

Hi Greg, Steve, Jay, Kathy:

I've been following these posts with interest. In my personal
research, I've always made public 'the good, the bad, and the
ugly' of this phenomenon.

I'm reminded when reading this thread of the time I was told,
"You can't put that in your book - it's way too negative!"

It was advice from several people I had asked to review the
manuscript for The Alien Jigsaw. Several were UFO/abduction
investigators. I was told that some of what I saw during my
abduction experiences was so horrifying that it would detract
from my 'story' if I published it in Alien Jigsaw. Some of the
information I took out, while some of it I published anyway.
What I took out, I published in my Researcher's Supplement and

some of the info was published later in Project Open Mind.

One thing that I think is important in this discussion is the fact that there are several different types of ETs or beings interacting with humans and they do not all share the same agenda.

We should be careful not to make general assumptions about their behavior by looking at one particular groups' actions and then assuming that they are all behaving in the same manner.

One of the worst things I've ever seen done to abductees during an experience was being perpetrated by other humans.

See the chapter titled Liquid Memory in my free on-line book for one example.

The question is, were these humans like us, humans of our time or humans from some place else?

I've been attempting to read 10 years of journal entries by an abductee who I've known for 2 decades and at times I find it impossible. What this person has endured is so difficult to read that at times I have to put it down for weeks just to stay grounded, and I am an abductee. I understand how difficult it will be for the public to grasp some of this knowledge.

Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention? They are receiving attention within UFO groups and organizations - thanks to the Internet. Slowly, but surely. We need to keep talking about this information. It may not be what people want to hear, but it's part of the overall truth of the phenomenon. Let's just try not to 'shoot the messengers' when they publish their findings.

Thanks all -

Katharina Wilson
www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:52:44 -0600
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 15:59:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 12:50:13 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

>>From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 16:44:18 -0600
>>Subject: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research

>>Dear List:

>>I wanted to let everyone know that the Third Quarter publication
>>of The Journal of Abduction Encounter Research has just been
>>published. (Please note: The information below was taken
>>directly from their latest e-mail announcement.)

<snip>

>I have been interested in this endeavor, The Journal of
>Abduction Encounter Research, since it's first publication. But
>I have been reluctant to support JAR, due to its links with the
>Exopolitical movement.

>I have to oppose current Exopolitics because of their
>fundamental flaws in policy, which center around assuming an
>eventual audience of equals with ETs that abduct and abuse
>victims.

>Past behavior being the best predictor of future behavior, that
>it is, abducting ETs have no interest in an Exopolitical
>dialogue, or any other dialogue, with us.

>If this assessment is in error, please correct it. In the
>meantime, I will continue to point those, who email me off-list,
>to folks who share the desire to end these abductions, and help
>the abductees to cope with the trauma.

Rick -

I'm not aware of any direct links between JAR and the
Exopolitical movement. They have published articles by a couple
of people associated with that movement, but JAR does not
promote it or any other particular movement as far as I am
aware.

You may be referring to the article in JAR II by Richard Boylan,
which I, among others, was somewhat surprised to read. You can
contact Elaine Douglass for further information regarding that.
I'll be happy to send you her email if you do not already have
it.

Give JAR a second look. The third issue is quite interesting.

Katharina Wilson
www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 20:10:23 -0000
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 16:01:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 08:09:14 -0500
>Subject: Re: Sensitivity Of Dogs

>Did you miss my post about the detailed study of animal reaction
>cases by Joan Woodward for MUFON? See the MUFON web site. It
covers every kind of animal for which case material is available.

Thanks Richard,

Just downloaded that as WORD .doc from:

http://nicap.org/anreact/AR_rep081505.doc

Interestingly Joan Woodward _has_ picked up on "overload" of
dogs' senses during some CEs.

"Howling is a social response, a form of communication, usually
done by a relaxed dog with its head raised. Normally howling is
done to elicit a response or to respond to another animal, or to
a sound (like sirens) that triggers howling. Howling is not due
to the dog's ears being hurt. Sound was reported in 8 of 11
sightings were dogs were reported to howl. This might be expected
and makes sense. But some of these events involve dogs that are
very fearful and howling, and this is not an expected or normal
combination of behaviors (see 2/24/59 CA, 3/15/65 FL, and 2/22/90
IN on NICAP.org Category 4). Fear vocalizations are normally
yelping, screaming, or moaning. This makes one speculate that the
stimulus causing the howling is overwhelming."

Which brought to mind a recently read case where the witness's
dog 'went crazy' and was circling and biting its own tail -
which seems to be a pretty strong symptom of overload or of
'overwhelming' stress.

BTW - Joan Woodward gives a few clear, sensible suggestions for
questions to witnesses regarding animal reactions - aimed at
providing meaningful information which could be of use in later
analysis.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:11:21 -0600
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 16:03:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 07:59:52 -0500
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 08:13:32 -0800
>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>From: Jay Nelson <jnelson.nul>
>>To: UFOupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 01 Dec 2007 15:59:10 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

>>>From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: <UFOupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 08:15:03 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Will The UFO Horror Stories Get News Attention?

<snip>

>I am sorry to be blunt about it, but this entire thread is as
>phony as a \$3.00 bill.

>There is a vast published literature on abduction cases that
>gives all the gory details.

>Has no one read David Jacobs' books, for example? Budd Hopkins
>reports all sorts of horrendous incidents, as have Ann Druffel
>and many other other lesser known abduction researchers.

>People are shooting from the hip on this one, and merely
>displaying their ignorance of the literature.

Hi All:

I failed to mention other researchers in my recent post. I'd
like to add (the late) Karla Turner's publications as well as
her mentor's Barbara Bartholic.

Karla's books can be read on-line at her memorial site.

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

For a look at the manipulative side of ET involvement in
people's personal lives see Eve Lorgan's site:

<http://www.alienlovebite.com>

See also the research of Donald Worley at:

<http://www.abduct.com/worley/worley.php>

See also: Chief Credo Mutwa's story at:

<http://www.metatech.com>

Katharina Wilson
www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 21:29:49 -0400
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:37:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:34:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>Source: CanWest MediaWorks - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

>><http://tinyurl.com/3codv2>

>>Monday, April 09, 2007

>>Strange Sightings Over Canada
>>Allison Hanes
>>The National Post

><snip>

>Anyone have a date on this incident or where the report came
>from? It is easily checkable but my records show no indication
>of it ever happening.

>Note that the newspaper report carries on with mundane reports
>of UFOs but one supposedly involving an airliner loaded with
>people having a TCAS alert which are required to be reported by
>law - because they are very serious - gets just the hyped blurb
>above.

>I have a vague recollection of someone reporting an airliner
>swerving to avoid a UFO by someone on the ground near the Bay of
>Fundy. If a pilot says this happened and was reported and it
>didn't show up in the daily reports then I have something upon
>which I can base an AIA.

TCAS - Traffic Collision Avoidance System for airplanes

AIA - Access to Information Act in Canada

Don

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 19:33:27 -0600 (CST)
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:39:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:34:37 -0400
>Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>Source: CanWest MediaWorks - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

>><http://tinyurl.com/3codv2>

>>Monday, April 09, 2007
>>Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>Allison Hanes
>>The National Post

><snip>

>>and a blaze of white light that triggered a commercial
>>airliner's collision avoidance system over New Brunswick are
>>among 736 mysterious sights reported in Canadian skies last year
>>and a handful that remain unidentified.

>Anyone have a date on this incident or where the report came
>from? It is easily checkable but my records show no indication
>of it ever happening.

I think this is the one I discussed here or on CANUFO some time ago. The article was published in April, so it's an old story. (Not sure why it was reposted.) I think you had even commented on it back then.

This was the case of the airliner overflying Gagetown and its TCAS went off. There was some discussion about the possibility it was a signal on the ground that set it off, as opposed to an aerial object, although a light had been seen as well. I hadn't been able to find out much more at that time. I think Stan was asked about it too.

An AIA request might be interesting.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:04 -0500
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:46:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 11:03:58 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>>>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three
>>>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are
>>>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>>>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>>radiation.

Yes, but it wouldn't be the "red" seen in the photos. It would
glow more like a 'blackbody' - think of very hot coals, more
orange than red - as the temperature during reentry gets very
high.

>>>This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>>going in shadow.

>>Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos?
>>Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at
>>about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles
>>height.

>>The earth's limb was about 1,400 miles away from Skylab's
>>height. The only way a 60-100-mile high re-entry could be viewed
>>from Skylab against a black space background if it was about
>>1,400 miles away. But the earth's limb would be visible
>>immediately below the re-entry about 2 to 4 degrees below and the
>>burning object would be progressively falling still lower.
>>Garriott said the red object was "well above the horizon."

Since the object was first seen 10 minutes before the shadow
boundary, and considering that there is no evidence of the earth
in the photos, an object at lower altitude that was glowing due
to reentry heating would have to be far ahead of the Skylab.

Furthermore, I can't imagine how the astronauts would have
thought it was anything other than a reentry if they saw it
streaking along.

>Yes, you make sense. I'll have to think about this. The other
>thing to consider is that the degraded re-entry orbit may place
>it near Skylab, but prior to actual burn-up/glow. No way to say.

>>>I do not have a feel for how long such heating up and glowing

>>>could occur (if even possible) but it would seem to take some
>>>time (~10 minutes) if the objects are made of metal (rather than
>>>how meteors generally rapidly burn up due to high angles they
>>>enter the atmosphere with usually).

>>Re-entries take 2-3 minutes, not 10 minutes, and travel nearly
>>horizontally about 600 to 900 miles - a movement not seen by the
>>Skylab astronauts or evidenced in the photos which do not show a
>>flaming streak.

>Do you have a reference for this? I mean when does "glow" start
>and how long it takes till it hits the ground.

When it hits the ground is not relevant since it stops glowing
brightly long before then. Stops glowing brightly at least by
the time it reaches 8 - 10 miles (more likely 20 miles) because
the fall slows it and cooling increases as the atmosphere gets
thicker.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:50:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 14:08:31 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 14:27:36 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>The Earth background being missing is a good point I failed to
>consider. It seems to eliminate the re-entry glow idea, although
>I still have to think about it.

>>>Regarding the images before and after the UFO sequence,
>>>according to the Skylab mission photo guide they are not
>>>immediately before or after. The prior image #2137 is a blurred
>>>attempted photo for the Goddard Laser Experiment which was aimed
>>>at a Maryland region, considerably prior to the UFO photos. The
>>>subsequent image #2142 is of "Lake Erie, Ohio, Ontario, clouds",
>.>a much later time. I doubt the images actually are of the laser
>>>beam (although the laser _was_ tested at red wavelengths),
>>>mainly because I see no reason for the astronauts to mess up
>>>their observations so much and that only two photos of the laser
>>>beacon were officially taken during Skylab 2 on Sept 4, 1973,
>>>which does not correspond with when they reported photographing
>>>the odd object. One point of interest is that an interview of
>>>the crew regarding the laser experiment showed that they used
>>>the 300mm lens for it, so there seems to be a good likelihood
>>>they kept the lens on for the subsequent "UFO" pictures.

>>Strange that they would attempt to photograph the red laser
>>while the earth was in sunshine. The red beam would have a lot
>>of light to compete with. The photo you mention does not look
>>like a red filtered image which would likely be used if one were
>>to try to detect a red laser beam against a bright background. I
>>could imagine them trying the Goddard laser experiment when the
>>earth surface was dark. Then they wouldn't need a red filter.
>>But then there would also be no image of the surface such as we
>>see in 2137.

>All I know about this is the description of the scene in the
>photo index and the laser experiment.

>"Evaluation of SKYLAB Earth LASER Beacon Imagery"

>"Experiment Debrief"

>"Bean: The laser was the only thing that I saw during the
>mission that had a neon-light look to it... This actually
>radiated like a neon light that's on in the daytime outside. It
>has a brilliance to it."

I looked up the tinyurl.com/yw4pym and found the report you were
reading. Now I know what that experiment was all about. And
guess what: during the Skylab 3 they used only the argon-ion

laser which puts out 5145 A radiation which is - ta-dah - green!

Therefore my earlier comments about photographing a red laser are moot. Also, the experiments were run during the daytime, despite my "logic" that they would be run at night. The intent was to determine whether or not a laser could act as a daytime beacon or brightness calibration in the presence of sunlit ground. They used powers up to 10 watts... which is quite bright!

Garriott said he could see it during the first experiment but not during the second. He said he took "some photographs" during the first experiment. Was 2137 the second of these? If so I would expect to see a green spot. But I don't.

Anyway, the lens the used for laser experiments was 300 mm with f stop 4.8 - 8 and shutter time 1/125 to 1/500 sec. The film was "like" Ektachrome MS 2448.

>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found >on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were >underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were >approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8. >They were also blurry so there might have been some movement >although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

Now that we know Garriott took "some photographs" during the first sighting (2136 and 2137), then the question is, did anyone take any photos during the second sighting? I think not. Then the "second set of photos" mentioned above is actually 2138-2141 (the red object) which, they say, was underexposed.

I think that the photo analysts who were looking for laser imagery before talking to the astronauts, and without knowing that the Garriott intentionally photographed a "red satellite", might have thought that there was a second set of photos corresponding to the second laser observation experiment. If this is what they thought it would have been natural for them to assume that 2138-2141 were the second set of laser photos. But if they so concluded (and I now think they did) they would have immediately also concluded that the photos were severely underexposed because there was no image of the earth and because nothing showed up in the pictures (except the very tiny red dot in the first three and a larger red "structure" in the fourth). They probably wouldn't have spent much if any time trying to understand how the red dot images could have occurred in underexposed photos.

>Also,

>"On Skylab 3, Astronauts Bean and Lousma confirmed the beacon >size and shape manifested in the Skylab 3 imagery. They >described the beacon as both a neon tube lying in the plane of >the earth and as a searchlight coming up through the atmosphere. >Strangely, the photographs were taken by Scientist-Astronaut >Garriott who did not verify the beacon size and shape, but >described the beacon as only a dot." >The second set were prior to the "UFO" set. I assume "neon" >means red, but maybe not.

Yes. I read the report and understand what they were saying.

There are green colored "neon tubes" used in advertising signs, etc. At any rate, the laser was green and the shape of the source, looking like a line lying horizontally on the earth, is a perspective effect: looking along a laser beam projected roughly in your direction you see a line of light which gets smaller as you look toward the laser beam source. The beam is a result of laser light being scattered by particles in the atmosphere. In the case of the astronauts at 270 miles altitude, they would see the laser beam passing through the atmosphere more than 200 miles below them and the beam would appear as a short line where it passed through the atmosphere, being visible by atmospheric scattering for maybe as much as 40-50 miles up.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:54:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 23:53:09 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>>I discovered in Edward Condon an honest man who, in the end, had to
>>bend to ! his employers. It must have been very difficult for him.

>Oh please! You must be joking. Condon was not working for the
>CIA just because he got a briefing there! He was working for the
>far more insidious and hostile AF.

<snip>

No, I am not joking. Please read on.

>>This is probably old knowledge for the seasoned ufologists on
>>the List (and old suppression for the seasoned debunkers).

>Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most
>salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders
>was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out
>that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but
>simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which
>processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

>Saunders never breathed a word of his CIA NPIC visit and
>contacts to anyone, even after Condon fired him in Feb 1968 over
>the famous pro-UFO incident when he leaked the Low 'trick' memo
>to McDonald. Why not ponder the coverup involved with that?

<snip>

You said that the concerned document is "nothing new". Obviously
it has been a long time since you read it: there is no reference
to any R. Saunders and no mention of anyone touring anything.

It is only a report on the reactions of Condon and his group on
the value of the Zanesville photography.

More: the reader discovers in Condon a passionate man overly
enthusiastic about the possibility it is the real deal. He even
wanted to share this with the public.

That is all that is said, written and inferred in the reference
I mentioned.

I thought this was some lesson of life: people change under
whatever pressure.

It is also evident that Condon did not deny the reality of UFOs.

For me, this is a good story about human nature, when you consider how the man was demonized - and still is - by ufologists.

<snip>

>>This was some revelation to me.

>>The magnitude of the implications leaves me speechless. Most of >>the text could have been capitalized.

>Lots more than just this, and released in the 70's, but it would >require an in-depth investigation of CIA organization and >history to understand it, beginning with the fact the CIA is not >a monolithic agency speaking and acting with one voice. Most UFO >researchers cannot even keep up with the polarized 'covert' and >'overt' sides of the CIA, so everything that is 'CIA' is >automatically attributed to spook assassins and James Bond >types.

<snip>

I am talking about human nature, you're talking about The Company.

Have you ever seen the documentary 'The Corporation'?

It is said that corporations are deemed 'moral entities' by the Law, but, as such, would be diagnosed psychotic if they were people.

More on this if you care to discuss it.

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 21:15:05 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:55:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III

>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2007 13:52:44 -0600
>Subject: Re: Journal Of Abduction Encounter Research III

<snip>

>Rick -

>I'm not aware of any direct links between JAR and the
>Exopolitical movement. They have published articles by a couple
>of people associated with that movement, but JAR does not
>promote it or any other particular movement as far as I am
>aware.

>You may be referring to the article in JAR II by Richard Boylan,
>which I, among others, was somewhat surprised to read. You can
>contact Elaine Douglass for further information regarding that.
>I'll be happy to send you her email if you do not already have
>it.

>Give JAR a second look. The third issue is quite interesting.

>Katharina Wilson
>www.alienjigsaw.com

Katharina:

Thank you for your response! I would appreciate a copy of
Elaine's email, you reference above.

But I'm still concerned.

There is a direct reference to the Exopolitical membership of at
least one of the JAR Board Members. Specifically, I'm referring
to JAR board member and webmaster, Manuel Lamiroy, referenced on
this webpage:

<http://www.jarmag.com/board.html>

Obviously, ufology often stumbles while walking that tightrope
between fact and faith. And while no one wants to throw out the
good with the bad, direct links to questionable causes and
characters, causes careful consideration, then avoidance.

Wouldn't we be best served with a journal that addresses what
little is known, instead of an agenda?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

A Perspective On The UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 11:09:38 -0500
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 11:09:38 -0500
Subject: A Perspective On The UFO

Source: 'Copernicus's' The Brane Space Blog - Colorado, USA

<http://brane-space.blogspot.com/2007/12/perspective-on.html>

Tuesday, December 4, 2007

A Perspective On The UFO

I've long since concluded that the "UFO" is not a subject that astronomers can avoid. Over the years, at nearly every public lecture I've given, at least one curious questioner has asked: "Do you believe in UFOs?" or "Have you ever seen a UFO?"

Such questions deserve to be respected and not dismissed out of hand. Knee-jerk rejection or debunking is contrary to what the scientific temperament is all about. My own strategy has been to first clarify the definition of UFO, while challenging the assumption that it is a synonym for "spaceship from another world". It means exactly what the acronym implies: Unidentified Flying Object. As such, UFOs are an observed and recorded fact, as much as the Sun rising every morning. The existence of UFOs is a matter independent of "belief".

What remains open to question is the particular interpretation of the UFO. Here is where the astronomer can provide useful insight by introducing his or her audience to the notion of scientific hypotheses. Several are applicable to UFOs, which I will explore in detail later. They include: 1- a misidentified known object (planet, airplane, or balloon); 2- an unknown natural-meteorological phenomenon; 3- a psychological phenomenon and 4- a genuine craft from another planetary civilization. Note that depending on viewpoint, an astronomer may or may not regard (1) as a valid hypotheses. I do, because further research can be used to verify it.

From all the available UFO statistics, hypothesis (1) has most often been demonstrated by sheer attrition of reported sightings. These statistics show that about 95 per cent of initially reported UFOs turn out to be "IFOs" or identified flying objects. I used to have enormous difficulty coming to grips with this statistic, but I don't any more. The fact is that the majority of sporadic skywatchers really don't know what is up there. Many cannot distinguish a star from a planet, or an extremely bright planet or star from a man-made device. I cannot begin to recount here all the times an excited caller has phoned me to breathlessly report..... Venus! Incredibly, when I correct them they retain an attitude of disbelief that any "natural" object could be that bright! Surely it must be an unnatural object! An alien craft!

As long as the night sky remains unknown to the vast majority of people, misidentifications will be the rule for "UFOs". On the other hand, I'm intrigued by the 5 per cent of reports which persist as unidentified after close scrutiny: what I call the "signal" (as distinct from the 95% "noise".) These reports cannot be solved after years of comprehensive investigations.

They are what I call "the genuine UFO reports" (I use the term "UFO reports" rather than UFOs, since the existence of the reports is not in question, though their interpretation is open). These reports, in all probability, will fall into one of the other hypotheses: (2), (3) or (4). However, as we shall see, it is also possible to arrive at other hypotheses which are not so neat and tidy.

The difficulty in formulating UFO hypotheses, and interpreting UFO reports, is a first-hand experience for me. Not only have I investigated other people's reports and published the results[1] but I have seen a "UFO" myself. The incident occurred in the summer of 1962 while at the opening of a shopping center in Carol City, Florida. While awaiting the start of festivities I happened to look up at the night sky, being the amateur astronomer that I was. Amazingly, I witnessed a brilliant orange disc, at least the same diameter as a full Moon, moving rapidly from north to south. It hovered for two to three seconds above the crowd at the shopping center and I detected the odd "Oooh" or "Aaah" from random spectators. Thus, I knew I was not having a simple hallucination (at least not by myself!)

The most ironic and notable thing to me was the complete absence of sound. No whirring, like one would expect from a helicopter's propeller blades, or engine noise. The object - if "object" it was - appeared to be a light source rather than just reflecting light from elsewhere. After about three seconds it took off due south at what I estimated to be an incredible speed. As a seasoned sky observer, even at the age of 16, I was able to quickly eliminate all known man-made or natural objects from consideration. The exceptional luminous and dynamical behavior allowed this. Nevertheless, to this day I am not prepared to pinpoint a specific hypothesis in any dogmatic sense, though up until recently I have gravitated toward (4).

Why? From my knowledge of physics, it is the only one I could fit into a conceptual framework. The key is the fact that the UFO, certainly for the brief time I observed it, exhibited a remarkable degree of intelligent control. Weather phenomena, like ball lightning, simply do not behave in this fashion. They tend to be governed by stochastic or random forces. And, on a probability scale of 0 to 1 (with 1 certainty) I would put the existence of a hitherto "unknown" meteorological phenomenon at about 1 in ten million, or 0.0000001.

There may be rare weather phenomena capable of precisely imitating the dynamics of my UFO, but I wouldn't bet on it! Ball lightning, which is a known phenomenon, comes closest - but what I saw was not ball lightning by any stretch of imagination. (For one thing there were absolutely no clouds visible at the time, and ball lightning does not move at the speed this moved).

What about hypothesis (3), a psychological effect? This cannot be ruled out absolutely, but it is rendered highly improbable by there being a dozen or so other witnesses. If it was psychological, then it was a shared hallucination, which stretches credibility in yet another direction. That leaves hypothesis (4), or does it? At face value it would seem to be the most reasonable thing to accept that what I observed was an intelligently controlled spacecraft from another world. Somehow, however, it seems to me too facile an explanation.

Forget about my observation for the moment, and consider the vast number of UFO sightings each year. That 5 per cent of permanent unknowns translates, on average, into about ten thousand sightings each year. Surely, there cannot be ten thousand different craft visiting us each year.[2]

Even allowing for repeat sightings, the variety of shapes and sizes would suggest a figure of at least one thousand. One thousand craft from another world - or from a thousand different worlds? No way! I simply can't accept that any race of supposedly intelligent beings would regard the human species and its humdrum little world as that important - and consume so much energy in such an extended endeavor!

Energy, even for very intelligent aliens, must be extremely resource-intensive. And though highly advanced, I can't see how these hypothetical beings could bypass fundamental physical laws such as entropy[3]. To imagine that any civilization can afford to squander vast energy on thousands of yearly visitations to a

backwater world borders on the ridiculous.

[1] See: Transient Optical Phenomena of the Atmosphere - A Case Study, in The Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, Vol. 74, No. 3, June 1980.

[2] Jacques Vallee, in his book: Revelations: Alien Contact and Human Deception (Ballantine Books, 1991, Appendix) presents worldwide data and statistics which extrapolate to 14 million sightings over a thirty-year period. This figure, of course, renders the extraterrestrial hypothesis even more improbable. Is Earth really the "grand central station" of the Milky Way? I somehow doubt it.

[3] The entropy law, or 2nd law of thermodynamics, states that for every useful conversion of energy/fuel there will be a large amount of waste energy (e.g. heat) accompanying it. A corollary is that as the frequency of useful energy conversion grows, energy efficiency must go down and the amount of waste energy must increase.

About Me

Specialized in space physics and solar physics, developed first astronomy curriculum for Caribbean secondary schools, have written three books - currently working on 4th.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Brazilian Ufology Center Interviews Greg Boone

From: Milton Frank <mfrank.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 10:38:31 -0200 (BRST)
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 11:15:39 -0500
Subject: Brazilian Ufology Center Interviews Greg Boone

1 - Why did you start to study and search ufology? Have you ever seen an UFO? If so, how was your experience?

I started studying UFOs very young around six or seven years old. I was a very bright child and saw the legendary LOOK Magazine article on Betty and Barney Hill. From what I could put together at that age I saw how fantasy and reality didn't align. I saw how in the latest news articles the debate about ETs and UFOs was still in action, whereas in fiction such as Superman and Star Trek, it was a given.

Yes, I've seen several UFOs. Too much to go into in short. I grew up in an area of the country where UFO sightings were prevalent. It didn't take much effort to see a UFO.

It was so common it was like keeping an eye out for roadway problems like potholes or deer in the road. In my specific situation I've seen from saucers to boomerang shaped aircraft, mind you I said aircraft not spacecraft. Since I've not seen anything in outer space for all intents and purposes they're aircraft. Also balls of light. Very well documented phenomenon in that section of New York State.

2 - What are the world top 10 ufology cases in your opinion? The top 10? I'd say the most important at present are the Hudson Valley ufo sightings of the Hudson Valley in New York State. It's the first time in human history that so many ufos for over 30 years have been seen regularly over homes, military and other sensitive installations. There are videos, pictures, trace cases, police and military and personal reports. There've been at least four books written in the past 20 years each corroborating the other's data to a great degree. It still hasn't been addressed by the authorities to the satisfaction of the public. Some of these sightings are indeed top secret aircraft but not all.

3- What is your opinion about Abductions?

My opinion is about abductions is that they're happening and have been happening since the earliest records of history. The difference is that nowadays we have more extensive communications and language technologies. Today, a person can be abducted at noon on Monday and by a half an hour later the entire world can access the data if presented. That throws a big monkey wrench in the entire cover up. I can say that very soon the abduction phenomenon will be one of the most talked about by everyone on Earth. Reason being is the sheer volume of people who've been abducted are now sticking their heads out of their shells, realizing they're being lied to by their governments and the problem not being addressed in accordance to their legal birthrights and are taking a proactive stance. The ridicule will drop drastically as more famous abductees come forward including heads-of-state, athletes, movie and TV stars, and recording artists. The sheer number of reports is increasing at such a rate that it's becoming more common than car accidents in the U.S. alone. That's an alarming figure and one not to be ignored.

4 - What is your opinion about the dimensions theory? Do you think it can be possible?

Dimensional theory is easily provable but difficult to translate into our present language except for math. However our mainstream scientists are reluctant because many of them don't have the imagination necessary to see the application just the probability. It's far too complex an issue to discuss briefly and I not being a professional physicist I wouldn't want to confuse people. Basically the ideas of alternate realities introduces the possible abilities that would free human beings from the fear of loss and death which would lead to no control by our governments and religious bodies as they are now. It may introduce other controls in varying degrees. It's something very complex and in order to comprehend it one needs to elevate one's levels of awareness to degrees we don't as cultures allow. The ways to raise consciousness fly in the face of the conventional. Do you think the world would want to stop the use of alcohol, pharmaceuticals and illegal drugs? No, because they're multi-trillion dollar money makers. So for those who stay away from these substances, the ability to perceive in higher levels and control those levels leaves the rest of humanity in the liability of becoming slaves to the clean and sober.

5 - What are the most important points that an ufology searcher has to learn to do a good job?

Number one would be sanity. If one is unstable it will show up in one's works. Objectivity and thorough application of the fundamentals of investigation in the areas of the applied sciences. One can study these at any college or university or even high school. If one has bigotries and prejudices one might as well drop investigating right now or there is a very scary price to be paid. Tolerance of other's ideas, cultures, viewpoints are a must. Being sober and in good health as many witnesses and sites are in rugged terrain.

6 - What would you say to a young man that intends to be an ufology searcher?

I'd say first of all make sure you have the resources and support any researcher needs. Ufology is the target of many connen and liars. You could have a budget and go off in a direction led by a fraudulent person and exhaust your tools thus missing valuable research. It's not an area for the faint of heart nor poor. The low cost of internet communication has dropped the cost of phone calls drastically but still one may have travel costs, lab costs etc... First and foremost for a young person is to study the basic books of ufology. I will comprise a bibliography soon of books I've found to be essential. Primarily a dictionary. If there's one thing you will need in life is to take six months or so out of your life part time and read and get the definitions of each word and symbol in a dictionary. That will do you wonders.

7 - What is the most important UFO case you've been involved with? Does it give you a hard time? Was it difficult to research?

The Hudson Valley ufo sightings. I'm still studying it. It involved everything from close friends and family to threats, to intimidation to all sorts of things. I'm finishing up a book I'm writing about in part what happened in the past 30 years in that area. It's called "The UFO Mafia" and should be out later this year or early 2008.

8 - Have you ever thought that UFO phenomenon could not be from the space? How do you feel dealing with UFO phenomenon?

People often make the error of believing all ufo sightings and data can be answered in the singular. Like, all ufos are alien spacecraft or all ufos come from Mars. There's no one single source to ufos and no single explanations. Some are from outer space and some from right here on Earth and some from other dimensions. It varies.

The UFO phenomenon is like any other field of research except

one thing, it encompasses all the sciences and philosophies and cultures on the Earth past and present. When studying UFOs you'll get the nicest look at other people, cultures, religions and find that you, your ancestors, other living creatures are amazing to say the least. It's really a validation to our abilities to survive compared to how dangerous life can be.

9 - What is your opinion about Ufology's future?

My opinion is ufology will continue in some form or another. If we find out tomorrow that 'some' ufos come from another galaxy we'll still see ufos and wonder where they come from. It's about us looking up in the skies and seeing things that shouldn't be there. Here in the U.S. after the attacks on Sept. 11, 2001 all aircraft were grounded. UFO skeptics proclaimed that there wouldn't be any ufo reports during this time. However just the opposite occurred, there were 'more' UFO reports than normal!

So I expect there'll always be we who look into the sky and examine what we see.

10 - After all those years researching, what is your best definition to the UFO phenomenon? What did you learn from it?

My best definition of the UFO phenomenon is that there is a phenomenon. There's no one answer and no one question. People see things flying in the skies and wonder about them and when they don't get satisfactory answers they fill in the blanks or go and study themselves. The most important thing learned in ufology is that knowledge is freedom.

11 - I really would like you to live a message to The Brazilian Ufology Center. Right now we have more than 41.500 members and they really would like to hear what you have to say to them.

My message to the Brazilian Ufology Center is first of all I've found out recently I've got millions of cousins in Brazil. I didn't know that until one of my cousins here and some cousins in Brazil were doing genealogy. It was quite a surprise as I've been following certain UFO cases that have occurred over the years especially in Sao Paulo. Brazilians must realize that they're sitting on a gold mine of a country. All of S. America is precious but the use of narcotics and abuse of alcohol and the shunning of education are putting the populace there in grave danger. You must all stand up and fight for a good life or the evil doers will end up controlling you all. One day soon I hope to have some allies in some high end technologies that have shown interest energy in stopping drugs and crime and brutality but they have some ways to go until they're up to the level of professionalism I need. Brazil has a Portuguese ancestry as well as African and Native American. I'm a descendent of all three and more. If Brazil realizes they don't need anyone else in the world because of Brazil's natural resources and virile fishing coasts, Brazil can utilize the amazing new medical and energy technologies turning it into the first super advanced model modernized country in the world. It can be done it just takes enough love and respect to do so.

Thanks,

Milton Frank

You can read this interview in Portuguese at:

<http://tinyurl.com/3b62vx>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 13:15:33 -0400
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:04:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 19:33:27 -0600 (CST)
>Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2007 13:34:37 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>>Source: CanWest MediaWorks - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

>>><http://tinyurl.com/3codv2>

>>>Monday, April 09, 2007
>>>Strange Sightings Over Canada

>>>Allison Hanes
>>>The National Post

>><snip>

>>>and a blaze of white light that triggered a commercial
>>>airliner's collision avoidance system over New Brunswick are
>>>among 736 mysterious sights reported in Canadian skies last year
>>>and a handful that remain unidentified.

>>Anyone have a date on this incident or where the report came
>>from? It is easily checkable but my records show no indication
>>of it ever happening.

>I think this is the one I discussed here or on CANUFO some time
>ago. The article was published in April, so it's an old story.
>(Not sure why it was reposted.) I think you had even commented
>on it back then.

>This was the case of the airliner overflying Gagetown and its
>TCAS went off. There was some discussion about the possibility
>it was a signal on the ground that set it off, as opposed to an
>aerial object, although a light had been seen as well. I hadn't
>been able to find out much more at that time. I think Stan was
>asked about it too.

>An AIA request might be interesting.

Bogus Traffic Collision Avoidance System - TCAS - reports are an untapped resource in my opinion. They happen more often than they should without seeming causes. The air traffic control ATC system relies heavily on this technology to prevent mid-air and near misses. Ground signals are unlikely due to the narrow band of microwave frequencies that TCAS key off. It works in the same MW range as Transponders which is the basis for the system.

You would think that aircraft taxiing at airports below might activate the system but when operating from a controlled airport the transponder is kept on stand-by until the aircraft is several miles away otherwise the returns from the transponders would obliterate any primary returns right at the field and the

computer generated information showing up on the air traffic controllers screen would be a jumble of interlocking numbers and symbols.

This would not of course be the case at a private, uncontrolled airfield where one or more aircraft might be taxiing with their transponders operational, however the antenna [about 2.5 inches long] is located on the bottom of the aircraft [usually under the cabin as the coaxial cable connecting the antenna to the transponder is very short] and the signal is being absorbed by the ground and masked by the fuselage and highly unlikely to be strong enough to key the TCAS on an aircraft thousands of feet above it.

Incidentally, overflying Gagetown is right on the edge of the live fire range [approx.35 x20 miles just west of the Saint John River] that is restricted up to 25,000 feet. Everyone flying that area has to be careful not to fly into it.

Stan perhaps you have a date for this occurrence. I can't proceed any further without it.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA]

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 13:26:09 -0400
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:07:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA]

>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>>>I discovered in Edward Condon an honest man who, in the end, had to
>>>bend to ! his employers. It must have been very difficult for him.

>>Oh please! You must be joking. Condon was not working for the
>>CIA just because he got a briefing there! He was working for the
>>far more insidious and hostile AF.

><snip>

>No, I am not joking. Please read on.

>>Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most
>>salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders
>>was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out
>>that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but
>>simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which
>>processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

>>Saunders never breathed a word of his CIA NPIC visit and
>>contacts to anyone, even after Condon fired him in Feb 1968 over
>>the famous pro-UFO incident when he leaked the Low 'trick' memo
>>to McDonald. Why not ponder the coverup involved with that?

><snip>

>You said that the concerned document is "nothing new". Obviously
>it has been a long time since you read it: there is no reference
>to any R. Saunders and no mention of anyone touring anything.

>It is only a report on the reactions of Condon and his group on
>the value of the Zanesville photography.

>More: the reader discovers in Condon a passionate man overly
>enthusiastic about the possibility it is the real deal. He even
>wanted to share this with the public.

>That is all that is said, written and inferred in the reference
>I mentioned.

>I thought this was some lesson of life: people change under
>whatever pressure.

>It is also evident that Condon did not deny the reality of UFOs.

>For me, this is a good story about human nature, when you
>consider how the man was demonized - and still is - by
>ufologists.

><snip>

>>>This was some revelation to me.

>>>The magnitude of the implications leaves me speechless. Most of
>>>the text could have been capitalized.

>>Lots more than just this, and released in the 70's, but it would
>>require an in-depth investigation of CIA organization and >history to

>understand it, beginning with the fact the CIA is not >a monolithic
>agency speaking and acting with one voice. Most UFO >researchers
>cannot even keep up with the polarized 'covert' and >'overt' sides of
>the CIA, so everything that is 'CIA' is >automatically attributed to
>spook assassins and James Bond >types.

><snip>

>I am talking about human nature, you're talking about The
>Company.

<snip>

What do you both think of Condon's possibly being compliant
after his roughing up by the House Un-American Activities
Committee? He got off but who stepped up to get him out of that
mess?

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 13:36:33 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:10:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:04 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 11:03:58 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

><snip>

>>>>The number of Skylab debris items was about 23. There are three
>>>>objects that re-enter in Sept 1973, so the orbital elements are
>>>>likely useless. One of these re-enters on Sept 20, 1973, the day
>>>>claimed for the odd photo. There is a possibility that this
>>>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>>>radiation.

>Yes, but it wouldn't be the "red" seen in the photos. It would
>glow more like a 'blackbody' - think of very hot coals, more
>orange than red - as the temperature during reentry gets very
>high.

I have no idea how it would look over time. Has any spacecraft
ever photographed re-entering debris? The glow should change
color through the re-entry period depending on its temperature.
Meteors have been videoed using ISS/Shuttle cameras and
generally appear for no more than 2 seconds.

>>>>The earth's limb was about 1,400 miles away from Skylab's
>>>>height. The only way a 60-100-mile high re-entry could be viewed
>>>>from Skylab against a black space background if it was about
>>>>1,400 miles away. But the earth's limb would be visible
>>>>immediately below the re-entry about 2 to 4 degrees below and the
>>>>burning object would be progressively falling still lower.
>>>>Garriott said the red object was "well above the horizon."

>Since the object was first seen 10 minutes before the shadow
>boundary, and considering that there is no evidence of the earth
>in the photos, an object at lower altitude that was glowing due
>to reentry heating would have to be far ahead of the Skylab.

>Furthermore, I can't imagine how the astronauts would have
>thought it was anything other than a reentry if they saw it
>streaking along.

I am not really not pushing the re-entry idea, its just a notion
that can probably be ruled out for various reasons (needed
timing, height, camera angle stuff).

They did say it was ahead of Skylab during the transcript. It is
bothersome of some of the contradictory data (e.g. the memory of

the day of the event, whether it led or followed.) plus other data about the photos.

It would be helpful to know the attitude of the Skylab during that phase. I think it was usually solar inertially oriented, and we know the location of the window.

If it was not streaking along, but matching the orbit path somewhat during an early phase of glowing/reentry. Also, their experience with re-entry would be the latter phases I expect, not earlier. I still have to think through the camera angles/Earth visibility, it is a good point.

Another thing that bothers me that you can explain I am sure is about the fourth photo. Are you assuming the image is clearer image of the object with booms/extensions/etc or is it just a red dot in which the astronaut jostled the camera? I see no where that the astronauts say specifically that the object had booms/antenna/ protuberences. Have they ever done so? They said it had a rotation, but that could be due to changing brightness which is generally the case for satellites/objects/debris.

>>Do you have a reference for this? I mean when /does "glow" start >>and how long it takes till it hits the ground.

>When it hits the ground is not relevant since it stops glowing >brightly long before then. Stops glowing brightly at least by >the time it reaches 8 - 10 miles (more likely 20 miles) because >the fall slows it and cooling increases as the atmosphere gets >thicker.

I was interested in the timing of things and not just bright glowing, but really what I would be interested in is the temperature profile say 5 hours prior to hitting the ground. Then we can work out the blackbody color.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 13:13:53 -0600
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:16:49 -0500
Subject: Re: LA Times Editorial - Kucinich's Close Encounter

>Source: The Los Angeles Times - California, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/2olcl5>

>December 1, 2007

>Editorial

>Kucinich's Close Encounter

>The presidential candidate's televised acknowledgment of seeing
>a UFO has put the issue back on the radar.

This is ridiculous. Tim Russert didn't ask Kucinich about his UFO sighting because he thought it was a serious issue that the candidate should address. He only asked in order to simultaneously reinforce two narratives that the mainstream media wants to pound into the heads of the public:

(1) Kucinich is a flake who sees UFOs;

(2) flakes, like Kucinich, see UFOs.

Russert has never been one to distinguish himself from the rest of the journalistic herd except by spouting the conventional 'wisdom' in such a way that people who don't know any better will suppose he is expressing his own original and sage-like insights.

The author of the LA Times editorial, however, seems to be running off a short distance from the herd before quickly running back to its safety, making the usual smart-aleck comments to cover his rear end.

Unfortunately, he didn't bother to even learn enough about the subject of UFOs to avoid making the silly error of labeling Buzz Aldrin a "flying saucer enthusiast who spotted a mysterious something during Apollo 11's return trip." Buzz Aldrin would take exception to that - at least the 2007 Buzz Aldrin version.

While the 1969 model seems to have thought he might have seen a mysterious something judging by his debriefing comments, the 2007 model says he only saw a booster adapter panel. And the sighting happened on the way to the Moon, not on the return trip.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 14:31:20 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:21:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 14:08:31 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>All I know about this is the description of the scene in the
>>photo index and the laser experiment.
>>"Evaluation of SKYLAB Earth LASER Beacon Imagery"
>>"Experiment Debrief"

>>"Bean: The laser was the only thing that I saw during the
>>mission that had a neon-light look to it... This actually
>>radiated like a neon light that's on in the daytime outside. It
>>has a brilliance to it."

>I looked up the tinyurl.com/yw4pym and found the report you were
>reading. Now I know what that experiment was all about. And
>guess what: during the Skylab 3 they used only the argon-ion
>laser which puts out 5145 A radiation which is - ta-dah -
>green!

But according to the report they say:

"The argon ion was also utilized to pump a Coherent Radiation
Model 490 jet stream dye laser to obtain the yellow/red
wavelengths."

"The spacecraft was illuminated with only one wavelength at
a time, and successful imagery was collected at 5145(green),
5900 (yellow), and 6250 (red) Angstroms."

It is possible they just tried one wavelength for Skylab 3.

>Therefore my earlier comments about photographing a red laser
>are moot. Also, the experiments were run during the daytime,
>despite my "logic" that they would be run at night. The intent
>was to determine whether or not a laser could act as a daytime
>beacon or brightness calibration in the presence of sunlit
>ground. They used powers up to 10 watts... which is quite
>bright!

I could not find anywhere it mentioned day time photos.
Where was that?
They mention that the photos show certain objects,
but the quality of the document gives me no idea or day or
night.

>Garriott said he could see it during the first experiment but
>not during the second. He said he took "some photographs" during
>the first experiment. Was 2137 the second of these? If so I
>would expect to see a green spot. But I don't.

The mission report (pg 14.-5) states that they photo-graphed two times successfully and that "a third attempt was made but was obscured by cloud cover". The photo index only shows two sets of laser images. The first set SL3-125-2818/2819 from magazine CX-34. The second set SL3-118-2136/2137 from magazine CX-35. I am thinking the second attempt corresponds to 2136/2137 and that they didn't even try to film the cloud cover obscured attempt. The mission report describes the visual appearance as a line of multiple beams, but the experiment description says these photos were blurry so that there might have been some movement in taking the photos.

From my viewpoint, since the 2136 photos were taken on Sept 20, this confirms that the UFO object was filmed on or after that date and that the 300mm lens likely was still used (days afterward would be a different matter).

I really doubt the red laser was what caused the UFO pictures even though they oddly happened adjacent in the sequence.

>Anyway, the lens the used for laser experiments was 300 mm with >f stop 4.8 - 8 and shutter time 1/125 to 1/500 sec. The film was >"like" Ektachrome MS 2448.

>>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found >>on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were >>underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were >>approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8. >>They were also blurry so there might have been some movement >>although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

>Now that we know Garriott took "some photographs" during the >first sighting (2136 and 2137), then the question is, did anyone >take any photos during the second sighting? I think not. Then >the "second set of photos" mentioned above is actually 2138-2141 >(the red object) which, they say, was underexposed.

No, the "first set" was SL3-125-2818/2819 from magazine CX-34. The second set SL3-118-2136/2137 from magazine CX-35. The UFO photos are still unidentified and not likely from the laser, although it confuses matters to have them right after the other.

>I think that the photo analysts who were looking for laser >imagery before talking to the astronauts, and without knowing >that the Garriott intentionally photographed a "red satellite", >might have thought that there was a second set of photos >corresponding to the second laser observation experiment. If >this is what they thought it would have been natural for them to >assume that 2138-2141 were the second set of laser photos. But >if they so concluded (and I now think they did) they would have >immediately also concluded that the photos were severely >underexposed because there was no image of the earth and because >nothing showed up in the pictures (except the very tiny red dot >in the first three and a larger red "structure" in the fourth). >They probably wouldn't have spent much if any time trying to >understand how the red dot images could have occurred in >underexposed photos.

No I don't agree, unless the astronauts say otherwise. I gather they stand by their satellite story and that must mean the 2138-2141 sequence are not the laser images but a satellite at a totally different part of the orbit. Viewing the first set of laser images might clear up this a little.

Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

>>"On Skylab 3, Astronauts Bean and Lousma confirmed the beacon >>size and shape manifested in the Skylab 3 imagery. They >>described the beacon as both a neon tube lying in the plane of >>the earth and as a searchlight coming up through the atmosphere. >>Strangely, the photographs were taken by Scientist-Astronaut >>Garriott who did not verify the beacon size and shape, but >>described the beacon as only a dot." >>The second set were prior to the "UFO" set. I assume "neon" >>means red, but maybe not.

>Yes. I read the report and understand what they were saying. >There are green colored "neon tubes" used in advertising signs, >etc. At any rate, the laser was green and the shape of the >source, looking like a line lying horizontally on the earth, is

>a perspective effect: looking along a laser beam projected
>roughly in your direction you see a line of light which gets
>smaller as you look toward the laser beam source.

This was in the '70s so I do not know the predominate "neon" color back then. I thought red was the first one. Also, we don't know what color they used of the tunable laser. But what interested me was that Bean said it was the only thing that had a neon light look to it. That is suggestive that the red UFO was not too bright or "neon", whatever color that is.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

NASA To Use Balloon Flotilla

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 19:37:26 -0400
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:24:20 -0500
Subject: NASA To Use Balloon Flotilla

Hi All,

This should generate a few sightings. Forewarned!

Don

From: NASA News <hqnews.nul>
To: NASA News <hqnews.nul>
Date: Wed 05 Dec 2007 14:50:00 EST
Subject: NASA to Use Balloon Flotilla to Study Radiation That
Affects Earth

Dec. 5, 2007

Dwayne Brown
Headquarters, Washington
202-358-1726
dwayne.c.brown.nul

RELEASE: 07-265

Nasa To Use Balloon Flotilla To Study Radiation That Affects
Earth

WASHINGTON - A new NASA project will use more than 40 high altitude balloons to return new scientific insights about Earth's Van Allen Belts. The type of radiation in the belts can be hazardous to astronauts, orbiting satellites and aircraft flying in high altitude polar routes.

NASA's Science Mission Directorate, Washington, has awarded \$9.3 million to Dartmouth College of Hanover, N.H., for the study. Research using the balloons can be carried out at a fraction of the cost of using an orbiting satellite.

The new mission is called the Balloon Array for Radiation-belt Relativistic Electron Losses, or BARREL. The mission's principal investigator is Robyn Millan of Dartmouth. BARREL will fly in 2013 and 2014, and will provide answers to how and where the Van Allen Belts, discovered in 1958, periodically drain into Earth's upper atmosphere. BARREL will fly in conjunction with NASA's Radiation Belt Storm Probes satellites, due to launch in 2011.

"The study of near-Earth radiation is very important," said John Mather, Nobel Prize recipient and chief scientist of NASA's Science Mission Directorate. "This research will provide information to mitigate problems here on our planet as well as permit better design and operations of new technology in space and safer passage for space explorers."

The Van Allen Belts are a ring of energetic charged particles that encircle Earth and are constrained by Earth's magnetic field. Outbursts from the sun can pump additional energy and particles into the radiation belts, allowing them to drain again in a matter of days or weeks.

The balloons will be launched from Antarctica. They will expand to roughly the size of a large blimp when they reach the near-space research altitude. A single balloon of this type will hover at an altitude of approximately 21 miles for as long as two weeks. By carefully timing the launch of a series of balloons, about one per day, Millan and her group of young scientists in training can form a ring of balloons encircling the South Pole to study the total influx of radiation from the belts into Earth's atmosphere.

"This experiment will be the first of its kind in establishing a web of balloon-borne sensors working hand-in-hand with a satellite mission," said Dick Fisher, director of NASA's Heliophysics Division, Washington. "In addition to the groundbreaking science that BARREL will provide, this kind of use of NASA's suborbital program is vital for training the next generation of scientists in a wide range of areas."

The Radiation Belt Storm Probes satellites are part of NASA's Living with a Star Program that is designed to understand how and why the sun varies, how planetary systems respond and how human activities are affected. NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., manages the program for the Science Mission Directorate.

For more information on NASA's Living with a Star Program, visit:

<http://www.lws.nasa.gov>

For more information about NASA and agency programs, visit:

<http://www.nasa.gov>

-end-

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

UFOs Are With Us Again

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:35:09 -0500
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:35:09 -0500
Subject: UFOs Are With Us Again

Source: The Elk Grove Citizen - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2sy7sj>

Thursday, December 6, 2007

The Other Side Of The News
Keith Gebers Column

UFOs Are With Us Again

Great Scott, UFOs are back in the news.

Now the Unidentified Flying Object chase is taking a different approach. It's been modernized. Former pilots and officials are calling for a new United States UFO probe. Maybe the old theories of aliens from outer space will be relegated to the background as the search for unidentified flying objects takes on a new tack.

Today, former military aviators along with others say UFOs can pose a national security problem.

Panelists from seven countries, which included former senior military personnel, created the recommendation for the government to reopen its UFO investigation. The international panel said the United States government could face dangers if such a suggestion is ignored. They cited 9/11, saying it is unwise to ignore radar returns, which cannot be associated with conventional aircraft such as airplanes and helicopters.

The first 'modern' sighting of a UFO came in 1947 when pilot Ken Arnold noticed 'a formation of flying discs in skies above the Pacific Northwest'. Within days hundreds of sightings of unidentified flying objects were reported, ranging from cigar shaped objects to high-speed triangles darting about the skies. Flying saucers or discs remained the most reported objects.

Over 12,618 UFO sightings were investigated from 1947 to 1969 by the Air Force in a program called Project Blue Book. Finally, the government stated the sightings were no threat. But stories continued with various themes including reports from people who said they were actually abducted by aliens from outer space. Even former presidents Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter claimed to have sighted UFOs.

Since Project Blue Book was concluded the UFO reports have continued. In South America and elsewhere there have been moving pictures taken of unidentified flying objects streaking across the sky.

Personally, I grew up interested in the phenomena, although I never saw a UFO. When I was a teenager I amused myself thinking a rival country, such as Russia, possibly sent them aloft. Then I thought perhaps they were a natural phenomena created

naturally by atmospheric conditions. After all, there are many things nature hands down to us that we have not discovered the 'why's and how's' yet.

Most of us are familiar with the many stories and films that have come out about other- world aliens, pictures ranging from It Came From Outer Space to Girl From Mars.

The first author to spell out the credibility of UFOs was Donald Keyhoe, a former member of the Federal Aviation Administration. His book Flying Saucers Are Real was a sensation in the early 1950s. After all, he was a well-known military analyst as well as being a former government official, who toured the nation with transatlantic flier Charles Lindbergh. Few people remember however, that he was also a prolific fiction writer, who penned tales of master-spy Eric Trent and also Dick Knight, who was blind by day but could see perfectly at night.

Personally, I still like the natural phenomena theory. But the recent panel, organized by a group dedicated to accepting credibility for unidentified flying objects has urged Washington to resume UFO investigations through the NASA or the Air Force.

Today, my teenage fantasy of a rival foreign power launching such objects has more credibility than it did in the late 1940s or 1950s. Former Federal Aviation Administration investigator John Callahan said the CIA in 1987 tried to hush up sighting of a huge lighted ball four times the size of a Jumbo jet. Other UFO believers say authorities often dismiss such sightings without proper investigations.

Investigation of UFOs may come full circle. It might be taxpayer expensive but it can also be fun.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Condon & David R. Saunders [was: Newly Released]

From: Donald Johnson <ufocat2006.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 20:03:40 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:51:38 -0500
Subject: Condon & David R. Saunders [was: Newly Released]

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most
>salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders
>was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out
>that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but
>simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which
>processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

<snip>

Saunders did mention his visit to the CIA during the early days of the Colorado UFO Study to me, when I worked for him as a research assistant, I think it was in 1974, but it could have been later in 1988 or 1989, when we worked together again on personality research.

The reason he has never commented upon this visit is that he had to sign a secrecy agreement in order to see what evidence the CIA did have.

I only met Condon once - as a freshman student at the University of Colorado in the early spring of 1971. I went to his office one day in the Gamov Physics Tower on the CU campus because my friend Rod Dyke from Seattle had asked me to ask Condon if he would return some photographs he had loaned to the Colorado UFO Study. He claimed he had already returned the photos, which was not true.

I suppose Condon could be likeable enough to people who met him on neutral ground, but his treatment of Dr. Saunders can never be forgiven. Not only did he fire Saunders from the Colorado UFO Study after the Look magazine article, he tried to get him dismissed as a professor from the University of Colorado.

He tried to get him fired from the University for incompetence, not just for insubordination.

Fortunately Dr. Saunders had tenure, but he never received another pay raise for the remainder of the time he worked at C.U. (until August 1974). His wife Fran told me that he was earning more money from summer consulting work than he received as a full professor. That was a not-so-subtle message from the higher powers in the University administration that they wanted him to leave.

Saunders had other connections with the CIA. When he worked at ETS (Educational Testing Service) he was recruited to do research for the CIA by Dr. John Gittinger. This was part of the Human Ecology Fund that ETS and probably Princeton University signed up for with the government, and the CIA front organization known as Psychological Assessment Associates hired many assessment psychologists to use the methods he developed to recruit spies.

Many of Saunders' papers published in the late 1950s and early 1960s on the WAIS and personality assessment (based on profile analysis of intelligence subtest scores) were funded by the CIA.

When I worked for him in 1974 I was employed by Psychological Assessment Associates for 9 months, to help with a correlational study project comparing WAIS profile scores with scores from the Strong Vocational Interest Inventory.

If you want more insight into the relationship between the CIA and their recruitment of behavioral scientists during the Cold War, read the book Harvard And The Unabomber. The author claims that up to 60% of all academic psychologists during this period had received US government funding from intelligence agencies and defense department agencies (such as the Office of Naval Intelligence).

BTW - The best single item on the SVII to predict overall intelligence was the question "Do you like photography?" If you said you disliked it, as opposed to liking it or being neutral on the subject, you probably weren't very smart.

Donald A. Johnson, Ph.D.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA]

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 23:05:54 EST
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 07:57:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA]

>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 23:53:09 -0500 (EST)
>>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>>>I discovered in Edward Condon an honest man who, in the end, had to
>>>bend to his employers. It must have been very difficult for him.

>>Oh please! You must be joking. Condon was not working for the
>>CIA just because he got a briefing there! He was working for the
>>far more insidious and hostile AF.

<snip>

>No, I am not joking. Please read on.

Further on you do not say anything about Condon working for the
CIA or him "bending" to his "employers".

>>>This is probably old knowledge for the seasoned ufologists on
>>>the List (and old suppression for the seasoned debunkers).

>>Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most
>>salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders
>>was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out
>>that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but
>>simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which
>>processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

>>Saunders never breathed a word of his CIA NPIC visit and
>>contacts to anyone, even after Condon fired him in Feb 1968 over
>>the famous pro-UFO incident when he leaked the Low 'trick' memo
>>to McDonald. Why not ponder the coverup involved with that?

<snip>

>You said that the concerned document is "nothing new". Obviously
>it has been a long time since you read it: there is no reference
>to any R. Saunders and no mention of anyone touring anything.

I told you there were other CIA NPIC documents on Condon, and
they are posted on CIA's public FOIA website.

No Saunders? No touring NPIC?? Here is NPIC Director Art
Lundahl's memo to his boss the DDI on Feb, 7, 1967:

"It is now requested by Ratchford that certain scientists be

permitted to come to NPIC on 20 February to discuss technical aspects of photogrammetry and to see some of our special optical gear which is used to measure, enlarge, or trace isodensitometry of photos. These scientists include:

"Dr. E. U. Condon - University of Colorado
"Dr. Robert Lowe [sic] " " "
"Dr. David Saunders " " " ..."

The NPIC after-report of the Condon-Low-Saunders visit tells about what they toured at NPIC (Feb. 23, 1967, memo):

"On 20 February 1967 at 0915 Dr. Condon and four members of his investigative team visited NPIC. With Dr. Condon were Dr. Richard [sic] Lowe [sic], University of Colorado, Dr. David Saunders, University of Colorado....

"e. [Deleted name NPIC staff member] then escorted the group into the new clean area [at NPIC] where they viewed and discussed the isodensitometer and the new Mann Microdensitometer....

"f. ... [Deleted] then conducted the group into the [NPIC] instrument area where the Point Transfer Device, Mann 880 Comparator, the Benson-Lehner Plotter and the NRI were viewed by the group."

>It is only a report on the reactions of Condon and his group on >the value of the Zanesville photography.

The value of the Zanesville photos to Condon was that the NPIC assistance helped prove it was a HOAX. The May 8, 1967, NPIC memo describes a briefing on the Zanesville case during Condon's May 5 visit to CIA, given by (deleted name) Everitt Merritt of Raytheon Autometrics Division, apparently a CIA contractor that worked with NPIC.

Condon made arrangements to contract with Raytheon and Merritt to apply his UFO photoanalysis techniques developed with the Zanesville hoax case to other UFO photo cases. The only other case where there was a stereo pair allowing photogrammetry was the famous McMinnville case. But this was the nearest thing to a genuine UFO, according to Condon's own astronomer photoanalyst William K. Hartmann (who was with Condon at CIA in May 1967).

So Condon lied and claimed in his Final Report that the McMinnville photos were "too fuzzy" to apply Merritt's techniques, and so Merritt never got a contract to do the analysis of McMinnville. Meanwhile in the years since, Bruce Maccabee and I have been doing Merritt's kind of photogrammetry on the McMinnville photos, but without his Raytheon equipment. Such a tragic loss to science, all because Condon was determined to not help prove UFO reality.

>More: the reader discovers in Condon a passionate man overly >enthusiastic about the possibility it is the real deal. He even >wanted to share this with the public.

You need to read up on tricky Condon. He told an audience of the American Chemical Society on January 25, 1967, that he the government should "get out of this [UFO] business" because "there's nothing to it." Condon smiled and added "but I'm not supposed to reach a conclusion for another year."

(Saunders & Harkins UFOs>? Yes! 1968 p. 117; Jacobs 1976 p. 201

Condon was famed for his love of contactee "kook" cases, his frequent cursing of the "damn ooo-foe" as he liked to pronounce it. Condon made up bogus evidence against UFO reality, such as his egregious lie that witnesses to a prank hot-air balloon in Castle Rock, Colo., had reported seeing a "spacecraft ... with occupants." In fact no one reported any such thing and all of the reports right in the Condon Report accurately described a slow-moving balloon-like translucent object.

>That is all that is said, written and inferred in the reference >I mentioned.

>I thought this was some lesson of life: people change under >whatever pressure.

>It is also evident that Condon did not deny the reality of UFOs.

Again, you need to read up on Condon.

>For me, this is a good story about human nature, when you
>consider how the man was demonized - and still is - by
>ufologists.

Uh huh. You need to talk to someone who was actually there, like
Dick Hall.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 02:01:10 -0500
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 08:02:07 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 10:53:44 +0000
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>>Jose Escamilla's UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied
>>is on-line at:

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

>>"This is the best of the whole story of UFO investigation that
>>we have today. Its an All in One, UFOs Prophecy and
>>technology."

>>Its 1:34:04 in length.

>>ebk

>This production, whatever its ufological merits, is severely
>marred by unsympathetic 'incidental' music which obscures the
>soundtrack in many places. This is particularly irritating when
>applied to archive footage where the original sound is poor to
>start with. One is left with the impression that the director
>thought that the subject material lacked sufficient interest or
>drama, and felt the need to inject some creative excitement all
>of his own. Utterly Pathetic.

You've nailed it. With the ho-hum cable shows, one at least can
be confident that the cheesy production is the product of
overworked, supremely jaded 'artists' and producers whose
biggest concern is scoring a job doing World's Most Stupendous
Nazi Monster Trucks Showdown. This documentary, though showing a
lot of very interesting clips from interviews - and some
stinkers - is weighted down considerably by the ridiculous
music. Another aspect that bothered me was the rather poor
editing. The choice of graphics for inclusion, for example was
often ill-timed or even misleading.

I wonder if Errol Morris would consider interviewing some of
these people. I'd pay twice to see that. And not because I'd
rather listen to Phillip Glass.

>List members driven to the exit by this annoyance during the
>early part of the production might be interested to learn that
>during the second half of the show things do get better and
>interviewees do become audible.

Though to be clear: the wretched music does not cease. :-(

>Clearly, the director's lack of sensitivity (perhaps I should
>say 'everyday professionalism') is matched only by his lack of
>stamina.

I also wonder if the filmmaker has the raw footage that was
used. This doc could be remade into something much better. I
have no problem with a filmmaker revisiting past projects in
order to make them better.

I hope the soundtrack has been lost forever, though.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 07:48:34 EST
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 08:03:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 14:31:20 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 14:08:31 -0500 (EST)
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>>>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found
>>>on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were
>>>underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were
>>>approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8.
>>>They were also blurry so there might have been some movement
>>>although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

<snip>

>Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera
>jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

If the exposure was 1/500 of a second then camera "jostle" would be virtually impossible, as that would mean the camera was jerked at a velocity of about 0.4 m/sec or about 1 ft/sec. The Y-shape of the 4th photo red object is not a continuous motion smear image. The camera motion would have to precisely retrace one branch of the Y-shape then move back up the other branch which is patently absurd.

If the 300 mm lens was used then according to Bruce's measurement the image was only 2.9 milliradians or about 10 arcminutes or about 1/3 Full Moon. That is not a prominent angular size, and given a 10-second cycle of brightening and dimming (or rotation where the full Y-shape was only seen briefly during the 10-second period) then there was not continuous visibility of the Y-shape.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

Re: Edward Condon

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 09:02:40 -0500
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 16:25:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 23:05:54 EST
>Subject: Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?]

>>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>>It is only a report on the reactions of Condon and his group on
>>the value of the Zanesville photography.

>The value of the Zanesville photos to Condon was that the NPIC
>assistance helped prove it was a HOAX. The May 8, 1967, NPIC
>memo describes a briefing on the Zanesville case during Condon's
>May 5 visit to CIA, given by (deleted name) Everitt Merritt of
>Raytheon Autometrics Division, apparently a CIA contractor that
>worked with NPIC.

>Condon made arrangements to contract with Raytheon and Merritt
>to apply his UFO photoanalysis techniques developed with the
>Zanesville hoax case to other UFO photo cases. The only other
>case where there was a stereo pair allowing photogrammetry was
>the famous McMinnville case. But this was the nearest thing to a
>genuine UFO, according to Condon's own astronomer photoanalyst
>William K. Hartmann (who was with Condon at CIA in May 1967).

<snip>

>>More: the reader discovers in Condon a passionate man overly
>>enthusiastic about the possibility it is the real deal. He even
>>wanted to share this with the public.

>You need to read up on tricky Condon. He told an audience of the
>American Chemical Society on January 25, 1967, that he the
>government should "get out of this [UFO] business" because
>"there's nothing to it." Condon smiled and added "but I'm not
>supposed to reach a conclusion for another year."

>(Saunders & Harkins UFOs)? Yes! 1968 p. 117; Jacobs 1976
>p. 201

>Condon was famed for his love of contactee "kook" cases, his
>frequent cursing of the "damn ooo-foe" as he liked to pronounce
>it. Condon made up bogus evidence against UFO reality, such as
>his egregious lie that witnesses to a prank hot-air balloon in
>Castle Rock, Colo., had reported seeing a "spacecraft ... with
>occupants." In fact no one reported any such thing and all of
>the reports right in the Condon Report accurately described a
>slow-moving balloon-like translucent object.

>>That is all that is said, written and inferred in the reference
>>I mentioned.

>>I thought this was some lesson of life: people change under
>>whatever pressure.

>>It is also evident that Condon did not deny the reality of UFOs.

>Again, you need to read up on Condon.

>>For me, this is a good story about human nature, when you
>>consider how the man was demonized - and still is - by
>>ufologists.

>Uh huh. You need to talk to someone who was actually there, like
>Dick Hall.

Dick Hall agrees completely with Brad's characterization of
Condon - but not of his views on the Air Force vs CIA.

Mr. Merritt of Raytheon approached NICAP - me - requesting UFO
photographs that contained the elements that would allow
photogrammetric analysis. He told me, in a little white lie,
that he wanted to demonstrate Raytheon's photoanalysis
capabilities so they could obtain a contract from the Colorado
UFO Project.

I did not know at that time that they were consultants to the
CIA. Nor did I know about the Colorado members' tour of NPIC -
CIA's National Photographic Interpretation Center - until well
after the fact.

I loaned the Ralph Ditter photos to Merritt, telling him at the
time that we had already concluded that they were hoaxes based
on our own analysis. He didn't care about that, since (he said)
they only wanted to demonstrate their methods and capabilities.
The rest is history that becomes clearer only in hindsight.

- Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 11:59:07 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 06:12:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 14:31:20 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>All I know about this is the description of the scene in the
>>>photo index and the laser experiment.
>>>"Evaluation of SKYLAB Earth LASER Beacon Imagery"
>>>"Experiment Debrief"

>>>"Bean: The laser was the only thing that I saw during the
>>>mission that had a neon-light look to it... This actually
>>>radiated like a neon light that's on in the daytime outside. It
>>>has a brilliance to it."

>>I looked up the tinyurl.com/yw4pym and found the report you were
>>reading. Now I know what that experiment was all about. And
>>guess what: during the Skylab 3 they used only the argon-ion
>>laser which puts out 5145 A radiation which is - ta-dah -
>>green!

>But according to the report they say:

>"The argon ion was also utilized to pump a Coherent Radiation
>Model 490 jet stream dye laser to obtain the yellow/red
>wavelengths."

>"The spacecraft was illuminated with only one wavelength at
>a time, and successful imagery was collected at 5145(green),
>5900 (yellow), and 6250 (red) Angstroms."

>It is possible they just tried one wavelength for Skylab 3.

Not only possible, it actually happened. They used the dye laser
("pumped" by the argon ion laser) to get other colors during
SL4, but only the argon ion in SL3. Look at Figure 3.1 (page 20)
or Table 4.1 (page 47). In each case the beacon wavelength is
given for SL-3A and SL-3B (apparently they are calling 2136 A
and 2137 B). The wavelength was 5145 A.

>>Therefore my earlier comments about photographing a red laser
>>are moot. Also, the experiments were run during the daytime,
>>despite my "logic" that they would be run at night. The intent
>>was to determine whether or not a laser could act as a daytime
>>beacon or brightness calibration in the presence of sunlit
>>ground. They used powers up to 10 watts... which is quite
>>bright!

>I could not find anywhere it mentioned day time photos.

>Where was that?

>They mention that the photos show certain objects,

>but the quality of the document gives me no idea or day or
>night.

You are correct about the photographic "quality" of the document. One would hope that there is, somewhere, an original copy of this document. At any rate, the pdf version on line shows black that is peppered with white spots which could be holes in the emulsion or what, I don't know. It is clear from the copies I have of 2136 and 2137 that the photos were taken in daylight. One can see clouds and ground structure (see the on-line copy of 2137 at my web site) I also have a copy of 2136.

It shows a slightly shifted version of the same scene. The portion of cloud structure that is in both photos is, so far as I can tell from side by side comparison, exactly the same indicating that the time between pictures was probably measured in seconds. There are indistinct (very low contrast) ground features common to both photos.

In neither can I see clear evidence of the beam.

>>Garriott said he could see it during the first experiment but
>>not during the second. He said he took "some photographs" during
>the first experiment. Was 2137 the second of these? If so I
>>would expect to see a green spot. But I don't.

Regarding the expectation that the beam image would be green, I should point out that the photo analysts wrote (Figure 3.1) that the beacon was "five times brighter than the background in the green film band and ten times brighter in the blue." This means that the beam image should tend toward the blue rather than green. They also wrote that "the red layer is not exposed by the beacon" meaning that there was no tendency of the beacon image to appear reddish (or a mix of red and blue/green).

>The mission report (pg 14.-5) states that they photo-graphed
>two times successfully and that "a third attempt was made but
>was obscured by cloud cover". The photo index only shows two
>sets of laser images. The first set SL3-125-2818/2819 from
>magazine CX-34. The second set SL3-118-2136/2137 from magazine
>CX-35. I am thinking the second attempt corresponds to 2136/2137
>and that they didn't even try to film the cloud cover obscured
>attempt. The mission report describes the visual appearance as a
>line of multiple beams, but the experiment description says
>these photos were blurry so that there might have been some
>movement in taking the photos.

In Table 4.1 the date of the SL - 118 - 2136 and 2137 is Sept.
4, 1973. The SL4 experiments were in December and January.

>>From my viewpoint, since the 2136 photos were taken on Sept 20,
>>this confirms that the UFO object was filmed on or after that
>>date and that the 300mm lens likely was still used (days
>>afterward would be a different matter).

I really doubt the red laser was what caused the UFO pictures
even though they oddly happened adjacent in the sequence.

>>Anyway, the lens the used for laser experiments was 300 mm with
>>f stop 4.8 - 8 and shutter time 1/125 to 1/500 sec. The film was
>>"like" Ektachrome MS 2448.

>>>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found
>>>on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were
>>>underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were
>>>approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8.
>>>They were also blurry so there might have been some movement
>>>although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

>>Now that we know Garriott took "some photographs" during the
>>first sighting (2136 and 2137), then the question is, did anyone
>>take any photos during the second sighting? I think not. Then
>>the "second set of photos" mentioned above is actually 2138-2141
>>(the red object) which, they say, was underexposed.

>No, the "first set" was SL3-125-2818/2819 from magazine CX-34.
>The second set SL3-118-2136/2137 from magazine CX-35. The UFO
>photos are still unidentified and not likely from the laser,
>although it confuses matters to have them right after the other.

My suggestion is that the photoanalysis thought that the photos
2138-2141 were a second set of laser beacon photos taken by SL3

astronauts, but that, in fact, there was no second set of photos taken by the SL3 astronauts.

>>I think that the photo analysts who were looking for laser
>>imagery before talking to the astronauts, and without knowing
>>that the Garriott intentionally photographed a "red satellite",
>>might have thought that there was a second set of photos
>>corresponding to the second laser observation experiment. If
>>this is what they thought, it would have been natural for them to
>>assume that 2138-2141 were the second set of laser photos. But
>>if they so concluded (and I now think they did) they would have
>>immediately also concluded that the photos were severely
>>underexposed because there was no image of the earth and because
>>nothing showed up in the pictures (except the very tiny red dot
>>in the first three and a larger red "structure" in the fourth).
>>They probably wouldn't have spent much if any time trying to
>>understand how the red dot images could have occurred in
>>underexposed photos.

>No I don't agree, unless the astronauts say otherwise. I gather
>they stand by their satellite story and that must mean the 2138-
>2141 sequence are not the laser images but a satellite at a
>totally different part of the orbit. Viewing the first set of
>laser images might clear up this a little.

There is no disagreement here between us regarding the four photos.

>Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera
>jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

I have looked at a lot of "jiggled" photographs and even movies, as you might imagine (I get photos of night lights taken by hand-held cameras quite often). In a jiggle situation you always get a sort of looping effect and bright spots occur when the camera momentarily pauses to nearly reverse direction. As the photographer's hand vibrates about an average pointing direction the bright spots are connected by fainter lines, but since the hand never exactly retraces a motion (at least not in my experience) the track of the pointing direction always makes loops. The loops may be very narrow, but there are loops nevertheless. IN this case there are dim but definite lines between the bright spots but no evidence of hand vibration loops, so I conclude that the structured image actually represents some bright light source or reflective features (glint spots? lights?) of a single object.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 12:48:17 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 06:14:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 07:48:34 EST
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 14:31:20 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 14:08:31 -0500 (EST)
>>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found
>>>>on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were
>>>>underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were
>>>>approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8.
>>>>They were also blurry so there might have been some movement
>>>>although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."
>>Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera
>>jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

>If the exposure was 1/500 of a second then camera "jostle" would
>be virtually impossible, as that would mean the camera was
>jerked at a velocity of about 0.4 m/sec or about 1 ft/sec. The
>Y-shape of the 4th photo red object is not a continuous motion
>smear image. The camera motion would have to precisely retrace
>one branch of the Y-shape then move back up the other branch
>which is patently absurd.

Does f-stop truly relate to the exposure time? I remember in
Rutledge's book (Plate 9, 800mm lens, f/8 had a 1 minute
exposure) that he had time exposure images with standard f-
stops. I am a novice about photography. Is there some other
setting to keep the iris open for time lapse? Does the f-stop
affect over-under exposure?

The f-stop (f/4.5) mentioned was for the prior blurred laser
images. Of course, by my past logic it would make sense that
they keep the same f-stop but then it is possible for it to be
the f/8 (1/125 second). Seems pretty fast, but maybe slow enough
to catch a jostle, I haven't measured jostle speed before. How
much of a distance must the camera be jostled to replicate the
image using a single red dot?

For this camera, out of the about 600 frames of the 10 film
magazines, about 50 images were blurred (about 20 blurred images
occurred in the UFO sequence film magazine +the one prior),
about 10 out of focus (6 in the two film magazines), about 30
underexposed (3 in the two magazines), and 3 over exposed. So
blurred images seemed to occur more frequently for some reason
during these final two film magazines. Due to the nature of the

other blurred frames (not points of light in darkness, except for the immediately prior blurred laser frames), the kind of blur would be hard to see. Blur implies one axis of motion.

I know I have messed up alot of photos simply from pressing the button on the camera without holding still enough. The blur in my fouled up photos do not stand out as to the exact trajectory of camera movement due to the large amount of complexity in the image, but for a single point light source, it might be viewed.

>If the 300 mm lens was used then according to Bruce's
>measurement the image was only 2.9 milliradians or about 10
>arcminutes or about 1/3 Full Moon. That is not a prominent
>angular size, and given a 10-second cycle of brightening and
>dimming (or rotation where the full Y-shape was only seen
>briefly during the 10-second period) then there was not
>continuous visibility of the Y-shape.

If they looked through their camera to take the "structure" image, then I assumed they could see the object with its structure, even though it may not be visible to the naked eye. The lens would make it visible to the photographer, as he took his time to aim and shoot. But the photographer doesn't mention any structure in his account. If it was spinning much faster (<1 sec/cycle?), then even looking in the camera lens would make the structure not visible, except on film when the quick camera speed captured the shape. But this is not the account. The other possibility was two cycles of rotation somehow superimposed, one, slow, which caused the general brightening and the other, very fast, making it seem a circular blob.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 18:31:19 +0000
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 06:16:39 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2007 02:01:10 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 10:53:44 +0000
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied

>>>Jose Escamilla's UFOs: The Greatest Story Ever Denied
>>>is on-line at:
>>><http://tinyurl.com/yqbxzt>

>>>"This is the best of the whole story of UFO investigation that
>>>we have today. Its an All in One, UFOs Prophecy and
>>>technology."

>>>Its 1:34:04 in length.

>>>ebk

>>This production, whatever its ufological merits, is severely
>>marred by unsympathetic 'incidental' music which obscures the
>>soundtrack in many places.

<snip>

>You've nailed it.

<Snip>

>This documentary, though showing a
>lot of very interesting clips from interviews - and some
>stinkers - is weighted down considerably by the ridiculous
>music.

Maybe I should put my money where my mouth is on this. I do
understand the constraints that film-makers operate under in
this field, and I understand that the cost of a decent
soundtrack can be the last straw that breaks the camel's back.

I've been doing all sorts of music for years, so if anybody on
the List is involved in a serious production and is strapped for
cash on the incidental/theme music front, then drop me a line
off-List and I'll do all I can to help. It might not be Philip
Glass, but it will be sympathetic and it won't cost much (or
even anything at all in worthy cases) either.

--

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Origins Of The Grays

From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 06:40:16 -0500
Subject: Origins Of The Grays

I am researching the origins of the entities we know as the Grays. One thesis is that grays are not from another planet or perhaps not even aliens. There are many theories and speculations that have been put out that agree and disagree with this supposition.

However, I am looking for specific references about the creation of Grays. For example, in Fowler's book, The Watchers, Betty Andreasson Luca describes assisting a woman giving birth during an abduction. She witnesses a Gray perform a circumcision of the eyelids of a fetus delivered from a human abductee.

There is enough tissue cut away from the eyes to expose the entire eyeball and then the fetus is placed in a tank after having needles put in it's head and ears. Presumably the needles provide stimulation or nourishment. Anyway, to further the supposition the child would have looked very human before having its eyes lids removed. Of course stimulating the cranium could cause the brain and skull to grow. Poof, a human is converted to a Gray but not with only genetic manipulation but by technology and alteration of the development process.

Any reference assistance or comments with would be greatly appreciated.

Best regards,

Frank

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 07:19:16 -0500
Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so, according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

<http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

26th January 2007

Posted By:

Blacksheep
Cunning Artificer

I was reading a Great Mysteries... book belonging to one of the children. It contained a UFO sighting that occurred in the USA where a recently retired USAAF "Pursuit" pilot was flying a private plane in the vicinity of Mt. Rainier near Seattle. He was shocked to see a formation of huge bright silver crescent shaped craft pass him some way off travelling at what he estimated was about 1,000 mph. They changed direction very sharply with the sun flaring off their crescent shaped bodies and disappeared towards the north west. He said they definitely weren't aircraft as they were too big, too fast and manouvered too suddenly.

At the time there was nothing to match such a description and great credence was given to the story because of the chap's history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47 bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official Boeing photo shoot.

Its a pity the B47 crews never saw these UFO's as they had a well set up camera ship flying with them. Of course, the photos of the UFOs might have been taken away by secret agents when they landed soon afterwards at Moses Lake - the flight test centre to the north west of Seattle."

John Rimmer
<j.rimmer.nul>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Edward Condon

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:21:07 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 07:48:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 23:05:54 EST
>Subject: Re: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?]

>>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

<snip>

>Further on you do not say anything about Condon working for the
>CIA or him "bending" to his "employers".

<snip>

>>You said that the concerned document is "nothing new". Obviously
>>it has been a long time since you read it: there is no reference
>>to any R! . Saunders and no mention of anyone touring anything.

>I told you there were other CIA NPIC documents on Condon, and
>they are posted on CIA's public FOIA website.

>No Saunders? No touring NPIC??Here is NPIC Director Art
>Lundahl's memo to his boss the DDI on Feb, 7, 1967:

<snip>

There is something you don't seem to get: I simply mentioned the
February 1967 report as an illustration of human nature and you
jumped in with this kind of sneer comment:

>Speaking of "suppression" aren't you leaving out the most
>salient point which is that our pro-UFO hero David R. Saunders
>was part of Condon's group visiting the CIA? You also left out
>that they weren't visiting some spooky CIA spy operation but
>simply touring the photographic facilities of NPIC which
>processed U-2 and satellite recon pics.

Implying I was manipulating information in some way to support
my point..!

You even followed with a time jump of one year:

>Sau nders never breathed a word of his CIA NPIC visit and
>contacts to anyone, even after Condon fired him in Feb 1968 over
>the famous pro-UFO incident when he leaked the Low 'trick' memo
>to McDonald. Why not ponder the coverup involved with that?

When I say there was no Saunders and no touring I simply meant
that the essence of this document, for me, was an illustration
of human nature, which you seem to stubbornly ignore by coming
back with what not about the CIA, the spooks, and the nefarious
aspects of a boiling plot.

I know perfectly well that Condon sank ufology. It was the
purpose of this study from the beginning. Nobody except the
Colorado University wanted to do it because of fear of ridicule.

<snip>

>So Condon lied and claimed in his Final Report that the
>McMinnville photos were "too fuzzy" to apply Merritt's
>techniques, and so Merritt never got a contract to do the
>analysis of McMinnville. Meanwhile in the years since, Bruce
>Maccabee and I have been doing Merritt's kind of photogrammetry
>on the McMinnville photos, but without his Raytheon equipment.
>Such a tragic loss to science, all because Condon was determined
>to not help prove UFO reality.

<snip>

>>More: the reader discovers in Condon a passionate man overly
>>enthusiastic about the possibility it is the real deal. He even
>>wanted to share this with the public.

>You need to read up on tricky Condon. He told an audience of the
>American Chemical Society on January 25, 1967, that he the
>government should "get out of this [UFO] business" because
>"there's nothing to it." Condon smiled and added "but I'm not
>supposed to reach a conclusion for another year."

Yes: from Clark The UFO Book, p597, Keyhoe and Hall brought the
news to a shocked Saunders on January 31, 1967. This was from
a January 26 clipping from the Elmira Star-Gaze tte.

Still: this was talking to the press, but the February 1967
mentions that "3. The clearance level for the meeting was
SECRET."

The "shocked" Saunders from January 31 1967 was with the tricky
Condon on February 20, 1967, along with Low and a few others, to
discuss the merits of the Zanesville case and its value as the
real deal.

It is clearly established then that no link between the CIA and
Condon shall ever be mentioned.

<snip>

>Condon was famed for his love of contactee "kook" cases, his
>frequent cursing of the "damn ooo-foe" as he liked to pronounce
>it. Condon made up bogus evidence against UFO reality, such as
>his egregious lie that witnesses to a prank hot-air balloon in
>Castle Rock, Colo., had reported seeing a "spacecraft ... with
>occupants." In fact no one reported any such thing and all of
>the reports right in the Condon Report accurately described a
&g!
t;slow-moving balloon-like translucent object.

<snip>

Since the dice were loaded from the start, what would you have
him do? Study the subject seriously?

<snip>

>>It is also evident that Condon did not deny the reality of UFOs.

>Again, you need to read up on Condon.

<snip>

I'm doing my homework.

It seems though that we see the data from a different
perspective.

For you, Condon is the bad guy.

For me, I am not sure he had a choice in the matter and I don't
think that his personal beliefs were ever a factor.

We should ponder on Hynek's final words about him in Clark's
book.

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Nick Balaskas <ikolaos.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 10:06:08 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 15:56:54 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

<snip>

>Blacksheep
>Cunning Artificer

<snip>

>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a
>vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by
>Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a
>formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft
>flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same
>date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47
>bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official
>Boeing photo shoot.

<snip>

Thanks John for bringing this story to our attention.

It could very well be that the objects Arnold saw flying in the vicinity of Mt. Rainer, located close to the Boeing aircraft manufacturing plant in Seattle, Washington, were a formation of shiny B47s with the highly swept back wings. From a distance these B47s would have looked like the cresecent shaped objects Arnold later recalled and drew than the typical cross shaped aircraft that were more common at the time.

UFO sightings are rare and credible photographs of UFOs are even much rarer. I think we all agree that aircraft are much more commonly seen in our skies than things that cannot be readily identified, including UFOs. With so many experimental and secret aircraft test flown from at least the 1940s, some of which were later produced in large quantities and some other very unusual and still secret aircraft that are flying today, the question I have is "Where are all the missing pictures of these secret aircraft or man-made UFOs?". Should they not be much more common than pictures of the rarer pictures of true UFOs?

Maybe like in the Arnold UFO sighting, such pictures or drawings of UFOs are in fact pictures and drawings of man-made UFOs or still secret aircraft. If this is true, then the Blacksheep story may not only have solved the famous Arnold UFO sighting of 1947 but may have also given us the answer to all those strange and unusual objects we continue to see in our skies whose appearance changes from decade to decade much like Earth based

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

technology and design does.

Would it be possible for us to see a copy of this old book that
Blacksheep dug up?

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 10:37:41 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 15:58:47 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

>26th January 2007

>Posted By:

>Blacksheep
>Cunning Artificer

>I was reading a Great Mysteries... book belonging to one of
>the children. It contained a UFO sighting that occurred in the
>USA where a recently retired USAAF "Pursuit" pilot was flying a
>private plane in the vicinity of Mt. Rainier near Seattle. He was
>shocked to see a formation of huge bright silver crescent shaped
>craft pass him some way off travelling at what he estimated was
>about 1,000 mph. They changed direction very sharply with the sun
>flashing off their crescent shaped bodies and disappeared towards
>the north west. He said they definitely weren't aircraft as they
>were too big, too fast and manouvered too suddenly.

>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a
>vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by
>Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a
>formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft
>flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same
>date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47
>bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official
>Boeing photo shoot.

>Its a pity the B47 crews never saw these UFO's as they had a well
>set up camera ship flying with them. Of course, the photos of the
>UFOs might have been taken away by secret agents when they landed
>soon afterwards at Moses Lake - the flight test centre to the
>north west of Seattle."

>John Rimmer
><j.rimmer.nul>

John,

Silly nonsense from some clown who has no idea what he is
talking about, but obviously thinks UFOs are nonsense.

A simple Google search will show you that the first prototype B-
47 didn't fly until December 1947. Do we now have time traveling
B-47s to match the Roswell crash-test dummies?

Much less formations of B-47s in June 1947. Also it's news to me
that Arnold was a recently retired USAF pursuit pilot. This guy

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

has no care for facts at all.

- Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 11:21:24 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 15:59:51 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

[non-subscriber response]

Hi John

THE ARNOLD CASE....SOLVED?

Explaining Kenneth Arnold's sighting of a formation of objects on June 24, 1947, as a formation of experimental Boeing B-47 Stratojets runs into one major problem: the first flight of the prototype XB-47 was made on December 17, 1947, almost 6 months later!

Don Berliner
Chairman
The Fund for UFO Research, Inc.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 11:47:43 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 16:01:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 11:59:07 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2007 14:31:20 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:32:09 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>"The spacecraft was illuminated with only one wavelength at
>>a time, and successful imagery was collected at 5145(green),
>>5900 (yellow), and 6250 (red) Angstroms."
>>It is possible they just tried one wavelength for Skylab 3.

>Not only possible, it actually happened. They used the dye laser
>("pumped" by the argon ion laser) to get other colors during
>SL4, but only the argon ion in SL3. Look at Figure 3.1 (page 20)
>or Table 4.1 (page 47). In each case the beacon wavelength is
>given for SL-3A and SL-3B (apparently they are calling 2136 A
>and 2137 B). The wavelength was 5145 A.

The report does not clearly state that they only used the
fixed laser wavelength of 5145A for Skylab 3 and did the
tunable laser starting with Skylab 4. You can deduce that
from the data in the report.

Since they gave an erroneous date of Sept 4 in the report for
the successful Skylab 3 laser images (as compared to the dates
from the Skylab 3 mission report), I think the images are
actually from the first attempt (SL3-125-2818/2819). The second
attempt (2136 and 2137, prior to the UFO images) were too
blurred so although the astronauts saw the laser beam, no
successful images were captured. This report did not list the
wavelength of the second blurred photo attempt or failed third
attempt. However, the mission report says the first two laser
viewing attempts were at 5145A.

So this rules out red, as you stated before.

>In Table 4.1 the date of the SL - 118 - 2136 and 2137 is Sept.
>4, 1973. The SL4 experiments were in December and January.

I don't agree that the SL3-118-2136/2137 are the ones shown in
the report, but the ones I mentioned above. They would not show
blurred images in the report, but would show the distinct ones.
Also, the mission report states dates which make more sense as
matching the UFO time period, so I assume the Sept 4 dates are
in error.

>>The "first set" was SL3-125-2818/2819 from magazine CX-34.
>>The second set SL3-118-2136/2137 from magazine CX-35. The UFO
>>photos are still unidentified and not likely from the laser,
>>although it confuses matters to have them right after the other.

>My suggestion is that the photoanalysis thought that the photos
>2138-2141 were a second set of laser beacon photos taken by SL3
>astronauts, but that, in fact, there was no second set of photos
>taken by the SL3 astronauts.

No, again, the prior film magazine had the very good laser images (the first set), and the two images you have (prior to the UFO photos) were the second blurred laser ones. The astronauts didn't even bother filming the third attempt due to cloud cover.

>>...the 2138-2141 sequence are not the laser images but a
>> satellite at a
>>totally different part of the orbit....

>There is no disagreement here between us regarding the four
>photos.

I agree that they cannot be the laser beam. But the value in them is that they do help corroborate the time period and give insights as to more of the likely camera data/operation/settings.

>>Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera
>>jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

>I have looked at a lot of "jiggled" photographs and even movies,
>as you might imagine (I get photos of night lights taken by
>hand-held cameras quite often). In a jiggle situation you
>always get a sort of looping effect and bright spots occur when
>the camera momentarily pauses to nearly reverse direction. As
>the photographer's hand vibrates about an average pointing
>direction the bright spots are connected by fainter lines, but
>since the hand never exactly retraces a motion (at least not in
>my experience) the track of the pointing direction always makes
>loops. The loops may be very narrow, but there are loops
>nevertheless. IN this case there are dim but definite lines
>between the bright spots but no evidence of hand vibration
>loops, so I conclude that the structured image actually
>represents some bright light source or reflective features
>(glint spots? lights?) of a single object.

Yes, that makes sense, but can we apply the same photographic principles in zero gravity. Floating around, bumping into things or bracing the camera against the window and slipping, are quite different than guys holding a camera or using a tripod on Earth. Just an idea. That's why it's helpful to compare other images from the same astronauts (and camera hopefully).

But there seems little to compare. Most "blur" or jostled images were of Earth and that kind of motion not easy to resolve (well maybe if you had some fancy software). A few images were of the Moon, so maybe those could be examined. And a couple of the jettison. But those were much earlier in the mission and taken by whom? No records. What we need is image "blur" analysis of the prior film magazine that seemed to have so many blurred images.

The only reason I raise this issue is why no record exists or the astronauts stating the satellite had structure. I suggested to Sparks that if the satellite was spinning very fast (compound rotation), the photo would differ quite differently to any visual appearance when they were looking in the camera (to frame, focus, aim, etc) immediately prior to taking the picture. The main reason the object caught their attention seems to be its brightness, and then its 10 second period, but seeing its structure would seem quite an outstanding thing they should have mentioned.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 09:01:33 -0800
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 16:03:14 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!
>
><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

>-----

>26th January 2007

>Posted By:

>Blacksheep
>Cunning Artificer

>I was reading a Great Mysteries... book belonging to one of
>the children. It contained a UFO sighting that occurred in the
>USA where a recently retired USAAF "Pursuit" pilot was flying a
>private plane in the vicinity of Mt. Rainier near Seattle. He was
>shocked to see a formation of huge bright silver crescent shaped
>craft pass him some way off travelling at what he estimated was
>about 1,000 mph. They changed direction very sharply with the sun
>flashing off their crescent shaped bodies and disappeared towards
>the north west. He said they definitely weren't aircraft as they
>were too big, too fast and manouvered too suddenly.

>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a
>vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by
>Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a
>formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft
>flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same
>date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47
>bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official
>Boeing photo shoot.

>Its a pity the B47 crews never saw these UFO's as they had a well
>set up camera ship flying with them. Of course, the photos of the
>UFOs might have been taken away by secret agents when they landed
>soon afterwards at Moses Lake - the flight test centre to the
>north west of Seattle."

Hi, John, & List,

Let's just say, like Rich Reynold's old speculation about
"prototype" B-47 Stratojet's being involved in the Kenneth
Arnold sighting, that the reference by Mr. Rimmer to the post by
"Blacksheep" on the PPRN web page he cites, is also completely
incorrect, as far as "Blacksheep's" recollection goes. Here are
the citations:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B-47>
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kenneth_Arnold

Just by doing a little googling, I traced "Blacksheep" (a.k.a. "Cunning Artificer") to his personal website, and also found the above wiki citation, wherein it says the very first, short flight hop of one of the only two "early, prototype" XB-47 prototypes did not occur until 17 December 1947, its' maiden flight. The second XB-47 prototype did not make its' maiden flight, in turn, until 21 July 1948. Production B-47 bombers, in any quantity, did not get introduced into service before June of 1951.

This absolutely rules out any form of prototype XB-47 or production B-47 Stratojet bombers from being the source of the Arnold sighting, which involved nine objects flying in a chain formation with unusual flight and configuration characteristics near Mt. Rainier at an estimated speed of roughly 1,000 mile per hour or so. In fact, based on my net searching when I saw Mr. Rimmer's post, over about an hour or less, I found that there were NO U.S. or foreign jet aircraft of any quantity that could be the source of Arnold's sighting. For one thing, even the first, the XB-47 prototypes, were sub-sonic, and flew at roughly 500 mph or less.

The speed, size, flight characteristics and shape, number, location, date, and other variables cited by Arnold on the day of his sighting in fact fit no aircraft at that time produced in either the US or any foreign country.

I'd have to say, as a result, that the known facts preclude a prosaic, "jet aircraft" of any kind, or sort of explanation, and so the Arnold case is not by any means "solved" by such speculation, and remains open.

Steve Sawyer

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:26:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 12:48:17 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 07:48:34 EST
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>>Query: The second set of photos that we blew up we found
>>>>on the filmstrip, but they didn't come out; they were
>>>>underexposed. If I looked at the records correctly, they were
>>>>approximately an f/4.5 and the others were approximately a f/8.
>>>>They were also blurry so there might have been some movement
>>>>although the shutter speed was 1/500 of a second."

>>>Could the 'structure' in the fourth be simply due to camera
>>>jostle since no astronaut mentions it?

>>If the exposure was 1/500 of a second then camera "jostle" would
>>be virtually impossible, as that would mean the camera was
>>jerked at a velocity of about 0.4 m/sec or about 1 ft/sec. The
>>Y-shape of the 4th photo red object is not a continuous motion
>>smear image. The camera motion would have to precisely retrace
>>one branch of the Y-shape then move back up the other branch
>>which is patently absurd.

>Does f-stop truly relate to the exposure time? I remember in
>Rutledge's book (Plate 9, 800mm lens, f/8 had a 1 minute
>exposure) that he had time exposure images with standard f-
>stops. I am a novice about photography. Is there some other
>setting to keep the iris open for time lapse? Does the f-stop
>affect over-under exposure?

Photography 101:

The "f stop" and shutter time are independent parameters which can be adjusted to determine the exposure level. The f stop number is related to the diameter of the aperture that lets light into the camera to be focused onto the film (plane). The size of the aperture is inversely proportional to the f stop (f stop number is the focal length divided by the diameter of the lens opening). The shutter time is independent of the f-stop. It is literally the time that a shutter allows light to hit the film. A simple equation for Exposure (energy captured by the film) is $E = (\pi) BTt/4(f\#)^2$ (think I have that right; been years since I thought about it). B is the "brightness" of the light source (this has a technical definition I won't go into, but is related to "brightness" as a physiological sensation), T is the lens (glass) transmission factor (typically 80-98%), t is the shutter time, and f# is the "f-stop" number (typically between f/22 and f/1.8 or so). The point here is that t and f# are different quantities that act together to determine the exposure of the film (whether one wants to consider exposure in lumens or joules).

The brightness of the final printed image produced depends not

only upon the exposure as calculated above, but also in the "film speed" or film sensitivity. The sensitivity of a film is given by its ISO (formerly ASA) number. The more sensitive the film, the larger the ISO number and the less exposure is necessary to make a usefully bright image.

To answer your questions: the shutter can be adjusted over a wide range on cameras such as the Nikon. The longer the shutter time the more the exposure. But longer shutter times mean blurrier pictures in a dynamic scene (changing with time). So, if you want to minimize the effects of motion blur you use a short shutter time (and even try to pan with the motion, if that is possible, but then the background is blurred) like 1/125, 1/500., 1,1000 or "faster" (less time open). If you need to have a fast shutter to "stop" motion, then you may have "open the stop" (decrease the f#) in order to maintain good exposure.

>The f-stop (f/4.5) mentioned was for the prior blurred laser >images. Of course, by my past logic it would make sense that >they keep the same f-stop but then it is possible for it to be >the f/8 (1/125 second). Seems pretty fast, but maybe slow enough >to catch a jostle, I haven't measured jostle speed before. How >much of a distance must the camera be jostled to replicate the >image using a single red dot?

Although there could be lateral motion of the camera, what causes the displacement of the image is rotation of the camera lens axis. If, while photographing the moon, you rotate the camera by 1/2 degree during the shutter time you will get an elongated image that is twice as long as the moon is wide (because the angular size of the moon is 1/2 degree). If the shutter were open for 1 second, then the rotation rate could be 1/2 degree per second to get that elongation. However, at 1/100 sec the rotation rate has to be 100 times faster (50 deg/sec). Smaller blur amounts require less angular rotation. At 1/250 or 1/500 sec the angular rotation rate has to be even greater. But there is one other thing, and that is angular acceleration that is needed to get the rotation' rate up to some value. The angular acceleration can be caused by the forces (torques on the camera) of hand vibration, but they are opposed by the inertia (moment of inertia) of the camera. So. one does not get instantaneous changes in the angular rotation. In order to have one ":dot" make the image in photo 4 as a result of motion smear would require angular motions of several tenths of a degree up-down and left-right during the shutter time. Not impossible, but, as I pointed out in a previous email message, the continuous motion of the camera while the shutter is open generates "looped" images because of the interaction of the hand vibration with camera inertia. IMHO there is no "loopiness" in the image in the fourth photo.

>For this camera, out of the about 600 frames of the 10 film >magazines, about 50 images were blurred (about 20 blurred images >occurred in the UFO sequence film magazine +the one prior), >about 10 out of focus (6 in the two film magazines), about 30 >underexposed (3 in the two magazines), and 3 over exposed. So >blurred images seemed to occur more frequently for some reason >during these final two film magazines. Due to the nature of the >other blurred frames (not points of light in darkness, except >for the immediately prior blurred laser frames), the kind of >blur would be hard to see. Blur implies one axis of motion.

Linear blur, yes. If all the images are elongated in a certain direction then this is motion blur during the shutter time. However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as "up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. IN this case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations to change the rotation from around one axis to around another, perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant) momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy" image."

Another cause of blur in the astronaut's photos could have been the window(s) they photographed through. (Photographing through glass windows always introduces some small blur.)

>I know I have messed up alot of photos simply from pressing the

>button on the camera without holding still enough. The blur in
>my fouled up photos do not stand out as to the exact trajectory
>of camera movement due to the large amount of complexity in the
>image, but for a single point light source, it might be viewed.

>>If the 300 mm lens was used then according to Bruce's
>>measurement the image was only 2.9 milliradians or about 10
>>arcminutes or about 1/3 Full Moon. That is not a prominent
>>angular size, and given a 10-second cycle of brightening and
>>dimming (or rotation where the full Y-shape was only seen
>>briefly during the 10-second period) then there was not
>>continuous visibility of the Y-shape.

>If they looked through their camera to take the "structure"
>image, then I assumed they could see the object with its
>structure, even though it may not be visible to the naked eye.
>The lens would make it visible to the photographer, as he took
>his time to aim and shoot. But the photographer doesn't mention
>any structure in his account. If it was spinning much faster (<1
>sec/cycle?), then even looking in the camera lens would make the
>structure not visible, except on film when the quick camera
>speed captured the shape. But this is not the account. The other
>possibility was two cycles of rotation somehow superimposed,
>one, slow, which caused the general brightening and the other,
>very fast, making it seem a circular blob.

Possibly Garriott did notice structure at the time he took the
fourth photo, even though the image was still quite small in the
viewing aperture of the camera. But he may also have forgotten
that fact when queried about the event days later. THE
astronauts did say it was "big".

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:28:40 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:28:39 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

>26th January 2007

>Posted By:

>Blacksheep
>Cunning Artificer

>I was reading a Great Mysteries... book belonging to one of
>the children. It contained a UFO sighting that occurred in the
>USA where a recently retired USAAF "Pursuit" pilot was flying a
>private plane in the vicinity of Mt. Rainier near Seattle. He was
>shocked to see a formation of huge bright silver crescent shaped
>craft pass him some way off travelling at what he estimated was
>about 1,000 mph. They changed direction very sharply with the sun
>flashing off their crescent shaped bodies and disappeared towards
>the north west. He said they definitely weren't aircraft as they
>were too big, too fast and manouvered too suddenly.

>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a
>vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by
>Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a
>formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft
>flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same
>date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47
>bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official
>Boeing photo shoot.

>Its a pity the B47 crews never saw these UFO's as they had a well
>set up camera ship flying with them. Of course, the photos of the
>UFOs might have been taken away by secret agents when they landed
>soon afterwards at Moses Lake - the flight test centre to the
>north west of Seattle."

Amusing. I guess this is the updated version of Hynek's
original "explanation" (large airplanes 6 miles from Arnold). I
wonder why the Boeing company didn't make the connection at the
time of the publicity about Arnold's sighting.

Anyway, I would ask:

- is this an actual photograph of an event or a composite for
advertisement purposes?

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

- if an actual event, at what time did they "over" Mt. Rainier (was it really "over" or was Mt. Rainier simply part of the background)

- Arnold said he saw the silhouetted against Mr. Rainier; at what altitude were these bombers flying?

- what was their speed (Arnold's clocked speed calculates to 1700 mph, trifle high for bombers)

I see that there is a discussion ongoing at the PPR site, so maybe someone will be able to answer these questions.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 13:54:41 -0400
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:32:55 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so, according to Don
>Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

<snip>

John: I needed a good laugh having spent 3 hours on Coast to
Coast radio (3-6AM) my time.

The first flight of a B-47 was on December 17, 1947, from
Seattle to Moses Lake which is ESE of Seattle not northwest, and
there was only one B-47 for many months after that.

It took quite a while before there were 9.

I realize that if the USAF can time travel crash test dummies
for 6 years, why not B-47s?? Deniers can work miracles.

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 14:27:07 -0400
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:37:44 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

<snip>

The Arnold Case - not Solved!

John is baiting me of course. There was one [1] B-47 that flew in 1947 and that was one of two prototypes [XB-47 Model 450 3-3] being developed. It flew about 6 months after the Arnold sighting on its maiden flight on December 17, 1947. By the time the B-47E-II Stratojet was up and running it could make a top speed of 604 mph. Mildly interesting but not an impressive speed even for Arnold in 1947 but not applicable in any event because it hadn't yet flown in June of 1947. It was not built to fly around mountain tops either but a high altitude bomber with a thin, highly flexible wing [as much as 5 feet at the tips during a complete cycle] that didn't lend itself to the dangerous winds around mountainous areas.

Arnold wasn't flying a pursuit aircraft, he was flying a CallAir A-2 that was basically a non-electric [no electric instruments or radios or navigation aids] steel truss and fabric [ragwing] airplane with a cruise speed of 100 mph. It was originally designed by a farmer who wanted an airplane that he could fly out of a rough field. It was low-wing and had reversed wing struts meaning they were attached high up on the fuselage and were fixed to the top of the wing.

Arnold was 32 years old when he had his sighting and had been selling Fire Suppression Control Equipment since he started his company in 1940. He was not in the USAAF.

Like many since then who had have had anomalous sightings, Arnold figured he had witnessed some secret military aircraft on that day in 1947. Of course we now know that not to be true.

I don't see it stated that Blacksheep Cunning Artificer is a pilot-artificer suggests ground crew. Nor do I know anything about his/her observational abilities but his choice of reading material leaves a lot to be desired.

Hope that helps you John. I know you were sweating this one thinking the Arnold case was going to be so simply solved. Not even close.

Don Ledger

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:41:01 -0500
Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

[I think the final paragraph of this article is particularly superfluous! - Joe]

Sourc: The Daily Mail London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/ypnndx>

03/12/07

Science & Tech Section

Pilots' 'out-of-body experiences' responsible for more than a quarter of fatal air crashes

By RICHARD SHEARS

Some pilots will suffer the illusion that they are sitting on the wing of their aircraft watching themselves in the cockpit, according to an extraordinary official report released in Australia.

Every pilot will at some stage lose all sense of direction, height and speed, drawing attention to spatial disorientation (SD) - one of the most common factors in plane crashes, according to a report by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau.

Aviation medicine specialist Dr David Newman said 90 to 100 per cent of pilots experienced SD, which have been linked to between 15 and 26 per cent of fatal crashes worldwide.

Dr Newman drew attention to the illusion suffered by some pilots who gained the impression of sitting on the wing looking at themselves flying the aircraft, but there were other dangerous misconceptions including a feeling that the plane was falling when it was merely slowing down.

Another effect of SD was a false sensation of the aircraft rolling and another illusion suggesting the plane was flying straight ahead when it was actually turning.

Drawing attention to the "sitting on the wing" illusion, Dr Newman added: "The knife-edge illusion gives the pilot a sensation that the aircraft is precariously positioned in space and extremely sensitive to control inputs."

But he also referred to what he called the "giant hand illusion," which gives the pilot the sensation that the aircraft is "intolerable of control inputs and seemingly immovable in the air, as if held aloft by a giant handall[sic]."

The illusions, he said, often occurred when pilots were not busy while flying the plane.

"While seemingly bizarre, these illusions are generally associated with high altitude flight where the pilot has a relatively low level workload."

"Under such 'fish bowl' conditions, the brain can wander and generate these strange illusions."

Dr Newman's report said pilots should be aware they will experience SD sooner or later.

"If a pilot flies long enough as a career or even a hobby there is almost no chance that he or she will escape experiencing at least one episode of SD."

"Looked at another way, pilots can be considered to be in one of two groups: those who have been disorientated and those who will be."

The specialist said he issued the warning so that pilots could take measures to reduce the impact of SD by flying when fit.

They should not fly under the influence of alcohol or medications, which increase awareness of spatial disorientation illusions.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 13:41:00 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 23:42:10 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

Very interesting. What's claimed, if you follow the link, is that there's a photo of a fleet of silver-winged planes flying in formation on the very day, and in the very place, that Arnold had his sighting. These, supposedly, were early test of the B-47 bomber.

The only problem is that the first B-47 prototype wasn't flown until December, 1947, six months after Arnold's sighting. And only two of them were built, at that time. So there's no way a "formation" of B-47s (to use the word in the pilot's account, in the link) could have been flying at any time in 1947. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B-47_Stratojet

John, you might have checked this yourself before posting your impish challenge.

What's really interesting, in the page the link goes to, is how many pilots have seen something in the sky they can't identify, and how seriously they take these sightings.

Greg Sandow

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Russia Learns To Make Money On UFOs

From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 14:27:21 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:03:54 -0500
Subject: Russia Learns To Make Money On UFOs

Just another article. It does point out that people all over the world are interested in the subject.

Source: Russia-Info Centre - Moscow, Russia

<http://www.russia-ic.com/news/show/5332/>

7.12.2007

Russia Learns to Make Money on UFO 7.12.2007

Websites of Russian travel companies teem with promises to show Yeti or meet little green men. Many regions severely compete for the right of being called the most anomalous territory of the country. There is also a tendency of constructing roads and building hotels in such areas where the local dwellers prefer not to go to. All this is not an example of mass madness. It is just the active players of the travel market in Russia consider selling tours to paranormal sites of the country highly profitable.

At the end of November the authorities of the Perm Region reported about the intentions to create an UFO sanctuary in the local anomalous zone -- the so-called Molebsky Triangle. A number of other regions of the country have decided to follow the example of Perm. In the Krasnoyarsk Region they have begun constructing tourist objects in remote areas of the taiga where 100 years ago the Tunguska Meteorite fell. The authorities of the Samara Region are thinking about creation of a tourist zone not far from the Medveditskaya Chain where the locals have spotted UFO several times.

It seems that the Russian regional authorities have been eaten up by the fame of the American Roswell city that for already 60 years has been popular with tourists coming there to see the site of the supposed UFO crash.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Russian Tour Companies Hope To Make Fortunes On

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:09:34 -0500
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:09:34 -0500
Subject: Russian Tour Companies Hope To Make Fortunes On

Source: Itar-Tass World Service - New York, USA

<http://www.itar-tass.com/eng/level2.html?NewsID=12159197>

07.12.2007

Russian Tour Companies Hope To Make Fortunes On UFOs, Yeti

By Lyudmila Alexandrova
ITAR-TASS News Agency

Russia's tour companies are sure they have unearthed a bonanza. In the wake of a sudden surge of public interest in matters unknown they have addressed their clientele with a plethora of invitations to make pilgrimage to sites Unidentified Flying Objects and the Abominable Snowman - the Yeti - are said to frequent.

On the web sites of tourist firms one finds no end of promises of arranging rendezvous with yetis and green-skinned humanoid-like creatures, says the daily Novyie Izvestia. Different regions are almost at war with each other for the right to be called "the nation's most paranormal territory."

Roads are being laid to and hotels built at places local folks prefer to never ever venture into without a special need - just to be on the safe side. This is not an outbreak of collective insanity. The reason is very down-to-earth. The most active players in the market of travel services have realized that vouchers to ill-famed spots on Russia's map may help them make fortunes.

At the end of November the authorities of the Perm Territory declared they had established a UFO wildlife preserve in the local paranormal territory called the Molebka Triangle (Molebka is the name of a tiny local village) - an area where unidentified flying objects can be seen now and then. The local authorities hope the UFO preserve will make the region a major tourist attraction. Crowds of curious visitors will flock in and cash will be pouring like rain.

Local officials do not have a shade of doubt flying saucers do exist and drop in once in a while. Likewise, they are certain that those eager to get in touch with extraterrestrial civilizations are more than enough. Most people in the region are ready to believe in extraterrestrials. A recent sociological poll found that one in three Perm Region residents is certain there is a good chance of seeing a UFO in one's own back yard some day.

Many other regions have followed in Perm's footsteps. In the Krasnoyarsk Territory construction work is well in progress in the middle of dense Siberian taiga forests close to the site of the Tunguska Event of almost a hundred years ago. The local authorities hope that the 100th anniversary of the enigma will attract crowds, the hotels and infrastructures being built there

will not stay idle, and the local budget will make millions.

There are plans for opening an outdoor museum in a local village and laying an 80-kilometer road through the thicket and across marshland to the place where a huge celestial body of unknown origin and nature is thought to have hit the Earth's surface early last century. Flying there by helicopter will be no problem. Landing pads will be in place pretty soon.

On July 30, 1908 a huge round-shaped celestial body tore through the sky over Central Siberia with a roaring noise. On that night many in Western Europe and in Russia noticed unusual glow in the sky. The period of dusk is said to have been incredibly beautiful.

Combined efforts by Russian and foreign scientists have produced no plausible explanation to this day. Currently there exist seven groups of interpretations of the Tunguska Event and about 100 versions of what exactly happened then. The ice nucleus of some comet, a huge globular lightning, a solar plasmoid, and a cloud of space dust are the most frequently mentioned ones.

Dozens of international expeditions visit the Krasnoyarsk Territory every year in search of the truth.

In other regions moneymaking on things unexplainable is on the rise, too, although on a somewhat more moderate scale. In the Samara Region the authorities contemplate creation of a tourist zone near the Medveditskaya Gryada (She-Bear Ridge), where local people claim they often see flying saucers.

The authorities in the city of Togliatti, in the middle reaches of the Volga River, say in full seriousness that "the idea of turning the center of Russia's car-making industry into a paradise for UFO fans looks really good." Indeed, one in two locals claims to have an experience of dealing with paranormal phenomena at least once.

"Togliatti draws UFOs like a magnet. The high-rise tower of the AvtoVAZ car giant's head office is the extraterrestrials' usual target. This place is believed to be one of the most abnormal places in the whole of Russia," UFO expert Tatyana Makarova told the daily Noviy Izvestia.

Flying saucer hunters suggest building special communities, where UFO enthusiasts will be able to spend sleepless nights in the hope of meeting aliens from other worlds.

When the rumor of the authorities' plans fell on the attentive ears of local businessmen, the smartest ones promptly volunteered to supply future tourist musts with proper infrastructures - trading centers, bars restaurants and what not.

The regions where preserves could be established on enigmatic sites are two numerous to count. On their web sites travel companies invite clients to take a look at enigmatic circles on crop fields on either side of the Kuban River, visit a yeti's cave in Western Altai, or explore old-time labyrinths on the Solovetsky Islands. Researchers have catalogued Russia's unusual places to produce a special encyclopedia.

Even the tiniest villages, where nothing extraordinary has happened for centuries, hurry to earn what they can on Russians' UFO-mania.

The general public's interest in things unexplainable soars with every single day. Print runs of special publications are breaking records. Ever bigger television audiences switch to television channels that keep paranormalities and esoterics in focus.

One of the most popular television shows this season was The Battle of ESPs on the TNT channel, which holds competitions for specially selected contestants boasting unusual capabilities.

[Thanks to greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 11:36:44 -0800
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:14:16 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

>26th January 2007

>Posted By:

>Blacksheep
>Cunning Artificer

>I was reading a Great Mysteries... book belonging to one of the
>children. It contained a UFO sighting that occurred in the USA
>where a recently retired USAAF "Pursuit" pilot was flying a
>private plane in the vicinity of Mt. Rainier near Seattle. He
>was shocked to see a formation of huge bright silver crescent
>shaped craft pass him some way off travelling at what he
>estimated was about 1,000 mph. They changed direction very
>sharply with the sun flaring off their crescent shaped bodies
>and disappeared towards the north west. He said they definitely
>weren't aircraft as they were too big, too fast and manouvered
>too suddenly.

No, they disappeared to the southeast, not the northwest -
sheesh!

Arnold said that at first he assumed they were some new jet
plane, but he kept looking for vertical stabilizers and couldn't
see any. They also flew in reverse echelon formation, not
typical for jet planes. The formation weaved like the tail of a
kite, again, not the the way jets fly in formation.

Arnold did not report the shape of most of the objects as
"crescent shaped" - there was only one such object. The rest
appeared very thin and flat and half-moon shaped.

And, of course, the computed speed was way faster than any jet
plane of the time - more like 1700 mph, which Arnold
conservatively rounded down to 1200 mph. Had they been jet
planes flying more like 500 or 600 mph, then Arnold's estimate
of distance would have had to be off by around a factor of 3
(estimate based on seeing them momentarily disappear behind a
subpeak of Mt. Rainier and also weaving in around of mountain
peaks south of Rainier (not north). If that was the case, then
Arnold should have had no problem whatsoever seeing a control
surface like a vertical stabilizer.

>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>history as a fighter pilot.

I don't remember Arnold being a "fighter" pilot - just a private,
civilian pilot.

>Something in the account jogged a vague memory. I dug out an old
>book given to me as a souvenir by Boeing . There in the middle
>was a beautiful picture of a formation of large, bright silver,
>highly swept winged aircraft flying in formation over Mt.
>Rainier - oddly enough on the same date as his sighting. They
>were the early prototypes for the B47 bomber programme and were
>flying in formation for an official Boeing photo shoot.

But Wikipedia says the maiden flight was December 17, 1947, or 6
months after this supposed formation of B47s was flying and
supposedly confusing Arnold. In fact, assembly of the only
two prototypes (not the nine craft reported by Arnold),
didn't even begin until June 1947. Wait, isn't June 1947 the
same time Arnold reported his objects?

>Its a pity the B47 crews never saw these UFO's as they had a
>well set up camera ship flying with them.

Yes, add the ghost camera ship to go along with the ghost
formation of B47s 6 months before the first one ever flew.

>Of course, the photos of the UFOs might have been taken away
>by secret agents when they landed soon afterwards at Moses
>Lake - the flight test centre to the north west of Seattle."

But, but, but, the objects disappeared to the southeast, not
northwest. And Moses Lake isn't "northwest" of Seattle, but
about 150 miles east of Mt. Rainier and Seattle. And they were
just beginning to assemble the prototype B47s when Arnold made
his report. And there was only two of them. And on and on and
on.

In others words, this is just more Internet BS on a chat group
from some dufus - notice the guy even calls himself the "Cunning
Artificer". That should be a clue. Why are we not surprised that
someone like John Rimmer would still take it seriously and not
even bother to do some basic fact checking?

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Warminster

From: **Geoff Richardson** <geoff.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 20:26:52 -0000
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:17:41 -0500
Subject: Warminster

A cosy community confronted by the paranormal.

There are a number of U.K. UFO events which have gone down in UFO History and folklore both on a local and international basis. Of these the incidents which immediately spring to mind are The Rendlesham Forest Incident, RAF Cosford etc=85

However, in the 1960s and early 1970s a whole series of UFO and paranormal incidents occurred in and around a quiet and comfortable, typically English country town located in Wiltshire lying just to the south west of Salisbury plain.

The town, of course, is Warminster and the UFO sightings and paranormal events which befuddled this town ultimately featured on the front pages of the national press. Not only were UFOs observed in the Wiltshire skies but strange humanoid beings were seen in the local countryside, beings that disappeared when approached. The inhabitants of Warminster did not just to have to tolerate UFOs but strange ghostly apparitions.

See: <http://www.thewhyfiles.net/warminster.html>

Including an article by Kevin Goodman of

<http://www.ufo-warminster.co.uk/>

Warminster - The Forgotten Enigma

UFO Warminster is edited and hosted by

Kevin Goodman and Steve Dewey.

Geoff Richardson

www.thewhyfiles.net

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 16:05:11 EST
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:19:13 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Nick Balaskas <ikolaos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 10:06:08 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

>><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

<snip>

>>Blacksheep
>>Cunning Artificer

<snip>

>>At the time there was nothing to match such a description and
>>great credence was given to the story because of the chap's
>>history as a fighter pilot. Something in the account jogged a
>>vague memory. I dug out an old book given to me as a souvenir by
>>Boeing . There in the middle was a beautiful picture of a
>>formation of large, bright silver, highly swept winged aircraft
>>flying in formation over Mt. Rainier - oddly enough on the same
>>date as his sighting. They were the early prototypes for the B47
>>bomber programme and were flying in formation for an official
>>Boeing photo shoot.

Hello List, All -

I would have thought that the first thing done, when offering a solution to the Arnold case, especially one that could be easily checked, it would be checked. According to Boeing, or for that matter probably any aviation history site, the first flight of a B-47 was December 17, 1947... about six months too late to solve the Arnold sighting...

Not that the B-47 looked very much like what Arnold described.

KRandle

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 15:08:15 -0600
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:20:49 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

Wow, John, pretty impressive.

A vague anecdote drawn up from fallible memory, no real cited source - can you imagine what you would have done if somebody had put this forward in a pro-UFO, as opposed to pelicanist, context?

Oh, excuse me, I forgot. One standard for UFO proponents, another for pelicanists. Never mind.

This to Bruce Maccabee: I know you've been counting, so perhaps you can answer this question: What number explanation is this for the Arnold sighting? Are we in three figures by now?

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 21:23:03 +0000
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:22:18 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

Hello List,

I've emailed 'Blacksheep' privately, requesting more details of the publication. If I get a response, I'll let the list know.

This could be a deliberate hoax, or it could be that he is mistaken about the date or model of aircraft in the photo.

Whatever the case may be, it seems worth checking out.

Cheers,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: Origins Of The Grays

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 18:29:08 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:23:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>I am researching the origins of the entities we know as the
>Grays. One thesis is that grays are not from another planet or
>perhaps not even aliens. There are many theories and
>speculations that have been put out that agree and disagree with
>this supposition.

>However, I am looking for specific references about the creation
>of Grays. For example, in Fowler's book, The Watchers, Betty
>Andreasson Luca describes assisting a woman giving birth during
>an abduction. She witnesses a Gray perform a circumcision of the
>eyelids of a fetus delivered from a human abductee.

>There is enough tissue cut away from the eyes to expose the
>entire eyeball and then the fetus is placed in a tank after
>having needles put in it's head and ears. Presumably the needles
>provide stimulation or nourishment. Anyway, to further the
>supposition the child would have looked very human before having
>its eyes lids removed. Of course stimulating the cranium could
>cause the brain and skull to grow. Poof, a human is converted to
>a Gray but not with only genetic manipulation but by technology
>and alteration of the development process.

>Any reference assistance or comments with would be greatly
>appreciated.

An interesting hypothesis Frank.

You might want to check out the work of David M. Jacobs, Budd Hopkins, and possibly even some of the work by Patrick Cooke and Barry H. Downing.

But be very careful out there!

I would be extremely careful with any conclusions by others, even the one you mention above. This topic goes completely false when conviction colors conclusion. It is paramount that research and scientific method stay honest and reliably replicable.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Are They Out There?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:28:39 -0500
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 00:28:39 -0500
Subject: Are They Out There?

Source: Parade Magazine - New York, NY, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/ysnanx>

December 9, 2007

Are They Out There?
By David H. Levy

It may have been the most unusual question to come up at a Presidential debate. When moderator Tim Russert asked Democratic candidate Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich if he'd ever seen a UFO, the Ohio Congressman didn't hesitate. "I did," he replied. While this led to much amusement in the media, it also prompts a more serious look at the phenomenon of Unidentified Flying Objects.

Humans have long asked: Are we alone? Has our planet ever been visited by others? Among those committed to the search for evidence of life beyond Earth are the scientists at the SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) Institute. Thanks to a huge donation from Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft, SETI=97in partnership with the University of California at Berkeley=97is building a network of radio telescopes near Hat Creek in Northern California. Known as the Allen Telescope Array, its purpose is to pick up signals from space.

Currently, there are 42 telescopes in place. In 2010, when the Allen array is completed, 350 telescopes will scan the stars as far as 1000 light-years away. (They will not be looking for visiting craft, just radio signals.) These individual telescopes will be searching different regions of the sky, but they can be combined into one giant telescope if needed to confirm someone's call from the darkness of space.

Sightings of UFOs have occurred since biblical times. Renaissance artwork includes visions of strange flying objects in the sky. Many modern-day sightings are on record, and some remain mysteries to this day.

Some sightings are not easily dismissed. Years ago, the late Clyde Tombaugh, the man who discovered Pluto, observed green fireballs in the sky. Unlike the ordinary greenish fireballs that occasionally brighten the night, these appeared as a group and seemed to speed up during their flight through the sky.

But the more he thought about it, the more skeptical Tombaugh became about his sighting. "Even if they were visiting from a planet circling the nearest star, Alpha Centauri," he once told me, "an almost infinite amount of fuel, as we understand it, would be required to accelerate them from their home to ours. There must be another explanation."

Jack "Triple" Nickel, a retired Air Force fighter pilot, also is a respected astronomer. Early in his career, in the fall of 1973, as he flew at night between clouds over Oklahoma and Texas, a bright light suddenly appeared in front of him. "It was

either close by and dim or far away and bright," he recalls. "It lasted about 20 minutes before vanishing." Nickel can't rule out the possibility that the light was the bright star Sirius shining through a break in the clouds, but the sighting was never explained.

Still, most of the strange sights in the night sky are easy to explain=97 whether it's Venus, the northern lights or even an artificial satellite passing for a UFO. For example, pilot Tom Wideman was flying over California late one night in 1986 when he witnessed "a blazing fireball that crossed our path from right to left, trailing flaming debris before it went out of sight." The next day, Wideman learned that a Russian rocket booster had burned up on re-entry over the Mojave Desert. "It had crossed 20 miles in front of our flight path, close enough to be spectacular." Many scientists, myself included, believe we are probably not alone in our galaxy but that most likely no one has visited us yet. Even if a UFO landed in my backyard, I'd want to have a look inside and meet the occupants before I'd be convinced.

Recently, just before dawn, 11 faint lights appeared in my telescope's field of view. They climbed the sky, slowed, stopped, then started back toward the horizon. I thought about it for a while. Then it hit me: About 300 miles from my Arizona home is White Sands Missile Range, a facility that frequently launches rockets. I must have witnessed a missile launch.

If you hear a UFO story, be skeptical. Ask questions. If someone describes an object that hovers in the sky, motionless, then tears off at twice the speed of sound, ask how it could suddenly move that fast, breaking Newton's law of motion. It has to accelerate to that speed, and the faster it speeds up, the more force is needed. In the meantime, keep watching. Seeing unusual things is just one reason to look up at the night sky, eagerly and passionately, and wonder.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 01:18:25 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 15:08:15 -0600
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>>>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

>Wow, John, pretty impressive.

>A vague anecdote drawn up from fallible memory, no real cited
>source - can you imagine what you would have done if somebody
>had put this forward in a pro-UFO, as opposed to pelicanist,
>context?

>Oh, excuse me, I forgot. One standard for UFO proponents,
>another for pelicanists. Never mind.

>This to Bruce Maccabee: I know you've been counting, so perhaps
>you can answer this question: What number explanation is this
>for the Arnold sighting? Are we in three figures by now?

As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

This 'explanation' merely specifies the type of aircraft.

So If Hynek's explanation is #1A, this is #1B.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 13:48:07 -0000
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2007 08:50:45 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

><http://tinyurl.com/2pep7c>

And according to John Rimmer is on that account no more immune from misinterpretations than anyone else. I think in this case John's point of view wins out.

The story of a "formation" of mass-produced (!) prototype B-47s flying on 24 June 1947 doesn't add up.

According to

<http://www.wingweb.co.uk/aircraft/Boeing B-47 Part1.html>

and

<http://www.b-47.com/history/ch01/b-47ch01.html>

the first prototype of the B-47, the XB-47, didn't roll out of the Seattle factory until September 12 1947 and had its first 55 minute test flight on December 17 1947, timed to coincide with the 44th Wright Bros anniversary. And the Air Force ordered only two prototypes, the second having its first flight on July 21 1948. There still weren't enough for a "formation" even then.

The Boeing company image library at

<http://www.boeingimages.com/boeingCSharpSite/>

is very comprehensive and allows you to search by type, date, location, aspect, weather, events, manufacturing milestones etc etc, and checking all XB-47 photos including publicity events and first flights produces no photograph matching the one described on any date.

However, the B-50 Superfortress had its first test flight on June 25, 1947. The wrong aircraft, but only a day away, a near miss for this blogger then? But again there was no chance of a "formation" of B-50As and the wings of this 4-engine prop bomber were not swept at all, but straight.

Aside from the inaccurate account of Arnold's sighting (the objects did not disappear in the NW for example but in the opposite direction) I find this a very unconvincing and inconsistent claim, and I'm sure John would agree that in the absence of physical evidence - i.e. at least a copy of the original printed photo with its caption, then preferably some test of the probity of that information and an explanation of the historical anachronism - no good sceptic will take this seriously.

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:48:13 -0000
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 11:42:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 11:11:47 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>>Penniston has confirmed (see page 183 of Georgina Bruni's book
>>You Can't Tell The People) that this typed statement "seems
>>original in content", though he said that his original statement
>>was handwritten. Halt told me on Saturday that he didn't know
>>who typed up the statement.

>>Penniston left many details out of his statement in the same
>>way as Halt left details out of his memo. The reasons for this
>>included concern at the official reaction and concern for their
>>careers. Reference to this is made on page 220 of You Can't
>>Tell The People.

>So if I have this right, Penniston confirmed that in his
>original statement he did say 50 meters was "the closest I got
>at any point", but now claims that he just "left out some
>details"? I find this difficult to square with the believably
>consistent picture painted by the original statements of all
>five people involved. That picture doesn't seem to me to be a
>result of just passively "leaving out details". These accounts
>imply a conspiracy to actively invent an interlocking false
>story - and one done in a very subtle fashion. Perhaps they were
>subtle people. But if they did this for the purpose of
>suppressing the embarrassing fact that they really saw a
>mechanical device at close quarters, why did Penniston shoot
>them all in the foot by claiming to have "positively identified"
>the lights as a mechanical device? I find it much easier to
>believe that these original statements are ingenuous. If there
>are good reasons not to think this, can you summarise what they
>are (other than Penniston's changed story I mean)? The relevant
>passages are quoted below for reference.

<snip>

Some issues concerning the original witness statements are
examined in You Can't Tell The People. To give one example of
the problems with them, Edward Cabansag told Georgina Bruni that
he signed his statement without looking at it.

Other issues that may have had a bearing on all this include
concern as to whether any USAF personnel had undertaken actions
contrary to the Status of Forces Agreement and concerns about
the fact that light beams were seen striking a certain area -
one of several details Charles Halt left out of his memo to the
MoD.

The various witnesses saw and experienced different things and
reacted to them in different ways. This, together with

variations in the subsequent debriefings (and the way in which those concerned reacted to these debriefings), will also have had a bearing on what went into the statements and what was left out.

I've discussed the Rendlesham Forest incident twice with Charles Halt in the last month. It's clear to me that a decision was taken to sanitize some of the accounts, with a view to raising the more sensitive issues in the subsequent investigation, once some indication of official reaction had been received. This strategy was undermined by the fundamentally flawed nature of the MOD's investigation.

I don't have any definitive answers here, but the full story of the incident and what happened afterwards has yet to emerge.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 11:44:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>image."

Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
and less loopy-looking trails?

MS

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 10:49:27 -0800
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 11:46:34 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 15:08:15 -0600
>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>>>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>>Any comments on this? It does come from a pilot, and so,
>>>>according to Don Ledger, speaks with extra authority!

>>Wow, John, pretty impressive.

>>A vague anecdote drawn up from fallible memory, no real cited
>>source - can you imagine what you would have done if somebody
>>had put this forward in a pro-UFO, as opposed to pelicanist,
>>context?

>>Oh, excuse me, I forgot. One standard for UFO proponents,
>>another for pelicanists. Never mind.

>>This to Bruce Maccabee: I know you've been counting, so
>>perhaps
>>you can answer this question: What number explanation is this
>>for the Arnold sighting? Are we in three figures by now?

>As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
>Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
>explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
>that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
>if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

Hynek's, incorrect, argument was that according to his incorrect
calculation based on Arnold's description, the objects would
have been over 2000 feet long, which he deemed impossible.

Hynek was off by at least a factor of 5-10, as I have explained
previously on the List, based on his misunderstanding of how
human visual acuity is measured.

So Hynek instead proposed jet planes maybe 6 miles away instead
of Arnold's 23. Does anybody see the second flaw in his
argument?

All Hynek did was bring his giant objects about 4 times closer,
which would scale them 4 times smaller. So instead of objects
over 2000 feet long, we would have "jet fighters" over 500 feet
long. That's still a trifle big. This is pretty elementary
stuff, yet Hynek never seems to have seen the obvious absurdity
of his argument. He was still dismissing the Arnold sighting
even after his Bluebook days.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Bel Air Man Writes Of UFOs In Wartime

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 13:34:40 -0500
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 13:34:40 -0500
Subject: Bel Air Man Writes Of UFOs In Wartime

Source: The Baltimore Sun - Mayland, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/ysftgs>

December 9, 2007

Bel Air Man Writes Of UFOs In Wartime

Research of WWII events uncovers the unexplained

[Image]

By Cassandra A. Fortin
Special To The Sun

The peculiar red orb hung motionless in the summer sky near Frederick.

A boy at the time, Keith Chester vividly recalls that day in 1966. It was about 6:30 p.m. and Chester was on his way to a friend's house. As he walked, he noticed a shiny red ball in the sky near the Catoclin Mountains.

"The hair on the back of my neck stood straight up," Chester said. "I was so scared that I ran into my neighbor's house. I still think it was a UFO." To this day, the 50-year-old Bel Air resident has not been able to find an explanation for the object, but incident sparked an interest in unidentified flying objects.

In recent years, Chester's interest has grown into a passion that led him to write *Strange Company: Military Encounters with UFOs in WWII*. The 320-page book contains descriptions of UFO sightings by American and British service members culled from research that included documents at the National Archives.

The road to writing the book began with that boyhood sighting of the red object. Chester devoured books about UFOs and became interested in space. He wanted to be an astronaut until he realized he didn't have the necessary aptitude for math, so his interest shifted to World War II history. From 1978 to 1998, Chester portrayed an infantry soldier as a member of the Military Historical Reenactment Society, taking part in events around the region.

Over time, Chester's interest in UFOs waned. But it was reignited in 1989 when he met Leonard Stringfield, who was director of Civilian Research, Interplanetary Flying Objects, a research group during the 1950s, that produced books about UFOs.

Stringfield was a sergeant in the 5th Air Force during World War II and said he had his own UFO sighting.

Chester said Stringfield told him about how he was among the first people to fly into mainland Japan after the bombing of Nagasaki. Stringfield said that he was on a plane flying between Ie Shima and Iwo Jima, when he looked out the window and saw

three luminous, disk-shaped objects flying in formation.

"He told me that the objects had no outline, no exhaust, and no wings," Chester said, who works as a freelance artist.

Stringfield heard a commotion in the cockpit - the engine was malfunctioning. But when the objects disappeared, the plane was able to land safely, Chester recalls Stringfield saying.

"To hear his story was mesmerizing," he said.

Chester wanted to learn more about UFO sightings during WWII. In 1999, he began visiting the National Archives once a week to study military records for information about UFO sightings during the war.

Throughout almost four years of research, Chester found documents detailing sightings described as objects, lights, flares, strange lights or rockets.

"The sightings that were documented were considered phenomena," he said. "The military thought that they knew what they were observing, but the objects didn't match anything that was known by military intelligence."

The sightings he found include a silver, cigar-shaped object that looked like an airship. He also found a preponderance of information about unexplained objects reported by members of the 415th Night Fighter Squadron, a former Army Air Forces fighter squadron that fought during World War II.

"Some of the soldiers thought the objects they saw were beyond the realm of conventional technology," Chester said. "But there is something extraordinary happening out there ... and there is a phenomenon that exists, and I believe that it's extraterrestrial."

At a reunion of the night fighters, Chester met Harold Augspurger, a commander of the squadron, who recounted a sighting that Chester details in his book. While flying near the border of France and Germany, Augspurger said he saw a light in the sky that he could not pick up on the radar.

"I believe that what I saw was something from some other space," Augspurger, 88, said in a telephone interview from his home in Dayton, Ohio. "I think it's real important to document it because it's a piece of history."

By 2002, Chester concluded he had enough information to write a book. He was struck by how much documentation existed and figured most people weren't aware of it. He said he has come across so much material that he has begun work on a second book.

"The phenomenon was far larger than ever expected," he said. "I found that the military applied known terminology and didn't come up with answers. They would call something a flare, but it didn't act like a flare."

Along the way, Chester has encountered plenty of skepticism, even from friends. But he said his goal is not to persuade people one way or the other.

"It's up to the people who read my book to decide what the objects truly were," he said.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Gary McKinnon Radio Drama

From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 15:38:30 -0000
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 13:36:26 -0500
Subject: Gary McKinnon Radio Drama

Listers may be interested that there is a radio play being broadcast by the BBC Radio 4 service in the UK this coming Wednesday afternoon about Gary McKinnon the UFO hacker facing deportation.

This site will lead you to a link where you will be able to listen to this play for one week after transmission:

<http://www.freegary.org.uk:80/>

Cheers

Dave Haith

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Origins Of The Grays

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:54:14 -0600
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 07:44:16 -0500
Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

<snip>

>However, I am looking for specific references about the creation
>of Grays. For example, in Fowler's book, The Watchers, Betty
>Andreasson Luca describes assisting a woman giving birth during
>an abduction. She witnesses a Gray perform a circumcision of the
>eyelids of a fetus delivered from a human abductee.

>There is enough tissue cut away from the eyes to expose the
>entire eyeball and then the fetus is placed in a tank after
>having needles put in it's head and ears. Presumably the needles
>provide stimulation or nourishment. Anyway, to further the
>supposition the child would have looked very human before having
>its eyes lids removed. Of course stimulating the cranium could
>cause the brain and skull to grow. Poof, a human is converted to
>a Gray but not with only genetic manipulation but by technology
>and alteration of the development process.

>Any reference assistance or comments with would be greatly
>appreciated.

Frank:

This may or may not mean anything, but I have never personally
witnessed anything like this during any of my experiences.
That's not to say that Betty didn't. I just don't know how
common this is. I read about something similar in the manuscript
version of "Rachel's Eyes," but it was in a different context,
and also something I'd not seen during any of my experiences. In
addition, I've been in contact with and have gotten to know many
abductees over the past 20 years and I've never heard of
anything like this from them either.

So, if this is in fact something a particular group of Greys are
doing, I do not believe it is common. Personally, I have a
difficult time discerning what the medical reason for a lid
circumcision would be - or what benefit it would serve.

In addition, I have seen eyelids on different types of Greys as
well as hybrids. They do have eyelids and I have seen them close
their eyes and/or blink many times.

I hope this information helps.

Katharina Wilson
www.alienjigsaw.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 10:55:37 -0800
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 07:46:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>>image."

>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>and less loopy-looking trails?

A question: Are there some images available of typical camera
jitter of, e.g., a street light at night? Or of some night light
known beyond question to have been a mundane fixture? I'd like
to compare some of

<truncated>

Jim

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Aliens Apart

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 12:04:51 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 07:49:10 -0500
Subject: Aliens Apart

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

<http://www.space.com/searchforlife/071206-seti-aliens-apart.html>

06 December 2007

Aliens Apart

By Seth Shostak
Senior Astronomer, SETI

For years scientists have wrestled with a puzzling fact: The universe appears to be remarkably suited for life. Its physical properties are finely tuned to permit our existence. Stars, planets and the kind of sticky chemistry that produces fish, ferns and folks wouldn't be possible if some of the cosmic constants were only slightly different.

Well, there's another property of the universe that's equally noteworthy: It's set up in a way that keeps everyone isolated.

We learned this relatively recently. The big discovery took place in 1838, when Friedrich Bessel beat out his telescope-wielding buddies to first measure the distance to a star other than the sun. 61 Cygni, a binary star in our own back yard, turned out to be about 11 light-years away. For those who, like Billy Joel, are fond of models, think of it this way: If you shrank the sun to a ping-pong ball and set it down in New York's Central Park, 61 Cygni would be a slightly smaller ball near Denver.

The distances between adjacent stars are measured in tens of trillions of miles. The distances between adjacent civilizations, even assuming that there are lots of them out there, are measured in thousands of trillions of miles =96 hundreds of light-years, to use a more tractable unit. Note that this number doesn't change much no matter how many planets you believe are studded with sentients =96 the separation distance is pretty much the same whether you think there are ten thousand galactic societies or a million.

Interstellar distances are big. Had the physics of the universe been different =96 if the gravitational constant were smaller =96 maybe suns would have been sprinkled far closer together, and a trip to your starry neighbors would have been no more than a boring rocket ride, kind of like cruising to Sydney. As it is, no matter what your level of technology, traveling between the stars is a tough assignment. To hop from one to the next at the speed of our snazziest chemical rockets takes close to 100,000 years. For any aliens who have managed to amass the enormous energy reserves and ponderous radiation shielding required for relativistic spaceflight, the travel time is still measured in years (if not for them, then for those they've left behind).

This has some obvious consequences (which, remarkably, have escaped the attention of most Hollywood writers.) To begin with, forget about galactic "empires" or more politically-correct

"federations." Two thousand years ago, the Romans clubbed together an empire that stretched from Spain to Iraq, with a radius of about 1,200 miles. They could do this thanks to organization and civil engineering. All those roads (not to mention the Mediterranean) allowed them to move troops around at a few miles an hour. Even the most distant Roman realms could be reached in months or less, or about one percent the lifetime of your average legionnaire. It makes sense to undertake campaigns designed to hold together an extensive social fabric when doing so requires only a percent or so of a lifetime.

In the 19th century, steamships and railroads increased the troop travel speeds by a factor of ten, which extended the radius of control by a similar amount. The British could rule an empire that was world-wide.

But here's the kicker: Even if we could move people around at nearly the speed of light, this "one percent rule" would still limit our ability to effectively intervene =96 our radius of control =96 to distances of less than a light-year, considerably short of the span to even the nearest star other than Sol. Consequently, the Galactic Federation is a fiction (as if you didn't know). Despite being warned that Cardassian look-alikes were wreaking havoc and destruction in the galaxy's Perseus Arm, you couldn't react quickly enough to affect the outcome. And your conscripts would be worm feed long before they arrived on the front lines anyway.

In other words, aliens won't be getting in one another's face.

There's a similar argument to be made for communication. We seldom initiate information interchange that takes longer than months (an overseas letter, for instance). More generally, we seldom begin any well-defined project that lasts more than two or three generations. The builders of medieval cathedrals were willing to spend that kind of time to complete their gothic edifices, and those who bury time capsules are occasionally willing to let a hundred years pass before the canisters are dug up. But what about a project that takes several centuries, and possibly millennia? Who's willing to do that? Only Stewart Brand's "Long Now Foundation" seems to have the guts for this type of enterprise, proposing to build a clock that will keep time for ten thousand years.

Clearly, these simple observations must have implications for SETI which, as we noted, involves transmissions that will be underway for hundreds to thousands of years. In particular, if there are signals being banded about the galaxy for purposes of getting in touch, either (1) the aliens are individually much longer-lived than we are, which =96 if you're a fan of circuit-board sentience =96 implies that they're probably not biological. Or (2) we're missing some important physics permitting faster-than-light communication, and extraterrestrial signaling efforts don't include burping light and radio waves into space.

Many readers will, in a display of endearing perversity, choose (2). Maybe they're right, but that flies in the face of what we know. And what we know argues something worth bantering about at your next cocktail party =96 namely, that the time scales for travel and communication are too long for easy interaction with beings whose lifetimes are, like us, only a century or less. So while the cosmos could easily be rife with intelligent life =96 the architecture of the universe, and not some Starfleet Prime Directive, has ensured precious little interference of one culture with another.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:22:53 -0700
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 08:46:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>>image."

>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>and less loopy-looking trails?

Gentlemen,

It may not be appropriate to consider gravity a "restoring"
force in this context, as it suggests that gravity tends to
return the camera axis to the desired alignment. This would only
hold in the case of a camera that is pointed straight down.

Aside from that nit, I find plausible the idea that the
'trajectory' of the camera aimpoint would differ in a free-fall
environment, perhaps even to become more linear, as Martin
suggests.

If such was the case, it would not eliminate the 'bright spot'
issue that Bruce alludes to, and indeed would exacerbate it. A
human being would not be capable of hand-reversing the linear
course of the camera at constant angular rate, and indeed this
would be difficult even with mechanical assistance. It seems
unavoidable that the linear segments in the image would have
tell-tale brightened end points. But this is just what is seen
in the fourth photo!

So, it may be prudent to ask, what is the minimum time required
for a human hand to execute three out-and-back linear 'jitters'
of some tenths of a degree in angular width? And, is the
corresponding shutter speed consistent with any plausible
configuration of the camera at the time (lens size, f-stop, film
speed, etc.)?

Mike

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 17:10:06 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 08:48:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>>image."

>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>and less loopy-looking trails?

Not likely. First, there is a restoring force: the hand.

The photographer tries to steady the image by applying a force
(torque) opposite to the direction of motion (rotation). This is
quite independent of gravity unless the lens on the camera is
large enough to have a noticeable torque that tends to pull the
lens downward (main body of camera held by hands, of course).
Removing this downward force on the lens (no gravity) would not
remove the hand vibration and the continual attempts to
compensate.

Also, if the shutter time was 1/250 of 1/500 sec there likely
wouldn't be time for hand vibration to switch from up-down to
left-right. If there were noticeable smear it would be a short
unidirection smear resulting in changing a perfectly round dot
to one elongated in a single direction.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 17:13:21 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 08:50:03 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 10:49:27 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

snip

>>As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
>>Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
>>explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
>>that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
>>if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

>Hynek's, incorrect, argument was that according to his incorrect
>calculation based on Arnold's description, the objects would
>have been over 2000 feet long, which he deemed impossible.

>Hynek was off by at least a factor of 5-10, as I have explained
>previously on the List, based on his misunderstanding of how
>human visual acuity is measured.

This is also discussed in the article at my web site.

>So Hynek instead proposed jet planes maybe 6 miles away instead
>of Arnold's 23. Does anybody see the second flaw in his
>argument?

>All Hynek did was bring his giant objects about 4 times closer,
>which would scale them 4 times smaller. So instead of objects
>>over 2000 feet long, we would have "jet fighters" over 500 feet
>long. That's still a trifle big. This is pretty elementary
>stuff, yet Hynek never seems to have seen the obvious absurdity
>of his argument. He was still dismissing the Arnold sighting
>even after his Bluebook days.

And no self-respecting bomber would "flip and flash in the
sunlight"

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 09:03:03 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 09:03:03 -0500
Subject: NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data

Source: The Chicago Tribune - Illinois, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/36gxnt>

December 10, 2007

NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data

A federal ruling requires the space agency to turn over any files it might have related to a 1965 incident in a small Pennsylvania town

By Sean D. Hamill
Special to the Tribune

KECKSBURG, Pa. - The U.S. government says nothing of note happened in this small town in the hills of southwestern Pennsylvania at 4:47 p.m. on Dec. 9, 1965. A meteor may have passed by, but no alien ship or Russian space probe fell to Earth, as many here believe.

Still, Bill Bulebush, 82, says he knows what he saw, heard and smelled, despite the doubts of the government and others in this community 40 miles southeast of Pittsburgh.

"I looked up and saw it flying overhead and it was sizzling," said Bulebush, a retired truck driver. "I found it in the woods down there [in a valley] and I got to it 15 to 20 minutes after it landed. I saw it 10 to 15 feet away from behind a big tree - because I was worried it might blow up - and it smelled like sulfur or rotten eggs and was shaped like a huge acorn, about the size of a VW."

Other people said that shortly afterward, dozens of Army soldiers and three members of the Air Force showed up; later that night a flatbed military truck took the object away.

Despite such accounts, the government has been "trying to make it out like we're a bunch of liars," Bulebush said. But now he and his fellow believers may have their best chance yet to prove their case.

A recent settlement in a 4-year-long Freedom of Information Act court battle requires NASA to meticulously comb its files for documents about the Kecksburg incident.

The lawsuit was filed in December 2003 in the District of Columbia by Leslie Kean, a freelance journalist, with financial support from the SciFi Channel, which ran a show that year titled "The New Roswell: Kecksburg Exposed."

Searching for answers

Kean was asked by SciFi in 2002 to find a UFO case with credible witnesses and possible physical evidence. She created the Coalition for Freedom of Information to support the effort and to look into other "unexplained aerial phenomena."

Part of Kean's own criteria, despite SciFi's title for the Kecksburg show, was to pick a case as far removed as possible from the 1947 incident in Roswell, N.M. - thought by many to be a crashed alien spaceship but later revealed to be a top-secret research balloon.

"The types that go to Roswell and parade in the street in costumes, we try to stay far, far away from that," she said.

Kean pressed the case after she filed a Freedom of Information Act request earlier in 2003 and NASA said it couldn't find any documents related to Kecksburg. But Kean already knew the space agency, which had a program in the 1960s to recover and analyze space debris, had some documents. Stan Gordon, a UFO and Bigfoot researcher with whom Kean was working, had information he got in response to a request he sent NASA in the 1990s.

"In the beginning, they probably saw Leslie's request and thought, 'Oh, she's after UFOs,'" said her attorney, Lee Helfrich of Washington. "Maybe they just didn't treat it seriously at first."

They do now.

From frustration, action

After NASA turned over about 1,000 pages of documents that failed to adequately address Kean's request, the case boiled over on March 20 for federal Judge Emmet Sullivan, who had tried to move NASA along for more than three years.

According to a transcript, the judge angrily referred to NASA's search efforts as a "ball of yarn" that never fully answers the request, adding: "I can sense the plaintiff's frustration because I'm frustrated."

A settlement was reached Oct. 17 specifying how NASA will make a new records search and that both sides must report to Sullivan periodically, starting Dec. 17. NASA also agreed to pay Kean \$50,000 in attorneys' fees and costs.

In a statement, NASA would say only that it was "conducting another records search."

This past week Kean and her attorney received the first batch of documents: 689 pages of Form 135s, which are inventory sheets that indicate what is in boxes and files in NASA's archives.

Based on a first read of the documents - from which Kean will select files for NASA to review for any documents related to Kecksburg - Kean said she's "cautiously optimistic" that they'll turn up something.

"I asked my attorney if she found the 'Kecksburg UFO Explained' file," Kean said with a laugh. "She said, 'Not yet.' But I'm still hopeful."

Many people in Kecksburg believe Kean's effort is just another frivolous step down the rabbit hole of fantasy.

"I wouldn't go along with the stories because it didn't happen," said Ed Myers, 81, who was chief of the Kecksburg Volunteer Fire Department in 1965 and said he didn't see the dozens of soldiers or the blue lights some people swear they saw.

Myers no longer helps his hometown fire department, a decision that began when the department encouraged UFO speculation by displaying a mock-up of the craft that Bulebush and others said they saw.

The mock-up was created in 1990 for a documentary and now sits prominently on a hillside behind the fire hall.

After years of rejecting efforts to make money off the story, the fire department hosted a wildly popular Kecksburg UFO gathering two years ago on the 40th anniversary, and began selling T-shirts, mugs, plates and hats with a picture of the flaming acorn hurtling across the sky, along with the date, Dec. 9, 1965.

Sales continue today at the Kecksburg UFO Store in the basement of the Rescue EMS headquarters house near the fire hall.

"We've made about \$10,000, mostly from shirts, so far," said Ron Strueble, 64, a fire department volunteer. "We're at the point now where we can start buying some additional equipment for the trucks."

For Bulebush, the UFO store is good for the town, but it's the lawsuit that he hopes will be his validation.

"I don't have too much time in this world. I'd like to be here to see this through," he said. "I want to find out what they're holding back on us."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 09:05:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>[I think the final paragraph of this article is particularly
>superfluous! - Joe]

>Source: The Daily Mail London, UK

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

<snip>

>Pilots' 'out-of-body experiences' responsible for more than a
>quarter of fatal air crashes

>By RICHARD SHEARS

>Some pilots will suffer the illusion that they are sitting on
>the wing of their aircraft watching themselves in the cockpit,
>according to an extraordinary official report released in
>Australia.

>Every pilot will at some stage lose all sense of direction,
>height and speed, drawing attention to spatial disorientation
>(SD) - one of the most common factors in plane crashes,
>according to a report by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau.

<snip>

>The specialist said he issued the warning so that pilots could
>take measures to reduce the impact of SD by flying when fit.

>They should not fly under the influence of alcohol or
>medications, which increase awareness of spatial disorientation
>illusions.

Hi Joe!

Although this newspaper article does not have anything directly
to do with UFOs, its very dubious claims could be used to
discount pilots as reliable witnesses should they make a UFO
sighting.

This article may have had another mischievous disinformation
goal in mind. One of the unrelated pictures included with this
article was a picture of JFK Jr which had the following caption:
"Victim of SD: The plane John F Kennedy Jr piloted crashed into
the Atlantic Ocean". Oh really?

I guess I was wrong in suspecting that certain powerful and evil
people would do anything to prevent JFK Jr from running for
President and also to prevent him from revealing very disturbing
truths in the well researched and more credible articles
published in his magazine 'George'. Also, JFK Jr was being urged
by some to run for Senator in New York. He would probably have
won easily thereby preventing Hillary Clinton from getting this

position, a step in her ultimate goal of one day running for President herself.

I forwarded this article to a pilot friend of mine with nearly 25,000 hours of pilot time. This friend never thought he was sitting on the wing of an airplane or had any other spatial disorientation experiences, including during stressful periods while flying in poor weather.

My pilot friend didn't think JFK Jr had an SD problem either. Although JFK Jr was an experienced and cautious pilot, and his aircraft was well equipped with instruments, my friend told me that he was flying nearby during that same time period JFK Jr's aircraft went down and remembers that the visibility was lousy. Also, having two women in the aircraft could well have caused an added distraction.

In support of my suspicions of foul play, my pilot friend did say he heard a report that someone near the destination Kennedy was trying to reach, either heard an explosion, saw a flash of light through the haze above him, or both.

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 12:02:54 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 09:13:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:48:13 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 11:11:47 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>So if I have this right, Penniston confirmed that in his
>>original statement he did say 50 meters was "the closest I got
>>at any point", but now claims that he just "left out some
>>details"? I find this difficult to square with the believably
>>consistent picture painted by the original statements of all
>>five people involved. That picture doesn't seem to me to be a
>>result of just passively "leaving out details". These accounts
>>imply a conspiracy to actively invent an interlocking false
>>story - and one done in a very subtle fashion. Perhaps they
>>were subtle people. But if they did this for the purpose of
>>suppressing the embarrassing fact that they really saw a
>>mechanical device at close quarters, why did Penniston shoot
>>them all in the foot by claiming to have "positively
>>identified" the lights as a mechanical device? I find it
>>much easier to believe that these original statements are
>>ingenuous. If there are good reasons not to think this,
>>can you summarise what they are (other than Penniston's
>>changed story I mean)? The relevant passages are quoted below
>>for reference.

><snip>

>Some issues concerning the original witness statements are
>examined in You Can't Tell The People. To give one example of
>the problems with them, Edward Cabansag told Georgina Bruni
>that he signed his statement without looking at it.

Thanks Nick

The problem I am struggling with is precisely that I don't see any issues with the original statements, as they stand. They read very convincingly, to me. They saw some wierd display of blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they got right up close and actually touched this thing.

The new story requires the original descriptions of all five direct and indirect witnesses to have been made up in collusion for motives of self-protection. But reading the subtly different

versions of the event and the individual tones of voice in which they are couched I don't find this believable. Too subtle and too cunning a deception, which yet is ineffective in covering up the "positive identification" of a mechanical UFO which supposedly was the motive of the deception. That's why my suspicious antennae twitch uncontrollably.

As I see it, faced with the fact that the original statement doesn't support the story he now wishes to be associated with, Cabansag tells us in his defence that he didn't read what he signed back then. In other words this claim implies that he had no idea what was typed above his signature, and therefore he can't be held responsible for its untruth. OK. But this would imply that he innocently thought he was signing a different and true statement, and this is inconsistent with the theory that he told a lie for reasons of personal protection.

Perhaps, then, his statement was fabricated by an unknown party, and like the others Cabansag knew he was signing a fabricated account but so trusted this other party to get it right on his behalf that he felt he didn't need to read it? But then the failure-to-read-before-signing defence becomes incongruous: If you'd always known it was fabricated, why would you plead that you didn't know what you were signing? This is then faux innocence and another level of deception.

And this scenario conflicts with Penniston's recent confirmation that the statement ascribed to him is to the best of his recollection the statement he wrote - no one fabricated this account on his behalf. So perhaps it was he who coordinated or ghost-wrote the others' false statements then? But if so he failed spectacularly to follow the script and undermined the collective cover story by saying that he positively identified the object as a mechanical device when he should have stopped at the agreed story that they chased some lights.

Well maybe this statement wasn't supposed to get used. Maybe it just slipped through unedited and talk of the machine was the one mistake in an otherwise carefully contrived ruse? But Sgt Chandler said exactly the same thing in his own statement and cited Penniston's real-time radio report as the source for it. The same report of a "definite mechanical object" was confirmed by Buran who testified to his conviction that Penniston had seen something "out of the realm of explanation". If there was collusion to suppress career-damaging admissions that they had seen an unknown mechanical device, why do Chandler's and Buran's stories exactly support Penniston's story of "positively identifying" an unknown mechanical device?

>Other issues that may have had a bearing on all this include
>concern as to whether any USAF personnel had undertaken actions
>contrary to the Status of Forces Agreement and concerns about
>the fact that light beams were seen striking a certain area -
>one of several details Charles Halt left out of his memo to the
>MoD.

We have been discussing the statements of Buran, Burroughs, Penniston, Chandler and Cabansag. Charles Halt's name does not come up in connection with this.

>The various witnesses saw and experienced different things and
>reacted to them in different ways.

Exactly so. The above statements are very convincing as independent accounts of the same real event for just this reason. They are not so convincing, to me, as an orchestrated fiction for the same reason. The deception seems far too subtle, much more so than simply "leaving out some details".

>This, together with
>variations in the subsequent debriefings (and the way in which
>those concerned reacted to these debriefings), will also have
>had a bearing on what went into the statements and what was
>left out.

Such speculations would work to mitigate problematic inconsistencies between testimonies. But it is not inconsistency that creates a problem here. Such inconsistency as there is seems very reasonable for independent accounts of the same event, for the reasons you mention. What creates a problem for the cover-story theory is the underlying common account so

convincingly borne witness to. The story of all the direct witnesses, and also of Chandler, is that they approached to within a moderate distance (estimated by one witness as 50 meters, a figure confirmed by Chandler as being the distance reported by radio at the time) of some strange coloured lights which Sgt Penniston was convinced were on a mechanical device but which then vanished.

>I've discussed the Rendlesham Forest incident twice with Charles >Halt in the last month. It's clear to me that a decision was >taken to sanitize some of the accounts, with a view to raising >the more sensitive issues in the subsequent investigation, once >some indication of official reaction had been received. This >strategy was undermined by the fundamentally flawed nature of >the MoD's investigation.

If, as suggested, Cabansag was "concerned for his career" and/or other nasty consequences because of adverse official reaction to his story I would have expected him to make sure he knew what he was signing.

>I don't have any definitive answers here, but the full story of >the incident and what happened afterwards has yet to emerge.

Whilst this is just a subjective opinion, I'm not convinced that the answer lies in further claims and speculations. I'll be pleased if you can challenge the above misgivings, and I certainly agree that the original case remains unresolved on the basis of information available. But I feel a cold dread creeping over me at the hint that I am expected to suspend judgment on the shortcomings of the case, pending yet another layer of revisionist disclosures and a "full story" yet to come, no doubt involving another book, documentary and/or press conference.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Aliens Apart

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:26:42 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 09:15:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Aliens Apart

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 12:04:51 -0000
>Subject: Aliens Apart

><http://www.space.com/searchforlife/071206-seti-aliens-apart.html>
>By Seth Shostak Senior Astronomer, SETI

<snip>

>Or (2) we're missing some important physics permitting faster-
>than-light communication, and extraterrestrial signaling efforts
>don't include burping light and radio waves into space.

>Many readers will, in a display of endearing perversity, choose
>(2). Maybe they're right, but that flies in the face of what we
>know.

Hi Diana,

Seth's picking up some bad media habits, including a priori
'pronouncements' and sneaky 'ad hominem' smears of possible
criticism.

His ad hominem use of "endearing perversity" has no basis in
fact. The history of physics shows that almost all new
discoveries "fly in the face of what we know" - or rather, of
what we thought we knew.

Seth's heavy-handed attempted embargo actually only says 'a
pedestrian won't easily cross the Sahara'.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Frequent CE Factor [was: NASA To Probe Self For

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:38:06 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:12:42 -0500
Subject: Frequent CE Factor [was: NASA To Probe Self For

>Source: The Chicago Tribune - Illinois, USA
><http://tinyurl.com/36gxnt>
>NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data

>KECKSBURG, Pa. - The U.S. government says nothing of note
>happened in this small town in the hills of southwestern
>Pennsylvania at 4:47 p.m. on Dec. 9, 1965.

<snip>

>Still, Bill Bulebush, 82, says he knows what he saw, heard and
>smelled ...

>"I looked up and saw it flying overhead and it was sizzling,"
>said Bulebush, a retired truck driver. "I found it in the woods
>down there [in a valley] and I got to it 15 to 20 minutes after
>it landed. I saw it 10 to 15 feet away from behind a big tree -
>because I was worried it might blow up - and it smelled like
>sulfur or rotten eggs and was shaped like a huge acorn, about
>the size of a VW."

Hello All,

Once again we've got 'sulfur or rotten eggs' smell during a CE
report.

And most of these early reports come from folk who couldn't have
known that we'd only now be correlating similar descriptions from
incidents going way back, some even in ancient history.

For researchers, early English reports often called it
'brimstone:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sulfur#History>

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:57:19 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:14:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 17:10:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>>>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>>>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>>>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>>>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>>>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>>>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>>>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>>>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the
>>>"loopy" image.

>>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more
>>linear
>>and less loopy-looking trails?

>Not likely. First, there is a restoring force: the hand.

>The photographer tries to steady the image by applying a force
>(torque) opposite to the direction of motion (rotation). This
>is quite independent of gravity unless the lens on the camera is
>large enough to have a noticeable torque that tends to pull the
>lens downward (main body of camera held by hands, of course).

>Removing this downward force on the lens (no gravity) would not
>remove the hand vibration and the continual attempts to
>compensate.

Well this is more or less what I meant. Perhaps I should have
been more explicit. I didn't mean to imply that there would be
no restoring forces at all, but only there is no gravitational
restoring force. This being so, the wander of the camera axis
will be subject only to those forces other than gravity that may
affect its path. Just as you say. My conjecture is that the path
in these circumstances could possibly be less loopy. I'm not
sure this is refuted above.

>Also, if the shutter time was 1/250 of 1/500 sec there likely
>wouldn't be time for hand vibration to switch from up-down to
>left-right. If there were noticeable smear it would be a short
>unidirection smear resulting in changing a perfectly round dot

>to one elongated ina single direction.

I don't necessarily disagree, but I suppose the "likely" here is the word that needs qualifying by some kind of experiment or calculation just in order to rule it out.

Martin

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Origins Of The Grays

From: Bert Reijersen van Buuren <bert.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 17:17:40 +0100
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:18:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:54:14 -0600
>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

><snip>

>>However, I am looking for specific references about the creation
>>of Grays. For example, in Fowler's book, The Watchers, Betty
>>Andreasson Luca describes assisting a woman giving birth during
>>an abduction. She witnesses a Gray perform a circumcision of the
>>eyelids of a fetus delivered from a human abductee.

>>There is enough tissue cut away from the eyes to expose the
>>entire eyeball and then the fetus is placed in a tank after
>>having needles put in it's head and ears. Presumably the needles
>>provide stimulation or nourishment. Anyway, to further the
>>supposition the child would have looked very human before having
>>its eyes lids removed. Of course stimulating the cranium could
>>cause the brain and scull to grow. Poof, a human is converted to
>>a Gray but not with only genetic manipulation but by technology
>>and alteration of the development process.

>>Any reference assistance or comments with would be greatly
>>appreciated.

>This may or may not mean anything, but I have never personally
>witnessed anything like this during any of my experiences.
>That's not to say that Betty didn't. I just don't know how
>common this is. I read about something similar in the manuscript
>version of "Rachel's Eyes," but it was in a different context,
>and also something I'd not seen during any of my experiences. In
>addition, I've been in contact with and have gotten to know many
>abductees over the past 20 years and I've never heard of
>anything like this from them either.

>So, if this is in fact something a particular group of Greys are
>doing, I do not believe it is common. Personally, I have a
>difficult time discerning what the medical reason for a lid
>circumcision would be - or what benefit it would serve.

>In addition, I have seen eyelids on different types of Greys as
>well as hybrids. They do have eyelids and I have seen them close
>their eyes and/or blink many times.

>I hope this information helps.

I don't know how reliable the next webpage is but Lt Col P J
Corso said that some aliens could spacetravel with the speed of
one lightyear a minute.

"Barney Hill - claimed to have been abducted by grey-
skinned entities from a space craft which apparently originated
from the Zeta II Reticuli star system.

http://www.world-mysteries.com/sci_6.htm

The Beginning

"...Another figure has an evil face... 'he looks like a german nazi. he's A Nazi... his eyes! His eyes. I've never seen eyes like that before!!!"

The above quote was made under regressive hypnosis by one of the first publicized 'UFO abductees', Barney Hill who - along with his wife Betty - claimed to have been abducted by grey-skinned entities from a space craft which apparently originated from the Zeta II Reticuli star system. The Grey alien abductors were obviously working with the human military officer who was encountered by Barney. This military officer was apparently a full-fledged Nazi, although this incident took place over 15 years after Europe had 'supposedly' been de-Nazified. This quote can be found in the paranormal encyclopedia ,Mysteries Of The Mind, Time & Space, p. 1379.

Bert (A W RvB)
bert.nul
www.rjrsnvbrn.nl

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 12:20:40 -0400
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:20:21 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 17:13:21 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 10:49:27 -0800
>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>snip

>>>As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
>>>Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
>>>explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
>>>that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
>>>if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

The obvious huge size of the thing notwithstanding - see Dave's
calculation below - 400mph would have been an unremarkable
speed, literally. A dozen or more prop driven aircraft were
capable of that speed.

>>Hynek's, incorrect, argument was that according to his incorrect
>>calculation based on Arnold's description, the objects would
>>have been over 2000 feet long, which he deemed impossible.

>>Hynek was off by at least a factor of 5-10, as I have explained
>>previously on the List, based on his misunderstanding of how
>>human visual acuity is measured.

>This is also discussed in the article at my web site.

>>So Hynek instead proposed jet planes maybe 6 miles away instead
>>of Arnold's 23. Does anybody see the second flaw in his
>>argument?

>>All Hynek did was bring his giant objects about 4 times closer,
>>which would scale them 4 times smaller. So instead of objects

>>>over 2000 feet long, we would have "jet fighters" over 500 feet

>>long. That's still a trifle big. This is pretty elementary
>>stuff, yet Hynek never seems to have seen the obvious absurdity
>>of his argument. He was still dismissing the Arnold sighting
>>even after his Bluebook days.

A 500 foot long aircraft at 6 miles would have been very
identifiable, if conventional, never mind scary. You can easily
pick out a B-747 at 6 miles and identify as same-or a DC-3.

>And no self-respecting bomber would "flip and flash in the
>sunlight"

Particulary one that didn't exist to begin with.

The B-47's thin wing had 5 feet of deflection over a complete cycle [up and down]. It was a high altitude bomber not meant for nape of the Earth operations particularly around mountain tops and mountain waves.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 11:35:08 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:21:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 10:55:37 -0800
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>>>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. In this
>>>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>>>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>>>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>>>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>>>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>>>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>>>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>>>image."

>>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>>and less loopy-looking trails?

>A question: Are there some images available of typical camera
>jitter of, e.g., a street light at night? Or of some night light
>known beyond question to have been a mundane fixture? I'd like
>to compare some of

I am not aware of any single frame picture at a shutter time of
1/250 of 1/500 of a second which shows anything other than
either a short straight linear motion (image stretched into a
short line) or a slight curve (image of a light turned into a
"banana" shape).

The "loops and whorls" that are "fingerprints" of complex hand
vibration turn up in relatively long exposures (0.1 sec to
several seconds). Most of the loopy hand vibrations I have
analyzed have occurred in movies or videos where the frame rate
is 10/sec to 30 /sec and the loops take several frames fo
complete.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 11:45:36 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:24:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:22:53 -0700
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

snip

>>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>>and less loopy-looking trails?

>It may not be appropriate to consider gravity a "restoring"
>force in this context, as it suggests that gravity tends to
>return the camera axis to the desired alignment. This would only
>hold in the case of a camera that is pointed straight down.

>Aside from that nit, I find plausible the idea that the
>'trajectory' of the camera aimpoint would differ in a free-fall
>environment, perhaps even to become more linear, as Martin
>suggests.

>If such was the case, it would not eliminate the 'bright spot'
>issue that Bruce alludes to, and indeed would exacerbate it. A
>human being would not be capable of hand-reversing the linear
>course of the camera at constant angular rate, and indeed this
>would be difficult even with mechanical assistance. It seems
>unavoidable that the linear segments in the image would have
>tell-tale brightened end points. But this is just what is seen
>in the fourth photo!

>So, it may be prudent to ask, what is the minimum time required
>for a human hand to execute three out-and-back linear 'jitters'
>of some tenths of a degree in angular width? And, is the
>corresponding shutter speed consistent with any plausible
>configuration of the camera at the time (lens size, f-stop, film
>speed, etc.)?

As I pointed out in another email, the loops and "whorls" I have
seen (where the hand reverses the vibration direction to
recenter the image) have occurred over the time of several
frames of a movie or video.

Typically any given frame (1/30 sec) or a still picture (1/60
sec or less) will have only a straight or a bent image (of a
distant light, for example).

The characteristic restore time (to bring the image back to
center) depends upon the person (who is holding the camera), how
he holds the camera and the mass and moment of inertia of the
camera.

All these things work together to make the hand vibration time many tens to hundreds of milliseconds, I would say from the experience of looking at numerous videos and movies. I have not tried to prove this by experiment. Of course, anyone is free to take a camera with 1/250 shutter time and take a picture of distant light - 'point source' - while trying to hold the camera steady.

My bet is that the image will be quite close to the actual shape of the object/light with no more than a slight smear in one direction... I won't try to predict which direction that would be!

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:47:30 -0400
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:31:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>[I think the final paragraph of this article is particularly
>>superfluous! - Joe]

>>Source: The Daily Mail London, UK

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

><snip>

>>Pilots' 'out-of-body experiences' responsible for more than a
>>quarter of fatal air crashes

><snip>

>Although this newspaper article does not have anything directly
>to do with UFOs, its very dubious claims could be used to
>discount pilots as reliable witnesses should they make a UFO
>sighting.

>This article may have had another mischievous disinformation
>goal in mind. One of the unrelated pictures included with this
>article was a picture of JFK Jr which had the following caption:
>"Victim of SD: The plane John F Kennedy Jr piloted crashed into
>the Atlantic Ocean". Oh really?

>I guess I was wrong in suspecting that certain powerful and evil
>people would do anything to prevent JFK Jr from running for
>President and also to prevent him from revealing very disturbing
>truths in the well researched and more credible articles
>published in his magazine 'George'. Also, JFK Jr was being urged
>by some to run for Senator in New York. He would probably have
>won easily thereby preventing Hillary Clinton from getting this
>position, a step in her ultimate goal of one day running for
>President herself.

>I forwarded this article to a pilot friend of mine with nearly
>25,000 hours of pilot time. This friend never thought he was
>sitting on the wing of an airplane or had any other spatial
>disorientation experiences, including during stressful periods
>while flying in poor weather.

>My pilot friend didn't think JFK Jr had an SD problem either.
>Although JFK Jr was an experienced and cautious pilot, and his
>aircraft was well equipped with instruments, my friend told me
>that he was flying nearby during that same time period JFK Jr's
>aircraft went down and remembers that the visibility was lousy.
>Also, having two women in the aircraft could well have caused an
>added distraction.

>In support of my suspicions of foul play, my pilot friend did
>say he heard a report that someone near the destination Kennedy
>was trying to reach, either heard an explosion, saw a flash of
>light through the haze above him, or both.

Bull pucky. Kennedy Jr. was a 300 hour pilot with no night rating let alone an instrument rating flying a 200mph Piper that he basically had about 100 hours of flight time on. He got behind it in haze over water at dusk while flying to Martha's Vinyard. He went into a spiral, lost a wing and impacted the water at 60mph - his Air Speed Indicator, ASI, showed "witness marks" on the instruments face at that speed. The wreck clearly showed there was no explosion. A large portion of one wing was found a good distance away indicating wing separation. He had the necessary instruments onboard to fly without a horizon as a reference but didn't have the training to do so.

Had he not waited around for his wife's sister to show up at the airport - she was something like 3 hours late - he would have been in a better position to see ground, in this case water, details and discern a horizon but he arrived off Martha's Vinyard at dusk and in haze.* He experienced spacial disorientation, and spiraled in hitting that water at about 60 miles an hour. His engine was still running when they hit.

This was a classic case of get-homeitis combined with spacial disorientation [SD] [the real kind, not the stuff spouted by the shrink from OZ]. Kennedy exceeded his limitations and the three of them paid for it.

For the record I've never had that sitting on the wing outside the cabin experience either and I've never heard of it. Kennedy was literally sitting on the wing in his Saratoga because the main spar passes right under the front seats.

Even at 25,000 hours for example no one can escape SD when the horizon is lost and there are no instruments to refer to.

Numerous tests have been carried out and the record for maintaining straight and level flight is about 30 seconds before the inner ear sends a false signal and the pilot corrects for some phantom input that didn't actually occur. Once pilots with experience and training lose the horizon they go on instruments referred to as Instrument Flight Rules [IFR] and fly "blind" as it was once known. Airline pilots get their clearances at controlled airports in IFR mode and stay that way regardless of the visibility throughout the flight. But if they lose those in weather and under IFR conditions they are in the same boat as was Kennedy. But Kennedy entered that condition voluntarily due to inexperience.

No conspiracy here just classic symptoms of inexperience, the time of day, no IFR training, his training was behind the airplane's capability [200mph] an urge to complete the mission, bad weather and SD. Most times it takes about three things piling up-it's called cascading events- to "get you", Kennedy had 7.

Don Ledger

* Haze-unlike fog or cloud - usually affects forward and horizontal visibility but not usually straight down as it tends to stay at a certain strata given weather and temperature. But at dusk even the ocean's surface was probably not visible to Kennedy.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 18:01:31 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:33:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 12:02:54 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:48:13 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>>>So if I have this right, Penniston confirmed that in his
>>>original statement he did say 50 meters was "the closest I got
>>>at any point", but now claims that he just "left out some
>>>details"? I find this difficult to square with the believably
>>>consistent picture painted by the original statements of all
>>>five people involved. That picture doesn't seem to me to be a
>>>result of just passively "leaving out details". These accounts
>>>imply a conspiracy to actively invent an interlocking false
>>>story - and one done in a very subtle fashion. Perhaps they
>>>were subtle people. But if they did this for the purpose of
>>>suppressing the embarrassing fact that they really saw a
>>>mechanical device at close quarters, why did Penniston shoot
>>>them all in the foot by claiming to have "positively
>>>identified" the lights as a mechanical device? I find it
>>>much easier to believe that these original statements are
>>>ingenuous. If there are good reasons not to think this,
>>>can you summarise what they are (other than Penniston's
>>>changed story I mean)? The relevant passages are quoted below
>>>for reference.

>><snip>

>>Some issues concerning the original witness statements are
>>examined in You Can't Tell The People. To give one example of
>>the problems with them, Edward Cabansag told Georgina Bruni
>>that he signed his statement without looking at it.

>The problem I am struggling with is precisely that I don't see
>any issues with the original statements, as they stand. They
>read very convincingly, to me. They saw some wierd display of
>blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-
>whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At
>that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were
>attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is
>with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they got
>right up close and actually touched this thing.

But the assertion in these original statements that they never
got closer than 50 metres is itself far from convincing. The
fact that Penniston's sketch of the object included symbols on
its side strongly suggested he must have been closer.

>The new story requires the original descriptions of all five
>direct and indirect witnesses to have been made up in collusion
>for motives of self-protection. But reading the subtly different
>versions of the event and the individual tones of voice in which
>they are couched I don't find this believable. Too subtle and
>too cunning a deception, which yet is ineffective in covering up
>the "positive identification" of a mechanical UFO which
>supposedly was the motive of the deception. That's why my
>suspicious antennae twitch uncontrollably.

>As I see it, faced with the fact that the original statement
>doesn't support the story he now wishes to be associated with,
>Cabansag tells us in his defence that he didn't read what he
>signed back then. In other words this claim implies that he had
>no idea what was typed above his signature, and therefore he
>can't be held responsible for its untruth. OK. But this would
>imply that he innocently thought he was signing a different and
>>true statement, and this is inconsistent with the theory that he
>told a lie for reasons of personal protection.

>Perhaps, then, his statement was fabricated by an unknown party,
>and like the others Cabansag knew he was signing a fabricated
>account but so trusted this other party to get it right on his
>behalf that he felt he didn't need to read it? But then the
>failure-to-read-before-signing defence becomes incongruous: If
>you'd always known it was fabricated, why would you plead that
>you didn't know what you were signing? This is then faux
>innocence and another level of deception.

>And this scenario conflicts with Penniston's recent confirmation
>that the statement ascribed to him is to the best of his
>recollection the statement he wrote - no one fabricated this
>account on his behalf. So perhaps it was he who coordinated or
>ghost-wrote the others' false statements then? But if so he
>failed spectacularly to follow the script and undermined the
>collective cover story by saying that he positively identified
>the object as a mechanical device when he should have stopped at
>the agreed story that they chased some lights.

>Well maybe this statement wasn't supposed to get used. Maybe it
>just slipped through unedited and talk of the machine was the
>one mistake in an otherwise carefully contrived ruse? But Sgt
>Chandler said exactly the same thing in his own statement and
>cited Penniston's real-time radio report as the source for it.
>The same report of a "definite mechanical object" was confirmed
>by Buran who testified to his conviction that Penniston had seen
>something "out of the realm of explanation". If there was
>collusion to suppress career-damaging admissions that they had
>seen an unknown mechanical device, why do Chandler's and Buran's
>stories exactly support Penniston's story of "positively
>identifying" an unknown mechanical device?

In relation to the description of what was seen, Chandler and
Buran's statements really only relay what they were told by
Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag, so we don't need a subtle and
cunning deception by five people. What we do need is either a
decision by three people to hold back some details of their
encounter until they had some indication of the official
reaction, or a decision by someone else to sanitize these three
statements, perhaps for the same reason. Neither possibility
seems too far-fetched.

>>Other issues that may have had a bearing on all this include
>>concern as to whether any USAF personnel had undertaken actions
>>contrary to the Status of Forces Agreement and concerns about
>>the fact that light beams were seen striking a certain area -
>>one of several details Charles Halt left out of his memo to the
>>MOD.

>We have been discussing the statements of Buran, Burroughs,
>Penniston, Chandler and Cabansag. Charles Halt's name does not
>come up in connection with this.

But he's central to this because he debriefed the witnesses and
ordered the statements to be taken. The fact that he too claims
he left out key details from his memo is also relevant.

>>The various witnesses saw and experienced different things and
>>reacted to them in different ways.

>Exactly so. The above statements are very convincing as

>independent accounts of the same real event for just this
>reason. They are not so convincing, to me, as an orchestrated
>fiction for the same reason. The deception seems far too subtle,
>much more so than simply "leaving out some details".

>>This, together with
>>variations in the subsequent debriefings (and the way in which
>>those concerned reacted to these debriefings), will also have
>>had a bearing on what went into the statements and what was
>>left out.

>Such speculations would work to mitigate problematic
>inconsistencies between testimonies. But it is not inconsistency
>that creates a problem here. Such inconsistency as there is
>seems very reasonable for independent accounts of the same
>event, for the reasons you mention. What creates a problem for
>the cover-story theory is the underlying common account so
>convincingly borne witness to. The story of all the direct
>witnesses, and also of Chandler, is that they approached to
>within a moderate distance (estimated by one witness as 50
>meters, a figure confirmed by Chandler as being the distance
>reported by radio at the time) of some strange coloured lights
>which Sgt Penniston was convinced were on a mechanical device
>but which then vanished.

>>I've discussed the Rendlesham Forest incident twice with Charles
>>Halt in the last month. It's clear to me that a decision was
>>taken to sanitize some of the accounts, with a view to raising
>>the more sensitive issues in the subsequent investigation, once
>>some indication of official reaction had been received. This
>>strategy was undermined by the fundamentally flawed nature of
>>the MoD's investigation.

>If, as suggested, Cabansag was "concerned for his career" and/or
>other nasty consequences because of adverse official reaction to
>his story I would have expected him to make sure he knew what he
>was signing.

Maybe. But he was a newly-qualified nineteen year old airman
being interviewed by a Lieutenant Colonel. He said he was
nervous and "in fear of Halt", so he may not have behaved as you
would expected.

>>I don't have any definitive answers here, but the full story of
>>the incident and what happened afterwards has yet to emerge.

>Whilst this is just a subjective opinion, I'm not convinced that
>the answer lies in further claims and speculations. I'll be
>pleased if you can challenge the above misgivings, and I
>certainly agree that the original case remains unresolved on the
>basis of information available. But I feel a cold dread creeping
>over me at the hint that I am expected to suspend judgment on
>the shortcomings of the case, pending yet another layer of
>revisionist disclosures and a "full story" yet to come, no doubt
>involving another book, documentary and/or press conference.

I would share your misgivings if resolution was promised in some
future commercial venture. My statement was meant to imply
nothing more than my opinion that there's information on this
incident that has yet to emerge.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming5.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:42:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 12:02:54 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:48:13 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion, but it appears that you're suggesting that the witnesses have been embellishing their story to such an extent that the "embellishments" should really be called outright lies. However, the Haut memo does seem to provide relevant corroboration to the more detailed stories:

"1. Early in the morning of 27 Dec 80 (approximately 0300L) two USAF security police patrolmen saw unusual lights outside the back gate at RAF Woodbridge. Thinking an aircraft might have crashed or been forced down, they called for permission to go outside the gate to investigate... The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest. The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape, approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high. It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath."

Clearly, what is being described here is much more than a "will o' the wisp". According to this memo, written in January 1981, somebody made a detailed report of a mechanical object of the type described much later by Penniston, but not described in any of the signed statements made by any of the witnesses at the time. Maybe there were embellishments made, intentionally or not, by the witnesses in later years, but Haut's memo seems to support the possibility that their signed statements might have been downplayed what they actually saw. If the detailed description of an unconventional machine in the middle of the forest was a fabrication made to sell books, it was a plot hatched less than a month after the alleged incident.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Origins Of The Grays

From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:48:51 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:45:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>From: Bert Reijersen van Buuren <bert.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 17:17:40 +0100
>Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:54:14 -0600
>>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>>>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
>>>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

<snip>

>I don't know how reliable the next webpage is but Lt Col P J
>Corso said that some aliens could spacetravel with the speed of
>one lightyear a minute.

>"Barney Hill - claimed to have been abducted by grey-
>skinned entities from a space craft which apparently originated
>from the Zeta II Reticuli star system.

>http://www.world-mysteries.com/sci_6.htm

>The Beginning

>"...Another figure has an evil face... 'he looks like a german
>nazi. he's A Nazi... his eyes! His eyes. I've never seen eyes
>like that before!!!"

>The above quote was made under regressive hypnosis by one of the
>first publicized 'UFO abductees', Barney Hill who - along with
>his wife Betty - claimed to have been abducted by grey-skinned
>entities from a space craft which apparently originated from the
>Zeta II Reticuli star system. The Grey alien abductors were
>obviously working with the human military officer who was
>encountered by Barney. This military officer was apparently a
>full-fledged Nazi, although this incident took place over 15
>years after Europe had 'supposedly' been de-Nazified. This quote
>can be found in the paranormal encyclopedia ,Mysteries Of The
>Mind, Time & Space, p. 1379.

This is good information and the exact kind of references I am
seeking. However, in the book Interrupted Journey, the author
John Fuller states that when Barney Hill was hypnotically
regressed the first time he thought he saw a Nazi but further
hypnotic exploration of the event indicated it was not a Nazi
but a "Gray". I don't remember a military officer being part of
the abduction in Fuller's account?

Thanks,

Frank

Re: Origins Of The Grays

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:11:55 -0600
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:47:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>This article may have had another mischievous disinformation
>goal in mind. One of the unrelated pictures included with this
>article was a picture of JFK Jr which had the following caption:
>"Victim of SD: The plane John F Kennedy Jr piloted crashed into
>the Atlantic Ocean". Oh really?

>I guess I was wrong in suspecting that certain powerful and evil
>people would do anything to prevent JFK Jr from running for
>President and also to prevent him from revealing very disturbing
>truths in the well researched and more credible articles
>published in his magazine 'George'. Also, JFK Jr was being urged
>by some to run for Senator in New York. He would probably have
>won easily thereby preventing Hillary Clinton from getting this
>position, a step in her ultimate goal of one day running for
>President herself.

It's precisely the sort of evidence - and logic - untainted
speculation expressed above that reminds me why I am not, nor
will I ever be, a conspiracy theorist.

It must be a nightmare to live in a mental universe where such
dark fantasies are mistaken for events occurring in the real
world, which is scary enough.

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Aliens Apart

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:38:18 -0500
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:49:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Aliens Apart

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 12:04:51 -0000
>Subject: Aliens Apart

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

><http://www.space.com/searchforlife/071206-seti-aliens-apart.html>

<snip>

>Or (2) we're missing some important physics permitting faster-
>than-light communication, and extraterrestrial signaling efforts
>don't include burping light and radio waves into space.

>Many readers will, in a display of endearing perversity, choose
>(2). Maybe they're right, but that flies in the face of what we
>know.

No, that flies in the face of what Western-science-corporate-culture declares, without valid evidence to back up the declaration, is accepted by that culture as "known".

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

My UFO Book And Journal Collection Must Go

From: Marc Davenport <marcdavenport1.nul>
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 0:01:24 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 08:01:05 -0500
Subject: My UFO Book And Journal Collection Must Go

I would be very grateful if you would pass this message along to everyone in your address book and post it far and wide

Due to failing health, I must sell the extensive personal collections of books, journals, magazines, and newsletters concerning UFOs and related subjects that I have spent a lifetime collecting.

They are listed in alphabetical order in the 4 files linked, below, which you should be able to D/L and open using any browser or word processor.

There are 256 books, including many rare and/or autographed volumes. There are 410 Journals, 67 commercially published magazines and 82 newsletters. Also included in the collection are some reports and individual articles that are not listed.

The fair market value for the entire collection is estimated conservatively at \$5,000 US.

Please e-mail me at marcdavenport1.nul with your offers.

I want this message to reach all serious collectors of UFO-related publications, so I appreciate your help with the 'chain-letter-type' e-mail.

I will be selling my audiotapes and videotapes at a later date, if and when I can sort them all out and make a list for you.

Thank you all very much for your help.

God bless you all for all the help you have given me during these past couple of difficult years.

Cordially,

Marc Davenport

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/ufoupdates/listers/20071206ufobooks.rtf>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/ufoupdates/listers/newsletters.rtf>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/ufoupdates/listers/journals.htm>

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/ufoupdates/listers/commercialmagazines.htm>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 21:01:53 -0000
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 08:05:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 18:01:31 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 12:02:54 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:48:13 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2007 16:49:55 -0000
>>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>>>So if I have this right, Penniston confirmed that in his
>>>>original statement he did say 50 meters was "the closest I
>>>>got at any point", but now claims that he just "left out some
>>>>details"? I find this difficult to square with the believably
>>>>consistent picture painted by the original statements of all
>>>>five people involved. That picture doesn't seem to me to be a
>>>>result of just passively "leaving out details". These accounts
>>>>imply a conspiracy to actively invent an interlocking false
>>>>story - and one done in a very subtle fashion. Perhaps they
>>>>were subtle people. But if they did this for the purpose of
>>>>suppressing the embarrassing fact that they really saw a
>>>>mechanical device at close quarters, why did Penniston shoot
>>>>them all in the foot by claiming to have "positively
>>>>identified" the lights as a mechanical device? I find it
>>>>much easier to believe that these original statements are
>>>>ingenuous. If there are good reasons not to think this,
>>>>can you summarise what they are (other than Penniston's
>>>>changed story I mean)? The relevant passages are quoted below
>>>>for reference.

>>>><snip>

>>>>Some issues concerning the original witness statements are
>>>>examined in You Can't Tell The People. To give one example of
>>>>the problems with them, Edward Cabansag told Georgina Bruni
>>>>that he signed his statement without looking at it.

>>The problem I am struggling with is precisely that I don't see
>>any issues with the original statements, as they stand. They
>>read very convincingly, to me. They saw some wierd display of
>>blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-
>>whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At
>>that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were
>>attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is
>>with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they
>>got right up close and actually touched this thing.

>But the assertion in these original statements that they never
>got closer than 50 metres is itself far from convincing.

I strongly disagree. I find this assertion, which is both explicitly stated and implicit as a strong structural feature of all the narratives, and which is expressed in credibly different ways by the participants, to be very convincing. I can see no internal evidence in conflict with it. But . . .

>The
>fact that Penniston's sketch of the object included symbols on
>its side strongly suggested he must have been closer.

This is new to me. Is it true that Penniston's original report included a sketch showing symbols on the object? (I only know of two diagrams, that show no such detail, but I admit my knowledge of the documents is scant.)

However, why would Penniston draw details of the object that "strongly suggested" he went up and touched an unknown machine, if the purpose of these fabricated accounts was to obfuscate the fact that they went up and touched an unknown machine?

Or perhaps the drawing doesn't suggest close proximity quite so "strongly" as all that, so that the dissemblers didn't think it was in conflict with their stories and let it go? If it doesn't, then maybe it is after all consistent with what Penniston thought he saw from 50 metres?

>>The new story requires the original descriptions of all five
>>direct and indirect witnesses to have been made up in collusion
>>for motives of self-protection. But reading the subtly different
>>versions of the event and the individual tones of voice in which
>>they are couched I don't find this believable. Too subtle and
>>too cunning a deception, which yet is ineffective in covering
>>up the "positive identification" of a mechanical UFO which
>>supposedly was the motive of the deception. That's why my
>>suspicious antennae twitch uncontrollably.

>>As I see it, faced with the fact that the original statement
>>doesn't support the story he now wishes to be associated with,
>>Cabansag tells us in his defence that he didn't read what he
>>signed back then. In other words this claim implies that he had
>>no idea what was typed above his signature, and therefore he
>>can't be held responsible for its untruth. OK. But this would
>>imply that he innocently thought he was signing a different and
>>>true statement, and this is inconsistent with the theory that
>>he told a lie for reasons of personal protection.

>>Perhaps, then, his statement was fabricated by an unknown party,
>>and like the others Cabansag knew he was signing a fabricated
>>account but so trusted this other party to get it right on his
>>behalf that he felt he didn't need to read it? But then the
>>failure-to-read-before-signing defence becomes incongruous: If
>>you'd always known it was fabricated, why would you plead that
>>you didn't know what you were signing? This is then faux
>>innocence and another level of deception.

>>And this scenario conflicts with Penniston's recent confirmation
>>that the statement ascribed to him is to the best of his
>>recollection the statement he wrote - no one fabricated this
>>account on his behalf. So perhaps it was he who coordinated or
>>ghost-wrote the others' false statements then? But if so he
>>failed spectacularly to follow the script and undermined the
>>collective cover story by saying that he positively identified
>>the object as a mechanical device when he should have stopped
>>at the agreed story that they chased some lights.

>>Well maybe this statement wasn't supposed to get used. Maybe it
>>just slipped through unedited and talk of the machine was the
>>one mistake in an otherwise carefully contrived ruse? But Sgt
>>Chandler said exactly the same thing in his own statement and
>>cited Penniston's real-time radio report as the source for it.
>>The same report of a "definite mechanical object" was confirmed
>>by Buran who testified to his conviction that Penniston had
>>seen something "out of the realm of explanation". If there was
>>collusion to suppress career-damaging admissions that they had
>>seen an unknown mechanical device, why do Chandler's and Buran's
>>stories exactly support Penniston's story of "positively
>>identifying" an unknown mechanical device?

>In relation to the description of what was seen, Chandler and
>Buran's statements really only relay what they were told by
>Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag, so we don't need a subtle
>and
>cunning deception by five people.

This rather gives added point to my previous argument. If
Chandler and Buran are to have been innocent victims of the
conspiracy rather than co-conspirators - so that we can
selectively believe their two contemporaneous statements to be
true, unlike those of the others - then this requires that the
decision to give false stories was cooked up in the forest at
the time, because Buran and Chandler report what they say
Penniston told them over the radio in real time, while the event
was happening. So before even finishing the chase they'd decided
not to tell anyone that they went right up and touched an
honest-to-god flying saucer, and agreed on the lie that they
only saw some lights from 50 meters. But then what happens? As
soon as they get to tell their story Penniston not only takes it
into his head to shoot their scheme in the foot by reporting
that, never mind, 50m was quite near enough to have positively
identified the object as a strange mechanical device, but he
also provides a drawing of (ex hypothesi) of details that he
could only have seen by close inspection. (Doh!)

>What we do need is either a
>decision by three people to hold back some details of their
>encounter until they had some indication of the official
>reaction, or a decision by someone else to sanitize these three
>statements, perhaps for the same reason. Neither possibility
>seems too far-fetched.

The former, apparently, unless we let Buran and Chandler back in
to the conspiracy, in which case we are back with (IMO) five
convincingly interlocking strands of the one plausible
narrative.

>>>Other issues that may have had a bearing on all this include
>>>concern as to whether any USAF personnel had undertaken actions
>>>contrary to the Status of Forces Agreement and concerns about
>>>the fact that light beams were seen striking a certain area -
>>>one of several details Charles Halt left out of his memo to
>>>the MoD.

>>We have been discussing the statements of Buran, Burroughs,
>>Penniston, Chandler and Cabansag. Charles Halt's name does not
>>come up in connection with this.

>But he's central to this because he debriefed the witnesses and
>ordered the statements to be taken. The fact that he too claims
>he left out key details from his memo is also relevant.

The fact that some (?) witnesses have elaborated their stories is
certainly relevant.

>>If, as suggested, Cabansag was "concerned for his career" and/or
>>other nasty consequences because of adverse official reaction
>>to his story I would have expected him to make sure he knew what
>>he was signing.

>Maybe. But he was a newly-qualified nineteen year old airman
>being interviewed by a Lieutenant Colonel. He said he was
>nervous and "in fear of Halt", so he may not have behaved as
>you would expected.

A nervous and raw recruit did well to convincingly tell this
fearsome Colonel the lie that Penniston, Burroughs and he must
have decided on back in the forest. Well, maybe he did well
because Halt was (as you imply) actually in on it, maybe even
encouraged them, helped him polish the story? But then why would
he have been "in fear" of Halt? That would imply he was
instructed to make this statement unwillingly, being forced or
intimidated by Halt to follow the part line. Is this what he has
claimed?

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Edward Condon

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 16:08:31 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:40:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 13:26:09 -0400
>Subject: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?]

>>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:12:50 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2007 20:39:40 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?

Hello Don and List,

[Oops! Sorry for the delay in my reply. I wrote something, thought I had sent it, ! but when I checked my "sent box" I had not. Here's another try.]

<snip>

>>>Lots more than just this, and released in the 70's, but it would
>>>require an in-depth investigation of CIA organization and >history to

>>understand it, beginning with the fact the CIA is not >a monolithic
>>agency speaking and acting with one voice. Most UFO >researchers
>>cannot even keep up with the polarized 'covert' and >'overt' sides of
>>the CIA, so everything that is 'CIA' is >automatically attributed to
>>spook assassins and James Bond >types.

>><snip>

>>I am talking about human nature, you're talking about The
>>Company.

>><snip>

>What do you both think of Condon's possibly being compliant
>after his roughing up by the House Un-American Activities
>Committee? He got off but who stepped up to get him out of that
>mess?

<snip>

Condon had worked for the Manhattan Project and had to resign
after six weeks because of a conflict with General Leslie Groves
over security measures and the living conditions. At the end of
the War he became director of the National Bureau of Standards.

In 1948, he had some problems with the House Committee on Un-
American Activities. Condon was a liberal who preached the
internationalism of science and world peace based on mutual
understanding.

Harry S. Truman himself came to his help and got him out of the
jam.

But Condon suffered most of his career from his stance on scientific freedom. That prevented him from getting permanent status at New York and Pennsylvania universities in 1955. There is a very interesting article about him at:

<http://www.physicstoday.org/pt/vol-54/iss-12/p35.html>

It seems that most of his career, Condon had his security clearance revoked, then restored, the revoked, then...

This link brings! us to the Colorado University in a funny way:

<http://library.wustl.edu/units/spec/exhibits/crow/condonbio.html>

By Lewis M. Branscomb:

"On October 1954, Condon's Navy clearance was again re-established in connection with government contract research at Corning. When the clearance was dramatically suspended by intervention of the Secretary of the Navy, the press reported that Vice President Nixon, a former member of HUAC, implied in campaign speeches that he had requested the suspension.

Ten years later, after Condon had taught at Oberlin two years and at Washington University for seven, he moved to Boulder, Colorado, as professor of physics and fellow of the Joint Institute for Laboratory Astrophysics. His security clearance was quietly restored, clearing his record once again."

Just in time to direct the University of Colorado Project?

Jerome Clark (UFO Book, p. 593) states that in 1966, following the 1965 nationwide UFO flap, six scientists urged the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board to investigate selected sightings applying scientific methods. Carl Sagan was the only scientist in the group not to be associated with the AFSAB. A note: Sagan was a former student of Edward Condon.

Then follow the Congressional Hearings, Hynek's proposal of a thorough study, and the opportunity for the Air Force to get off the hook by passing the buck to some University study.

The problem was that nobody wanted to touch the subject with a ten foot pole:

"Harvard University, the [MIT], the University of North Carolina, and the University of California all declined the invitation. None wanted to involve itself with a subject so controversial - worse, disreputable - as UFOs." [Clark, p. 593].

A little more of this before a reluctant Condon finally accepted the task.

We all know what happened after that. Condon became one of the worst debunkers in history. Clark, ! pp597-598:

"... At one point, Hall flew to Boulder and personally handed Condon a comprehensive report on NICAP's investigation of the Portage County sightings, an extraordinary multiple-witness case in Ohio, involving a two-state police-car chase of a large low-flying UFO. Much later Hall came to realize that Condon had paid no attention to the document. The case would not even be mentioned in the committee's final report.

"The only thing that did interest Condon was the crackpot contingent of the saucer world. On June 20, the (sic) openly expressed displeasure of all staff members notwithstanding, he attended the cartoonish 'Congress of Scientific Ufologists' in New York City. He regaled scientific colleagues and lecture audiences with tales of contactees and other eccentrics. He even dispatched field investigators to sites where contactees had predicted landings."

This is entirely out of character for Condon! . He was a better person than that:

"What kind of man was he? Grace Marmor Spruch's profile in Saturday Review (1 February 1969) says it well:

"The composite Condon is a moral, impassioned man, with a depth

of concern for mankind not common in scientists; a man fiercely principled and anti diplomatic; a man who believes and feels in sharp contrasts, and who will let the world know his position without ambiguity. Fuzzimindedness is an anathema to him and he insists on saying so at every opportunity. But this rasping trait is wedded to an extreme generosity and kindness. Throughout his life he has given freely of his time, his counsel, his finances, and his home." "

<http://library.wustl.edu/units/spec/exhibits/crow/condonbio.html>

Even Hynek had the highest respect for the man. Clark, p605:

"[Hynek:] It! is unfortunate that, almost certainly, popular history will henceforth link Dr. Condon's name with UFOs, and only the arcane history of physics will accord him his true place and record his brilliant career in contributing to the understanding . . . of the nature of the physical world. These contributions UFOs cannot take away from him, even though his work with this problem is analogous to that of Mozart producing an uninspired pot-boiler, unworthy of his talents.

Even Hynek saw Condon's attitude as out of character.

Speculations: Condon was coerced(?), manipulated(?) or convinced(?).

Was Condon a 62 year old man tired of being accounted for his opinions and moral stance? Was he looking for relief? Redemption?

What about what Bruce Maccabee mentioned lately: as much as we want the UFO enigma solved, maybe we would regret the answer? But did the CIA ever have the answer, and, if it did, would it give it t! o Condon?

Nobody wanted the study on UFOs. Condon was reluctant to take it.

To answer your question Don, I do not think he owed anybody anything. Whatever the reason, the real Edward Condon wouldn't have chosen tabloids over NICAP unless he had a good reason to do so.

His almost frantic behavior indicates that he was experiencing a deep conflict between his convictions and his obligations.

This Mozart produced an uninspired pot-boiler because he was forced to do so and he suffered in the process.

Lewis M. Branscomb summarizes:

"Watergate came as no surprise to Edward Condon, nor did its aftermath. I imagine he would like to have lived to see the outcome of the impeachment inquiry. But Condon understood and paid his share of the price of liberty. Somehow his idealism, his sense of humor and his inexhaustible energy made his relentless quest for a better world look like optimism. He was elected president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science du! ring the height of his troubles with HUAC. He was president of the society for Social Responsibility in Science (1968-69) and was co-chairman of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (1970). He was appropriately honored on his retirement from JILA and the University of Colorado in the summer of 1970 by the volume edited by Brittin and Odabasi. Brittin relates a comment about Condon by E. Bright Wilson: 'Sometimes I think he looks for trouble', Wilson said. Condon's reply: 'It's not hard to find.'"

It seems that, after his Committee on UFOs, Condon had it easy.

I would like to add a last thought.

Whatever Condon did, it only gave an alibi for lots of people to further ridicule the UFO phenomenon.

Demonizing Condon for his work on UFOs is the easiest - and cheapest - way to avoid the real issues.

Official Science [whatever that may be] and the governments were all too happy to join the bandwa! gon and to banish UFOs into

the fringe.

The Condon report served only as an excuse for those culprits to forfeit their duties and obligations. I was going to use the expression "those shameless cowards."

The aforementioned are still "going at it", as shamelessly and as cowardly.

Times have changed: Condon was going at saucer parties, now the boys must be into lap dancing.

Doing the same: denying the evidence, looking away.

On purpose.

Condon had an excuse.

What is theirs?

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 16:09:41 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:42:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 18:01:31 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>I would share your misgivings if resolution was promised in
>some future commercial venture. My statement was meant to imply
>nothing more than my opinion that there's information on this
>incident that has yet to emerge.

I'd like more information on what Sgt. Penniston meant by "a cloth surface" and "light that shined through the cloth surface", or words close to those. It seemed to differ not only with other sightings which all report metallic surfaces (or at least hard, smooth surfaces) from what reports I've heard and read, but also seems odd that hypersonic vehicles would be cloth covered.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Frequent CE Factor

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 18:24:20 -0400
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:44:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Frequent CE Factor

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:38:06 -0000
>Subject: Frequent CE Factor [was: NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data]

>>Source: The Chicago Tribune - Illinois, USA
>><http://tinyurl.com/36gxnt>
>>NASA To Probe Self For UFO Data

>>KECKSBURG, Pa. - The U.S. government says nothing of note
>>happened in this small town in the hills of southwestern
>>Pennsylvania at 4:47 p.m. on Dec. 9, 1965.

><snip>

>>Still, Bill Bulebush, 82, says he knows what he saw, heard and
>>smelled ...

>>"I looked up and saw it flying overhead and it was sizzling,"
>>said Bulebush, a retired truck driver. "I found it in the woods
>>down there [in a valley] and I got to it 15 to 20 minutes after
>>it landed. I saw it 10 to 15 feet away from behind a big tree -
>>because I was worried it might blow up - and it smelled like
>>sulfur or rotten eggs and was shaped like a huge acorn, about
>>the size of a VW."

>Once again we've got 'sulfur or rotten eggs' smell during a CE
>report.

>And most of these early reports come from folk who couldn't have
>known that we'd only now be correlating similar descriptions from
>incidents going way back, some even in ancient history.

Hi Ray,

There was mention made of an odor of sulfur while the searchers
were out on the water and plowing through the foam in the Sound
off Shag Harbour while searching for survivors - or less
fortunates - of what they thought was an airplane crash.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:24:20 -0000
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:45:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion,
Fair enough, but you're missing the point.

>but it appears that you're suggesting that the witnesses have
>been embellishing their story to such an extent that the
>"embellishments" should really be called outright lies. However,
>the Haut memo does seem to provide relevant corroboration to
>the more detailed stories:

Indeed Halt's memo does re-emphasise the Penniston, Buran and
Chandler story of positively identifying a "mechanical device",
an object also drawn by Burroughs as a "triangular" body bearing
blue and red lights.

The claim now is that they "left out" the detail of actually
touching it because they feared for their careers and so all
conspired to claim falsely that 50 meters was as close as they
got. But the difference, in terms of career damage, between
reporting that you have "positively identified" an object as a
mechanical device "out of the realm of explanation" from 50
meters away, and reporting that you have so identified it from 1
meter away, seems to me to be an overly sophisticated one that
could never reasonably have been expected to serve as a sensible
defence.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:36:03 -0800
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:47:19 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 15:08:15 -0600
>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:44:59 +0000
>>>Subject: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>This to Bruce Maccabee: I know you've been counting, so
>>perhaps
>>you can answer this question: What number explanation is this
>>for the Arnold sighting? Are we in three figures by now?

>As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
>Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
>explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
>that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
>if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

>This 'explanation' merely specifies the type of aircraft.

>So If Hynek's explanation is #1A, this is #1B.

So let's add to the list. Here's an article I stumbled across
from the Hood River News, Hood River, Oregon, Friday, July 18,
1947. In it a witness claims to have viewed through binoculars a
large plane "mothering" several smaller planes. Hood River is
about 30 miles due south of Mt. Adams, where Arnold said he saw
his objects disappear.

"Flying Saucers" Proved to Be Small, Fast Planes

Several residents of Hood River Valley, shortly after 7 p.m.
Wednesday [July 16], thought that at last they had definitely
seen "flying saucers" when they noticed a group of flashing
objects traveling swiftly from east to west high in the air of
the middle valley. A few seconds later, a few noticed a large
plane, behind and above the flashing objects.

Willis (Doc.) Eby, his wife and daughter, and the editor of the
News apparently saw them about the same moment, and the latter
[News editor] turned a pair of glasses on the flashing objects,
only to discover that they were small planes, five of them,
traveling at high speed, and apparently "mothered" by a large
plane above and behind them. Had the high-powered glasses not
been available to identify the objects, it is probable that
another "flying saucers" story would have been written, and two
more local people would have been inline to be accused of
"seeing things," for, at first glance, they could have accepted
as flying saucers.

The army now reports it is experimenting with small planes to take off from the bomb bay of a four-moted giant plane, while the navy has been using radio-controlled "drone" planes for several years. Which of these were seen Wednesday evening, by at least five valley residents is not known.

This has some elements of Arnold's story in it. There were multiple flashing objects (six instead of Arnold's nine), with one of them being larger than the others (Arnold's one crescent-shaped object). Supposedly they were traveling at "high speed", whatever that means for conventional airplanes, presumably less than 400 mph.

Beyond that, one runs into problems matching details. If the objects were flying several times slower than Arnold's calculated speed of at least 1200 mph (if not 1700 mph), then their distance would likewise have to be scaled several times closer. Why is it then that these witnesses had no problems identifying the large "mother" plane whereas a highly experienced pilot like Arnold could not, even after intensely scrutinizing the objects for 2 to 3 minutes? Arnold, e.g., had no problems seeing and identifying a DC-4 in the air at the time which he estimated to be 15 miles away, but a plane 2 or 3 times closer he could not identify as a plane. That makes no sense.

Although the objects in the story are all identified as "planes", there are no details as to what they looked like, such as having wings, tails, engines, etc. So were they really "planes"? Did the news editor looking through binoculars really do that or accurately report what he had seen? Maybe he was just a 1947 skeptic looking to debunk the saucer sightings.

There is also nothing like Arnold's single-file, reverse-echelon formation with well-coordinated flying such that they appeared to weave like the tail of a kite. How and why did they do that if they were conventional "planes".

I remember reading a newspaper article from a year later about plans to build a mother plane carrying several smaller planes, but I'm unaware that such a project ever got off the ground. I seriously doubt it was around in 1947. Maybe the aviation experts here know more.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 19:08:05 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:02:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:47:30 -0400
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>>>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>[I think the final paragraph of this article is particularly
>>>superfluous! - Joe]

>>>Source: The Daily Mail London, UK

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

<snip>

>>>Pilots' 'out-of-body experiences' responsible for more than a
>>>quarter of fatal air crashes

<snip>

>>My pilot friend didn't think JFK Jr had an SD problem either.
>>Although JFK Jr was an experienced and cautious pilot, and his
>>aircraft was well equipped with instruments, my friend told me
>>that he was flying nearby during that same time period JFK Jr's
>>aircraft went down and remembers that the visibility was lousy.
>>Also, having two women in the aircraft could well have caused an
>>added distraction.

>>In support of my suspicions of foul play, my pilot friend did
>>say he heard a report that someone near the destination Kennedy
>>was trying to reach, either heard an explosion, saw a flash of
>>light through the haze above him, or both.

>Bull pucky. Kennedy Jr. was a 300 hour pilot with no night
>rating let alone an instrument rating flying a 200mph Piper that
>he basically had about 100 hours of flight time on. He got
>behind it in haze over water at dusk while flying to Martha's
>Vinyard. He went into a spiral, lost a wing and impacted the
>water at 60mph - his Air Speed Indicator, ASI, showed "witness
>marks" on the instruments face at that speed. The wreck clearly
>showed there was no explosion. A large portion of one wing was
>found a good distance away indicating wing separation. He had
>the necessary instruments onboard to fly without a horizon as a
>reference but didn't have the training to do so.

<snip>

>No conspiracy here just classic symptoms of inexperience, the
>time of day, no IFR training, his training was behind the
>airplane's capabilitiy [200mph] an urge to complete the mission,

>bad weather and SD. Most times it takes about three things piling
>up - it's called cascading events - to "get you", Kennedy had 7.

Bullpucky, not! In WWII the allied pilots and flight crews that flew the large bombers loaded to capacity with bombs to distant targets they never visited or even heard of before, often under the cover of darkness and clouds, didn't have much more actual flying experience than Kennedy Jr had.

When I was learning to fly in a Cessna 172, my instructor put the plane in a spin and a spiral so that I could distinguish between the two and be able to recover from them. When I expressed concerns that such violent moves may rip the plane's wings off, my instructor, who also did aerobatics, reassured me that this was impossible. Of course if my wing support strut was tampered with, this would explain why JFK Jr's wing was found a good distance away as you say.

According to another interpretation of what happened that is based on witness testimony, not like yours which is based simply on the official account (and we know just how unreliable these can be when it comes to UFO incidents!) there apparently was an explosion. A reporter for the Vineyard Gazette newspaper told WCVB-TV in Boston that he was out walking Friday night about the time of the crash and saw "big white flash in the sky" off Philbin Beach (see URL below).

http://whatreallyhappened.com/RANCHO/CRASH/JFK_JR/upi.html

According to this same URL, visibility at the time was reported to be 8 miles, clear enough to fly without instruments. If these claims are correct, then it could not have been any one of your 7 things - or all of them combined - that led to this fatal crash (which I suspect was an assassination of another Kennedy and another attack on freedom in America).

Ignoring or discounting any eyewitness testimony because it conflicts with the official account does not help in our search for the truth but it does serve the goals of debunkers who don't want us to give further attention to something important, such as UFOs and other cover-ups.

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 17:46:21 -0800
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:04:10 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 17:13:21 -0500
>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 10:49:27 -0800
>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 00:51:04 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

<snip>

>>>As I pointed out in my earlier email response directly to
>>>Rimmer, I consider this to be a variant of the Hynek
>>>explanation: Hynek didn't specify the type of aircraft, just
>>>that it was a large aircraft about 6 miles in front of Arnold,
>>>if I recall correctly (and flying about 400 mph).

>>Hynek's, incorrect, argument was that according to his incorrect
>>calculation based on Arnold's description, the objects would
>>have been over 2000 feet long, which he deemed impossible.

>>Hynek was off by at least a factor of 5-10, as I have explained
>>previously on the List, based on his misunderstanding of how
>>human visual acuity is measured.

>This is also discussed in the article at my web site.

Quite right--"Science still in default".

>>So Hynek instead proposed jet planes maybe 6 miles away instead
>>of Arnold's 23. Does anybody see the second flaw in his argument?

>>All Hynek did was bring his giant objects about 4 times closer,
>>which would scale them 4 times smaller. So instead of objects
>>over 2000 feet long, we would have "jet fighters" over 500 feet
>>long. That's still a trifle big. This is pretty elementary
>>stuff, yet Hynek never seems to have seen the obvious
>>absurdity
>>of his argument. He was still dismissing the Arnold sighting
>>even after his Bluebook days.

As you mention in your article, the fact that Hynek (and also
Menzel with his 6 different "explanations") could get away with
such obvious tripe without comment from the scientific community
is an indication of the prejudice of the scientific community
against the subject. Thus Maccabee's first rule of debunkery:
any explanation, no matter how stupid, is better than none.

>And no self-respecting bomber would "flip and flash in the
>sunlight"

Another argument used by Hynek (and others) against the ETH,
namely UFOs don't behave rationally enough by his/their personal

standards to be extraterrestrial.

I once had a personal encounter with two jet fighters in the Mohave Desert where the pilots buzzed our car, passing maybe only 50 feet over our heads at near supersonic speed. Was that "rationale"? Maybe it was for two 20-year old jet-jockeys who decided to have a little fun with us, potentially putting both their and our lives in jeopardy. I bet they broke a whole batch of regulations in the process.

Acting "irrationally" can actually be very rational if the point is to play with somebody's head and confuse them as to your intentions, Hamlet pretending to be mad to cite but one example. Or it can be done for fun or demonstration purposes: "Let's put on a show for the primitive primates."

David "rationally irrational" Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Sighting Draws UFO Research

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:09:00 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:09:00 -0500
Subject: Sighting Draws UFO Research

Source: The Albany Democrat-Herald - Oregon, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2dnz3z>

Monday, December 10, 2007

Sighting Draws UFO Research

by Ellen Ast
Albany Democrat-Herald

LACOMB =97 One clear evening last September, Raye and Derral Laufer spotted what they thought were strange objects in the sky above their home on Moran Lane in Lacombe.

They reported the incident to the National UFO Reporting Center, and the Democrat-Herald reported on their experience in October.

Since then, Raye has heard from about 100 people who have seen strange things in the sky, and a few saw what she and her husband did: Two silver, bullet-shaped objects heading across the sky and a glowing ellipse size of a Greyhound bus that hovered for about a minute above the treetops of their forested backyard and emitted sparks.

One caller was upset that the couple didn't take any pictures. The Democrat-Herald touched base with Raye again last week.

"I'll never get to the bottom of this," she said. "I'll never get answers."

Three members of the Mutual UFO Network, known as MUFON, visited the Laufers early last month from its headquarters in Bellvue, Colo., and spent most of a Sunday afternoon scouting their backyard with equipment for remains of the craft the Laufers saw.

"They walked the property, wrote reports, wrote down stuff, picked up stuff," Laufer said. After heading to Albany for lunch, they returned to her home and stayed there until about 10 p.m.

"We drew the pictures of what we'd seen and they took pictures," Laufer added.

The Laufers and the MUFON group talked about sightings and spirituality. Raye and her husband of 19 years were raised Baptist. Raye, 50, said she always figured the universe was large enough to support other life but wasn't concerned about proving it.

The Laufers moved two years ago to their home about five miles outside Lacombe from Lebanon, where they lived for 13 years. Both were raised in Eugene and have three grown children from prior marriages. Derral has worked for 13 years as an auto technician at a Corvallis car dealership.

Raye TiVos programs about unidentified flying objects and researches them on the Internet. She's learned about an Oregon UFO Festival held each May at the Hotel Oregon McMenemy's in McMinnville. She said she plans to attend with her daughter and a friend.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Aliens Apart

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:18:01 -0400
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:12:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Aliens Apart

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 15:38:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Aliens Apart

>>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 12:04:51 -0000
>>Subject: Aliens Apart

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

>><http://www.space.com/searchforlife/071206-seti-aliens-apart.html>

><snip>

>Or (2) we're missing some important physics permitting faster-
>than-light communication, and extraterrestrial signaling
>efforts don't include burping light and radio waves into space.

>Many readers will, in a display of endearing perversity, choose
>(2). Maybe they're right, but that flies in the face of what we
>know.

>No, that flies in the face of what Western-science-corporate-
>culture declares, without valid evidence to back up the
>declaration, is accepted by that culture as "known".

This is really silly stuff. Suddenly Seth knows where the
civilizations are! Hundreds of light years indeed.

There are roughly 2000 stars within 54 light years of which at
least 50 are similar to the sun. That means that within roughly
100 light years there are about 16000 stars and within 200 LY
about 128,000.

We have already found, despite the very crude techniques, 250
exoplanets. Why not worry about zeta 1 and Zeta 2 Reticuli,
both sunlike stars, 39.2 ly from here but only 1/8th of a light
year apart from each other and a cool billion years older than
the sun?

Zeta Reticulans probably know much more than we and are
certainly not using radio systems like ours for communication.

I worked on fusion rockets providing 10 million times as much
energy per particle as in a chemical rocket. I doubt if Seth
Shostak is still using a slide rule and vacuum tubes. He
certainly justifies my saying that SETI stands for Silly Effort
To Investigate.

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Origins Of The Grays

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:21:25 -0400
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:15:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>From: Bert Reijersen van Buuren <bert.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 17:17:40 +0100
>Subject: Re: Origins Of The Grays

>>From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:54:14 -0600
>>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>>>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:41:49 -0500 (EST)
>>>Subject: Origins Of The Grays

>><snip>

>>>However, I am looking for specific references about the creation of
>>>Grays. For example, in Fowler's book, The Watchers, Betty Andreasson
>>>Luca describes assisting a woman giving birth during an abduction. She
>>>witnesses a Gray perform a circumcision of the eyelids of a fetus
>>>delivered from a human abductee.

>>>There is enough tissue cut away from the eyes to expose the entire
>>>eyeball and then the fetus is placed in a tank after having needles
>>>put in it's head and ears. Presumably the needles provide stimulation
>>>or nourishment. Anyway, to further the supposition the child would
>>>have looked very human before having its eyes lids removed. Of course
>>>stimulating the cranium could cause the brain and skull to grow. Poof,
>>>a human is converted to a Gray but not with only genetic manipulation
>>>but by technology and alteration of the development process.

>>>Any reference assistance or comments with would be greatly
>>>appreciated.

>>>This may or may not mean anything, but I have never personally
>>>witnessed anything like this during any of my experiences.
>>>That's not to say that Betty didn't. I just don't know how common this
>>>is. I read about something similar in the manuscript version of
>>>"Rachel's Eyes," but it was in a different context, and also something
>>>I'd not seen during any of my experiences. In addition, I've been in
>>>contact with and have gotten to know many abductees over the past 20
>>>years and I've never heard of anything like this from them either.

>>>So, if this is in fact something a particular group of Greys are doing,
>>>I do not believe it is common. Personally, I have a difficult time
>>>discerning what the medical reason for a lid circumcision would be - or
>>>what benefit it would serve.

>>>In addition, I have seen eyelids on different types of Greys as well as
>>>hybrids. They do have eyelids and I have seen them close their eyes
>>>and/or blink many times.

>>>I hope this information helps.

>>>I don't know how reliable the next webpage is but Lt Col P J
>>>Corso said that some aliens could spacetravel with the speed of
>>>one lightyear a minute.

>"Barney Hill - claimed to have been abducted by grey-
>skinned entities from a space craft which apparently originated
>from the Zeta II Reticuli star system.

>http://www.world-mysteries.com/sci_6.htm

>The Beginning

>"...Another figure has an evil face... 'he looks like a german
>nazi. he's A Nazi... his eyes! His eyes. I've never seen eyes
>like that before!!!"

>The above quote was made under regressive hypnosis by one of the
>first publicized 'UFO abductees', Barney Hill who - along with
>his wife Betty - claimed to have been abducted by grey-skinned
>entities from a space craft which apparently originated from the
>Zeta II Reticuli star system. The Grey alien abductors were
>obviously working with the human military officer who was
>encountered by Barney. This military officer was apparently a
>full-fledged Nazi, although this incident took place over 15
>years after Europe had 'supposedly' been de-Nazified. This quote
>can be found in the paranormal encyclopedia ,Mysteries Of The
>Mind, Time & Space, p. 1379.

Sorry but Barney was reliving his thoughts at the Time. There
was no Nazi.

Check out the text of Captured! The Betty And Barney Hill
Story (2007) by myself and Kathleen Marden, Betty's niece who
has all the tapes and correspondence.

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 21:32:42 EST
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:16:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 11:45:36 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 12:22:53 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2007 14:57:39 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>>>Just a thought: Is it possible that the characteristic looping
>>>returns of the light trail in normal camera jitter are partly
>>>due to gravity? In free fall there is no restoring force, so
>>>excursions of the camera off-axis will perhaps not be self-
>>>correcting in quite the same way. Could this lead to more linear
>>>and less loopy-looking trails?

<snip>

>>If such was the case, it would not eliminate the 'bright spot'
>>issue that Bruce alludes to, and indeed would exacerbate it. A
>>human being would not be capable of hand-reversing the linear
>>course of the camera at constant angular rate, and indeed this
>>would be difficult even with mechanical assistance. It seems
>>unavoidable that the linear segments in the image would have
>>tell-tale brightened end points. But this is just what is seen
>>in the fourth photo!

>>So, it may be prudent to ask, what is the minimum time required
>>for a human hand to execute three out-and-back linear 'jitters'
>>of some tenths of a degree in angular width? And, is the
>>corresponding shutter speed consistent with any plausible
>>configuration of the camera at the time (lens size, f-stop, film
>>speed, etc.)?

>As I pointed out in another email, the loops and "whorls" I have
>seen (where the hand reverses the vibration direction to
>recenter the image) have occurred over the time of several
>frames of a movie or video.

>Typically any given frame (1/30 sec) or a still picture (1/60
>sec or less) will have only a straight or a bent image (of a
>distant light, for example).

>The characteristic restore time (to bring the image back to
>center) depends upon the person (who is holding the camera), how
>he holds the camera and the mass and moment of inertia of the
>camera.

>All these things work together to make the hand vibration time
>many tens to hundreds of milliseconds, I would say from the
>experience of looking at numerous videos and movies. I have not

>tried to prove this by experiment. Of course, anyone is free to
>take a camera with 1/250 shutter time and take a picture of
>distant light - 'point source' - while trying to hold the camera
>steady.

>My bet is that the image will be quite close to the actual shape
>of the object/light with no more than a slight smear in one
>direction... I won't try to predict which direction that would
>be!

As I calculated for a previous posting, if the camera smeared a
single dot image into a nearly 1 mm Y-shape image and if the
exposure setting was 1/500 second then the camera would have had
to move at roughly 500 mm per second or roughly 1 ft/sec and it
would have to stop and reverse motion perfectly in the opposite
direction at 1 ft/sec back down one branch of the crooked Y-
shape then go back up the other branch at about 1 ft/sec.

For comparison with a known and widely available example of
handheld photography there is the famous Zapruder film of the
JFK assassination. In the stabilized version one can see and the
handheld motion from frame to frame and it is no more than about
1 mm per frame and usually only about 0.2 mm per frame.

At about 18.3 frames per second this is at most only about 18 mm
per second camera velocity, not even close to the Skylab 3
photo, assuming the fourth photo is blurred due to camera
motion, and that it is on the order of about 500 mm per second
camera motion. Thus about a 1/18 second exposure is long enough
to capture a 1-mm camera jitter blur of an object, but not a
1/500 or 1/250 second exposure, in which case the jitter would
be 10 to 30 times too small to explain the fourth Skylab 3
photo.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 00:01:46 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:17:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:11:55 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>>>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>This article may have had another mischievous disinformation
>>goal in mind. One of the unrelated pictures included with this
>>article was a picture of JFK Jr which had the following caption:
>>"Victim of SD: The plane John F Kennedy Jr piloted crashed into
>>the Atlantic Ocean". Oh really?

>>I guess I was wrong in suspecting that certain powerful and evil
>>people would do anything to prevent JFK Jr from running for
>>President and also to prevent him from revealing very disturbing
>>truths in the well researched and more credible articles
>>published in his magazine 'George'. Also, JFK Jr was being urged
>>by some to run for Senator in New York. He would probably have
>>won easily thereby preventing Hillary Clinton from getting this
>>position, a step in her ultimate goal of one day running for
>>President herself.

>It's precisely the sort of evidence - and logic - untainted
>speculation expressed above that reminds me why I am not, nor
>will I ever be, a conspiracy theorist.

>It must be a nightmare to live in a mental universe where such
>dark fantasies are mistaken for events occurring in the real
>world, which is scary enough.

The real world is scarier - and more exciting (at least to me) -
than we can even imagine or ever hope to fully understand.

Thanks to three faithful priests from Persia and some shepherds
near Bethlehem that witnessed his arrival by following a UFO and
together with the Egyptians in northeast Africa that gave refuge
to this fugitive and the protection given to him by angels (or
ETs?), the Christmas conspiracy is one of the biggest of them
all.

With over 6 billion people on this planet, each with the ability
or potential to change the world (just like a carpenter's son
did two thousand years ago), anything is possible, really.

What is reality or accepted truth depends on who is interpreting
it. Conspiracy theories to you may be dark fantasies that live
in our minds but to others, such as the many lawyer graduates
where I work, these conspiracies are dark secrets that they will
expose in court - a multibillion dollar industry for something
that you feel has no basis in fact.

To dismiss or ignore something outright because you consider it too improbable to be true or because it conflicts with your view of reality is a mistake, especially by a scholar like yourself.

<http://tinyurl.com/ypnndx>

I still can't understand what that picture of John F Kennedy Jr (or the picture of an China Airlines passenger jet parked at the airport that's on fire) had to do with spatial disorientation or 'out-of-body experiences' newspaper article other than to scare the public or to explain away some widely held truth (eg. JFK Jr was assassinated or that UFO sightings made by pilots cannot be taken too seriously - especially since pilots sometimes feel they are sitting on the wing of the aircraft they are flying, even without the influence of alcohol or medication!

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

The Tenacity Of An Old System

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:22:34 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:22:34 -0500
Subject: The Tenacity Of An Old System

Source: Billy Cox's Blog|Devoid - Sarasota, Florida

<http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

Monday, December 10, 2007, 1:17 pm

The Tenacity Of An Old System
By Billy Cox

If the mainstream media ever develop the chops for it, the Coalition for Freedom of Information's lobbying efforts to get the feds to sponsor a new UFO investigation could produce great copy.

Retired generals from the air forces of Russia, Belgium, Chile, Iran and France were among the 19 signatories last month to the "International Declaration to the U.S. Government," which calls on Uncle Sam to cooperate with them in their more public UFO efforts.

"If America acknowledged there was something worth investigating," says journalist Leslie Kean of the coalition, "it would encourage more people to get involved, and it could have a huge effect (on) other countries."

The declaration proposes that NASA or the USAF conduct the studies. Kean says, "We're not talking about a repeat of Project Blue Book." But this is where it gets interesting.

Nearly 40 years after leaving his beloved Air Force, Bill Coleman still bristles over the scalding broadsides of Blue Book. "They need to stop calling us liars," he says. "You're not going to make any headway there."

As the USAF's former chief public information officer =97 not to mention PIO for Blue Book, which encompassed the Air Force UFO studies from 1947 to 1969 =97 Coleman still occasionally employs the first person plural when discussing the Defense Department. And he likely speaks for a lot of colleagues, present and past, in response to the international declaration:

A UFO study "should be done under some agency =97 not the military."

Although Coleman's own eyewitness report of his pursuit of a flying disc in 1955 is mysteriously missing from the Blue Book records, the Indian Harbour Beach resident insists the USAF study was legitimate and uncompromised.

What he rejects were the conclusions reached by the University of Colorado, which reviewed the Blue Book files and provided cover for the USAF to get out of the flying saucer biz. The U of C declared UFOs didn't represent superior technology, weren't national security threats and weren't worth continued scientific study. Coleman's first-person encounter taught him those three points were patently false.

What did he and his bomber crew see? "I don't know," Coleman says. "It made evasive maneuvers. It ran like hell. It was scared of us.

"We've gone since 1947," when the USAF studies began, "without being attacked. But are we interested (in) foreign technology beyond our current state of understanding? You bet. Hear what I'm saying. We're still in the business of analyzing foreign technology. Our problem was, years ago, we saw nothing that posed a direct threat to our national security that was overpowering."

Coleman doesn't believe the military has recovered ET technology, and he predicts nothing but headaches for any government agency attempting to study this stuff in a public manner. "What's the purpose, specifically?" he asks. "What's the plan? Who's in charge? What exactly do you pursue, and for how long?"

If the media break form and give the international declaration sustained coverage, any resulting momentum could set the stage for a collision with a system that hasn't been retooled since the end of the Cold War. Forging these straits will require uncommon finesse and sobriety.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Money For Nothin' Chicks For Free?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:25:59 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:25:59 -0500
Subject: Money For Nothin' Chicks For Free?

Source: Billy Cox's Blog|Devoid - Sarasota, Florida

<http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

Tuesday, December 11, 2007, 12:41 pm

Money For Nothin', Chicks For Free??
By Billy Cox

It's great to see Parade magazine mixing it up for a change. The editors could've gone for "The Softer Side of Katie Couric", maybe, or "Life After Britney: A Glimmer of Hope for K Fed's Blue Xmas". Or wouldn't a double-truck retrospective on Dick Wilson's career as the sticky-fingered 'Mr. Whipple' have made a wonderful yuletide read?

Well sure. But that would've been too easy.

Instead, sensing yet another new-fangled craze afoot, Parade decided to stake a bold course by unleashing the hounds in the Dec. 9 edition, with this LBJ-era cover teaser: "UFOs - Are they out there?"

Initially, I thought, oh, great, finally, they've hired Larry King to get to the bottom of this fad. I've always wondered if they're out there, and now I'll find out for sure.

Well, it wasn't Larry King (grrr!), just David H. Levy, the guy who parlayed his discovery of the Shoemaker-Levy comet into the Science Editor job at the 32 million-circulation Sunday magazine.

But the piece started out just the way I'd hoped, with the timely, celebrity lead-in of Dennis Kucinich and his UFO sighting confessional to Tim Russert in October. Because nothing justifies squandering resources on an embarrassing issue the way a celebrity lead does.

Then, Levy got down to business, taking no prisoners in this 11-paragraph screed: "Humans have long asked: Are we alone? Has our planet ever been visited by others?"

Hot damn! Here we go!

Levy proceeded to bring home the bacon by explaining about radiotelescopes and SETI, all those conventionally sanctioned academic exercises that, even after 25 years of documentaries, articles, books and countless replays of Contact on HBO without producing a single shred of evidence to support the effort, never sound stale or irrelevant.

Levy advised readers, "If you hear a UFO story, be skeptical. Ask questions." Sound advice indeed. "Even if a UFO landed in my backyard," he went on, "I'd want to have a look inside and meet the occupants before I'd be convinced."

That's exactly how I feel about dolphins. I can see what appear to be dolphins from a distance, but unless I can drag one ashore and ply my inquistive hands through through the mush of its chest cavity, I'm still a little suspicious.

"In the meantime," Levy concluded, "keep watching. Seeing unusual things is just one reason to look up at the night sky, eagerly and passionately, and wonder."

Here's what I wonder: If I go out and discover a comet, can I get away with writing this stuff, too?

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

New Document Reveals Military Mystery's Powers

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:30:24 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:30:24 -0500
Subject: New Document Reveals Military Mystery's Powers

Source: Wired - New York, New York, USA

<http://blog.wired.com/defense/2007/12/secret-document.html>

December 10, 2007

New Document Reveals Military Mystery's Powers
By David Hambling

[Links & images at site]

For years, no military program has sparked more fevered speculation from conspiracy theorists than the mysterious High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program, or HAARP. And for years, the Pentagon has been pooh-poohing speculation that the enormous collection of transmitters, radars, and magnetometers in Alaska was some sort of superweapon.

But, it turns out, the conspiracy theorists may not have been entirely off-base, after all.

Since its inception, there's been a huge range of opinion on what HAARP actually does: everything from a giant mind control facility to a space nuke countermeasure to a weather controller to an ionosphere-boiling mad science experiment to the mother of all pork projects has been suggested. But now that the program is actually up and running, military managers say the electronics array has much more benign use. "HAARP's main job is to produce radio waves to probe the ionosphere," an Air Force Research Laboratory officer said in October.

Which is true - up to a point.

A drive by Clifford Stone on the X-Files-esque uber-site Above Top Secret to use the Freedom of Information Act to turn up UFO-related documents has led to the release of a fascinating report, HAARP: Research and Applications. It's from the Air Force Research Laboratory and Office of Naval Research, and it lays out the uses the military see for HAARP. Turns out the Pentagon wants some military bang for their buck from the program.

HAARP can actually perform a lot of militarily important functions, all involving the interactions of radio waves with the high atmosphere, magnetosphere and ionosphere.

The document points out that "on the higher frequency end (VHF/UHF) transionospheric propagation is a ubiquitous element of numerous civilian and military communication systems, surveillance and remote sensing systems." In other words, messing with the ionosphere means you can shut down VHF radio, TV and radar signals at will. As radio hams know, the reflection and refraction effects of the ionosphere make a huge difference to long-range radio reception, and HAARP provides the only means of influencing that.

Another interesting feature is how HAARP can influence the 'auroral electrodynamic circuit', a natural flow of electricity with ranges from 100,000 to 1 million megawatts ("equivalent to 10 to 100 large power plants"). Messing with the electrical properties of the ionosphere means some of this tremendous flow of power can be changed at the flick of a switch. In effect, the natural flow can be modulated to create a gigantic low-frequency radio transmitter.

Which is extremely interesting to military types. Extremely low frequency, or ELF, waves can be used for submarine communications and for probing the planet; because of the way they propagate, HAARP can cover "a significant fraction of the Earth." The document says that the waves can be used for "seabed exploration" and even locating mines underwater, not to mention "underground target detection."

HAARP can also "induce precipitation of energetic particles" in the ionosphere, which "could impact the operation and lifespan of satellites." While this is mainly about protecting satellites from particles from solar flares or nuclear explosions, the phrasing suggests that it might be able to have a subtle negative impact on satellites as well.

At the High Frequency range, HAARP also has some useful tricks, including being able to "enhance ground-to-ground and satellite-to-ground links that would otherwise be marginal or absent." Its ability to create a radio-reflective layer means it can create new over-the-horizon capabilities for radio and radar systems. It can even act as a HF radar emitter itself.

The third band is optical and near-optical: HAARP can make lights in the sky. While we have looked at the effect of creating high-altitude plasmas before (as possible anti-missile defence), the document notes that it can also produce "airglow with megawatt power=85in the IR [infrared] region of the spectrum." This has "significant military implications for IR detection and countermeasures." The picture with this shows the IR glow below a satellite, suggesting that the system may be able to blank out the view of IR satellites selectively. Given that such satellites are the best way of detecting the launch of ICBMs, this is a significant capability.

All in all, it's a set-up that can do a lot more than just basic research. And while this may not seem much compared to weather modification, remember that these are just the capabilities they're willing to make public...

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

How Advanced Are We As A Civilisation?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:34:42 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:34:42 -0500
Subject: How Advanced Are We As A Civilisation?

Source: FirstScience.Com - London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/3b8arz>

10 Dec 2007

How Advanced Are We As A Civilisation?
By Adrian Stuart

In 1964 soviet astronomer Nikolai Kardashev proposed a scale for measuring the technological advancement of an extraterrestrial civilisation.

Kardashev divided civilisations into three categories which reflected the amount of energy which they were able to use. Some researchers found this scale to be useful, particularly those who were involved in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence =96 or who were making efforts for modelling or predicting the future for human beings on earth. Others, more critical, dismissed Kardashev=92s scale as science fiction and so far in the realm of speculation that it had no practical value.

Perhaps the greatest positive effect of grand ideas such as the Kardashev scale is not that it is an accurate description of what exists =96 but that it is a concept capable of producing debate. An open exchange of perspective and opinion is always beneficial to the advancement of science =96 and to our future. As we=92ll find later in this article, there are some interesting questions of an environmentally significant nature which arise.

What types of civilisations are on the Kardashev scale?

Type I =96 a civilisation which can utilise all of the power available on a single planet

Type II =96 a civilisation which is able to harness all of the power from a single star

Type III =96 a civilisation that is able to harness all of the power of a single galaxy

Kardashev is working from the premise that =91since civilizations always face problems that require continuously greater activity, it is likely that supercivilizations will undertake activities and construct structures on a very large scale.=92

In 1984, Kardashev produced a paper entitled =91On the inevitability and the possible structures of supercivilizations=92 =96 which was presented at the Search for Extraterrestrial Life symposium that year. The ideas set forward imply that there is a natural and unavoidable direction to civilisations =96 that they always start in small areas and grow to occupy a much larger territory. As well, entrenched in Kardashev=92s position is his assertion that the energy use of a growing civilisation will always rise.

Kardashev states that evidence of highly advanced extraterrestrial civilisations should be possible to be observed from earth. That the machines, objects and technologies deployed by these civilisations would =91=85have a very large mass, a large energy potential and a high information volume.=92 As well, that they would tend to exist for billions of years.

We might question these sorts of statements if they are put forward as a general rule for the evolution of civilisations. After all, we have no evidence to either absolutely support or dispute this point of view. Our history on this planet and especially our technological history seems far too short to insist on a general rule of this sort.

However, even if ALL civilisations don't exhibit technological growth, some of them could.

How might we find evidence for a civilisation on the Kardashev scale?

Looking for Type I civilisations

Over the last decades, astronomers have been able to predict the existence of dozens of planets orbiting various stars outside our solar system. Much of this work is done by observing the =91wobble=92 of a star. Planets will cause their parent stars to =91sway=92 as both planet and star are actually both revolving around a common centre of gravity which is not in the middle of the star. Another method used is to measure the light from the star dimming as a planet passes in front of it.

In 2005, astronomers confirmed that they have produced an image of a planet five times the size of Jupiter orbiting a star 200 light years away from us. As you can see in the image, the planet is a fuzzy orange ball. Telescopes will have to be far larger than those which exist today in order to produce an image of oceans, land and cities.

If ET lives on a planet orbiting a distant star and has invented something like television or radio, then radio telescopes may pick up these signals. A strong collection of radio waves which continue over time may be our best way of finding a Type I civilisation. SETI, the well known Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence is well known for searching for signals of this type. Powerful and persistent radio signals are most likely our only currently available method to spot an extraterrestrial Type I civilisation.

Looking for Type II civilisations

Kardashev's scale indicates that civilisations of this type have been able to harness the power of a star =96 presumably the one around which their species originates from.

One way of doing this was proposed by physicist Freeman Dyson in 1959. Dyson suggested that perhaps a civilisation advanced to a sufficient degree could break apart the planets in their solar system and use the material to form other =91island=92 habitats orbiting the sun in a =91swarm=92. This would allow much, much more of the energy from the star at the centre to be used than what could be gathered on the surface of a planet.

These =91Dyson spheres=92, as they are commonly and inaccurately called, would most likely appear to have odd peaks of radiation and brightness as the sun they surrounded would be visible periodically when the swarm of islands orbiting it passed through our line of sight.

Again, radio telescopes could spot a Type II civilisation which had constructed a gargantuan structure of this kind around a star =96 as well as astronomical telescopes.

Looking for Type III civilisations

If Dyson spheres hinted at science fiction, then Type III civilisations which utilise the power of an entire galaxy will remove all doubt. If ET has had enough time to travel throughout his home galaxy then perhaps we would find hundreds or millions of radio signals or the tell-tale flickerings of Dyson spheres. Or perhaps on a more precarious limb of speculation, civilisations of this magnitude would have learned how to draw

power directly from more energetic phenomenon such as black holes or pulsars.

Possibly the biggest problem facing any serious effort to locate an extraterrestrial civilisation is the size of space =96 and the scale of time. At the most extreme estimate human beings on earth have only organised themselves in cities over the last 8000 years. We have only had radio communication during the last hundred of those years =96 and the tiny signal from our earliest radio and television communications would have only radiated out less than 100 light years from our solar system in all directions. As our galaxy is a disc about 100,000 light years wide and 1000 light years thick, any creatures looking for us would be practically our neighbours. The nearest galaxy to us, Andromeda is 2.5 million light years away =96 others are much further.

Where is human civilisation on the Kardashev scale?

Famously, theoretical physicist Michio Kaku is known to regularly state that we are Type 0 on the Kardashev scale - we are still engaged in burning dead plants and animals for energy.

Looking at when we might achieve a Type I status on the scale we ourselves have designed, some hint might be found in the publications of the International Energy Agency=92s World Energy Outlook. The predictions of this organisation are that global energy demand will rise to 50% greater than current levels by 2030 =96 much of this in coal, oil and gas. According to some very speculative analysis, this would put us at 0.7 on the Kardashev scale.

Recently, Al Gore and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change were awarded the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize. The Nobel committee made their decision based on their opinion that efforts to make nations and individuals more responsible and aware of energy demand, consumption and the effects on the environment are necessary and essential to avoid future conflicts and wars over natural resources.

As mentioned earlier, it=92s not necessary that the Kardashev scale is true or accurate - but it is certainly interesting as seed ground for debate. Perhaps the 2007 Nobel committee was not mistaken in it=92s concern that conflicts may await on the horizon of the future. And with this in mind and taking a step further, perhaps there is a general rule which explains why we haven=92t yet spotted any kind of extraterrestrial civilisation: that most of them don=92t make the leap to a Type 1 civilisation without wiping themselves out.

For more information

Proceedings of The Search for Extraterrestrial Life symposium - 1984
<http://articles.adsabs.harvard.edu>

The World Energy Outlook
<http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/>

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Saturn's Rings

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 12:51:13 -0000
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:35:56 -0500
Subject: Saturn's Rings

Remember the 'mother ship' that was supposedly seen in Saturn's rings some years ago? An explanation perhaps.

'Flying Saucers' Around Saturn Explained

<http://bcast1.imaginova.com/t?r=2&ctl=24279>:28316

The formation of strange moons in Saturn's rings have baffled scientists.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 15:52:31 -0000
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:37:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 16:09:41 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 18:01:31 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>I would share your misgivings if resolution was promised in
>>some future commercial venture. My statement was meant to imply
>>nothing more than my opinion that there's information on this
>>incident that has yet to emerge.

>I'd like more information on what Sgt. Penniston meant
>by "a cloth surface" and "light that shined through the
>cloth surface", or words close to those. It seemed to
>differ not only with other sightings which all report
>metallic surfaces (or at least hard, smooth surfaces)
>from what reports I've heard and read, but also seems
>odd that hypersonic vehicles would be cloth covered.

Where do the above quotes appear?

Penniston describes the craft in the statement he made at the
National Press Club event on November 12. The text of this
statement - as a .pdf - is available on the Coalition for
Freedom of Information website:

<http://tinyurl.com/2qm6lc>

He said the craft "was warm to the touch and felt like metal".

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 11:30:00 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:45:04 -0500
Subject: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

Source: Amercian Chronicle.Com - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/yuzmas>

December 10, 2007

Spies, Lies, And Polygraph Tape: CIA's Disturbing
Extraterrestrial Affair
Gary S. Bekkum

"I remain a skeptical agnostic. More skeptical as time advances, but careful to note that even if paranormal phenomena are entirely bogus, some individuals are surely able to instill the belief in unexplained capabilities. How they do this and what are the vulnerabilities to such enticements is worth knowing." -- Ken Kress, CIA officer assigned to the Stanford Research Institute psychic spy research project in the early 1970s.

The real-life tall-tale of espionage you are about to read spins around a confrontation between a former CIA official and officers of the United States Air Force.

Twenty years later, the game continues where disturbing worlds collide.

At the heart of the matter, a U.S. Government UFO Working Group, dark secrets kept in the shadows under the guise of counter-intelligence operations of the United States Air Force, and decades-old rumors of extraterrestrial contact with "something not of this world."

The official concern hidden within these "Real Life X-Files" appears to have been aimed at the dangers of a viral marketing scheme intended to elicit real classified information from past and present intelligence officers.

At the center of the latest controversy is an obscure book by former USAF intelligence officer Robert M. Collins.

Exempt From Disclosure revisits tales of conspiracy and intrigue that have been the mainstay of legends whispered within the USAF since at least the early 1980s, when I was first told by "Sarge" about Air Force involvement in an extraterrestrial affair.

Open-source materials published on line document the involvement of former senior intelligence persons in the search for the U.S. Government's role in alleged alien contact. One source, who remains active in government business, including a role as a CIA consultant and involvement with the Department of Homeland Security, confirmed knowledge of high-level rumors of extraterrestrial contact.

According to Exempt from Disclosure, beginning in 1986, researcher Bill Moore and Jaime Shandera, a TV producer, initiated meetings with interested parties including Ernie Kellerstrass of General Dynamics, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Rick Doty, a former USAF counter-intelligence officer who

had been assigned to cold-war Eastern Europe, Dr. Hal Puthoff, a physicist with several government contracts on his resume, and the author, Captain Robert Collins.

The group was later joined by Dr. Christopher 'Kit' Green, who had retired from a very senior position with CIA a few years earlier.

Bird names were assigned to conceal the identities of the various participants. The names stuck, and thus was born the AVIARY.

As the group continued to meet, strategies were discussed to propel a movement leading to government disclosure of the strangeness allegedly centered on bodies of dead aliens and recovered artifacts from alien spacecraft.

Collins writes, "Kit Green took center stage by proposing several lines of attack involving disclosure strategies."

Verbal shots were soon exchanged between a ranking Air Force Officer and a member of the AVIARY within the hallowed walls of secrecy in an office at CIA.

Twenty years later, the birds of a feather may no longer flock together, but the squawking never ceased, fueled by the emerging communication role of the Internet.

Some of the most revealing chatter allegedly took place over government channels, involving a different kind of disclosure altogether.

Last year, email messages were deliberately passed by a sitting Senior Intelligence Official (SIO) via his close contact in the civilian world, in full knowledge they would be handed to a foreign national of a friendly nation. Curiously the SIO previously suggested this same person might be an agent for the British Secret Intelligence Service, better known as the home of James Bond, or MI-6.

Rich with details, the information contained in the numerous messages includes a first-hand account of an AVIAN confrontation at CIA with officers from the USAF.

The dispute with the USAF officials, over their interpretation of a polygraph interview of one of their own counter-intelligence officers, was so heated that one USAF Official asked that the AVIARY member's security clearances "be revoked."

Apparently the USAF position interpreted the polygraph to indicate that their agent was lying.

Examination by the AVIARY expert had shown otherwise: there was no indication of confabulation on the part of the USAF agent. From the point of view of the AVIARY expert, the USAF officials appeared to be lying.

Curiously, the polygraph had nothing to do with UFOs, aliens, or any of the other weirdness that intrigued AVIARY members.

The incident was resurrected within the leaked messages, supported by a leaked audio recording of the Senior Intelligence Official about the existence of a government "UFO Working Group," and new intrigue suggestive of elicitation of intelligence using an Internet "viral marketing scheme" transmitted in the guise of UFO investigations. The worst case scenario under discussion included an assault by foreign intelligence agents against America's most sensitive institutions: a possible "false flag" operation conducted under the alias of phony DIA officials.

Messages deliberately leaked by the SIO include discussion of a search through DIA electronic databases for two names given to an AVIARY member. A search of DIA records failed to find the two individuals in question, but apparently elicited a strong reaction from one official at DIA, who reported that "nothing like that had ever happened to him after such a routine request in his over thirty years at DIA."

Ultimately it was concluded that "complete review of all databases indicates that there are no DIA employees with those

names."

The motive behind the SIO release of the messages remains a mystery, although I note for the record we were asked not to reveal details as "methods are more important than sources."

The messages also confirmed a discussion with the FBI, as well as cooperation by two of the AVIAN birds with Internal Affairs and the Justice Department.

Lost among all of the latest spy games is the 'Core Story' of extraterrestrial contact.

A recent public posting by one AVIAN, who currently has clients including the Department of Defense, the CIA, the DIA, the National Academy of Sciences, among others, clarifies some of the mystery:

"We all agree that there is a Core Story. I was the one that originally reported on the 1986 Denny's [meeting]... We agree on small, tiny, overlapping Core Elements for which we have sufficient data to believe... It happened. Once or twice. No abductions. Ever... It isn't anyone's business who told me, or the millions of hours of work that leads to this fragile, subjective, and personal and unsupportable conclusion based on inductive (not deductive) logic ... I know zero, anymore, that is (any longer) classified. I believe a Reverse Engineering program has been going on for decades. It has been singularly unsuccessful. It was moved to the private sector in the '70s and the '80s. Uncle [Sam] is quite clueless. Some guys in the I.C. [Intelligence Community] are playing bad games, mostly because they are clueless, know they are, and want to figure out how to find, and get, inside."

For more information please visit:

<http://starpod.org>

<http://stargate007.blogspot.com>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 11:52:04 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:47:52 -0500
Subject: Re: The Arnold Case - Solved?

[Posted for non-subscriber]

The U.S. Air Force experimented with 'parasite' fighters to be launched from large bombers from 1948 through 1953.

The McDonnell XF-85 Goblin was designed for the purpose, first flying on July 22, 1948, and performing its first drop from the Boeing EB-29B carrier on August 23, 1948. The idea was dropped after a few tests when it became clear that only a skilled test pilot would be able to pull off a hook-up.

Republic modified one of its F-84F Thunderstreaks into the YRF-84F FICON (for FIGHTer CONveyor), to be carried by a Convair B-36. Its first flight was on March 30, 1953. I saw it demonstrated at the National Aircraft Show in Dayton, Ohio, later that year. While it worked, the concept was rendered obsolete by the concurrent development of in-flight refueling.

Obviously, neither of these combinations (the only ones known to have been flown in the USA) could have accounted for an event in 1947.

Don Berliner
The Fund for UFO Research, Inc.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 14:09:11 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:49:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 16:09:41 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>I'd like more information on what Sgt. Penniston meant
>by "a cloth surface" and "light that shined through the
>cloth surface", or words close to those. It seemed to
>differ not only with other sightings which all report
>metallic surfaces (or at least hard, smooth surfaces)
>from what reports I've heard and read, but also seems
>odd that hypersonic vehicles would be cloth covered.

Wow. I just got a private email from Robert Morningstar stating that he heard the Washington NPC conference presentation by Sgt Penniston, and that Penniston described the surface as smooth, "like black onyx."

My information came from one of the youtube.com replays of the Larry King Live interview, and I heard first, Sgt Penniston's description of the surface as like cloth, and second, his description of interior light shining through the cloth surface when the vehicle was preparing to lift off.

Among our electronic harassment community members, we do sometimes get broadcasts distorted, (and on a few occasions, the distorted broadcast has been taped,) so it's possible that's what I heard, unless others heard his remarks about a cloth-like surface.

That's why I haven't reported my one and only lifetime UFO sighting above the city of Hamilton, Ontario here, a short one, directly overhead, in the wee hours of the morning, while working nights. Too much possibility that the sighting was created as harassment and not genuine.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

UFO Sighting Over notloB?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:55:10 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:55:10 -0500
Subject: UFO Sighting Over notloB?

Source: The Bolton News - Lancashire, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/27wao2>

December 11th, 2007

UFO Sighting Over Bolton?
By Staff Reporter

Members of the Bolton UFO Society are investigating a possible sighting of an unidentified flying object (UFO) above the town.

A caller telephoned the society's chairman, Phil Catterall, last Wednesday, saying he had seen a strange object in the sky, at around 8pm.

The man told Mr Catterall, of Pennine Road, Horwich, that he had been driving from Harwood to the centre of Bolton when he spotted a triangular silhouette in the night sky.

Mr Catterall said: "The man wanted to know if there had been any other reported sightings. He was convinced it was a UFO and was quite disturbed by it."

The chairman said there had been similar sightings in Birmingham and around Bristol.

Anyone who has spotted any unusual activity in the night sky should email Mr Catterall at catterap.nul or log on to the Bolton UFO society website at www.boltonufosociety.piczo.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 17:32:28 -0600
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 18:57:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 00:01:46 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:11:55 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>>>Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:31:16 +0000
>>>>To: uup <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Subject: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>It must be a nightmare to live in a mental universe where such
>>dark fantasies are mistaken for events occurring in the real
>>world, which is scary enough.

>The real world is scarier - and more exciting (at least to me) -
>than we can even imagine or ever hope to fully understand.

>Thanks to three faithful priests from Persia and some shepherds
>near Bethlehem that witnessed his arrival by following a UFO and
>together with the Egyptians in northeast Africa that gave refuge
>to this fugitive and the protection given to him by angels (or
>ETs?), the Christmas conspiracy is one of the biggest of them
>all.

With all due respect, Nick:

Huh?

>What is reality or accepted truth depends on who is interpreting
>it.

No, to determine truth, we collect evidence, analyze it as
scrupulously as possible, and draw conclusions closely tied to
it. All else is fantasy and guesswork, such as the evidence-
untainted conspiracy theories which apparently you find more
fascinating than things that can be demonstrated to be true or
are at least arguably so.

Wishing it - or fashioning romantic paranoia around it - doesn't
make it so. And worse: those sorts of cartoon fantasies distract
us from the world's actual problems and horrors which urgently
demand our attention.

Jerry Clark

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Aliens And UFOs In Contemporary Art

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:14:24 -0500
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:14:24 -0500
Subject: Aliens And UFOs In Contemporary Art

Source: The Sydney Morning Herald - New South Wales, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/2nyffl>

December 11, 2007

Artists are inspired by UFO sightings on Sydney's doorstep.

Genre Multimedia, Painting and Drawing
Location Penrith Regional Gallery and the Lewers Bequest
Address 86 River Rd, Emu Plains
Date 8 December 2007 to 17 February 2008

Phone Bookings (02) 4735 1100
Online Bookings www.penrithregionalgallery.org

The Visitors: Aliens And UFOs In Contemporary Art
Erik Jensen

In 1868 a floating ark, filled with paper and piloted by a neutral-coloured spirit, abducted surveyor Frederick Birmingham and took him to the highest point of Parramatta Park, kindly returning him to awake in his own home. Birmingham had another UFO sighting in 1873 and became so obsessed with the phenomenon he set down his experiences in a book.

By 1950, Katoomba and the surrounding Blue Mountains had become a hotbed of extraterrestrial sightings - a flap, to use the ufological term. Fever was such that the happenings made the front page of the Herald and the RAAF was put on standby with a warning not to provoke the aliens. Since then, incidents have become frequent enough to inspire a new exhibition at the Penrith Regional Gallery.

"My sons were out at a place they call the Ruined Castle at Faulconbridge, a derelict house out in a paddock. They saw what they described as a huge mothership going over," Vernon Treweeke, an artist participating in the Penrith show, says of his experiences.

"It went over and it was silent, they didn't hear anything until it had passed. It must have been very high in the atmosphere. Obviously, it might have been in space. Hard to tell. They described it as having some sort of symbol underneath it, a large sort of hieroglyph type of thing. It had portholes as well."

The curtains on Treweeke's house, in bushland at Hazelbrook, are drawn. The entire building is blacked-out and he answers the door with a pair of 3D glasses in his hand. Downstairs, in a basement-studio, he activates a series of ultraviolet lights. With the glasses and the fluorescent paint on his canvases, parts of the work start to morph. Blues sink into the background

and oranges reach forward.

"Prismatic Fresnels," he says, referring to the beam-splitting lenses he wears. Treweeke works with colour perspective and the effects of fluorescence, painting the reaches of his imagination in a process he likens to Einstein's theoretical physics. A product of the space race, and of London psychedelia in the 1960s, he believes art can push reality in directions science is unable to explore.

"It is a return to a visionary awareness. Artists used to be visionaries, they used to paint angels and gods. They had this visionary role and then they became just like cameras with paint," he says.

"We've been through a cycle. The movies have been doing it and people are ready for it in art. The artists as visionaries can actually explore the future and sort of report on it before it happens."

Anne Loxley, co-curator of *The Visitors*, mounted the show when she realised how many contemporary artists were working within the realms of ufology and how prevalent sightings were on the outskirts of Sydney. "I hadn't even seen the UFOs in Tim Johnson's paintings until it was pointed out," she says of the discoveries.

The show is weighted towards believers, with only one sceptic among the 15 artists, though that is not how Loxley planned it. "It's only weighted towards art of quality. I was surprised by the believers. If it was a show about believing, it would be put on by a UFO society."

Loxley is not a believer - "too emotionally and psychologically fragile to let that be part of my life" - but describes herself as an enthusiast. She is compelled by the repetition of accounts and what she calls seductive and persuasive geological evidence in the Blue Mountains.

The show itself, however, was curated with scholarly responsibility. Prominent ufologist Bill Chalker was commissioned for a catalogue essay and the exhibition furnished with an evidence room of accounts, photographs and DNA testimony.

Chalker prides himself on forensics - he is a chemist by training - and dismisses the majority of sightings as mis-identifications. But for all the false alarms and questionable witnesses, he has proof enough to believe. "Historically, from the 1950s to now, there have been thousands of sightings [in the Blue Mountains]," he says. "In terms of unexplained sightings, there has been less than 100 but even that is a compelling number."

Chalker, who has been working in the field for 40 years, looks first at the planets to explain most sightings - dismissing those things that are probably Jupiter or a comet. But if an event is unexplainable - better still, part of a pattern or leaving behind evidence - Chalker will consider it positively.

He is fastidious to the extent that certain accounts in the exhibition catalogue were footnoted with his disapproval, though the Blue Mountains have his certification as a hot spot. Chalker says ufology is marginalised by a lack of funding and the fact many practitioners approach it from an armchair vantage. There is too much data for most to wade through and doing so is no way to advance a scientific career.

"Eyewitness testimony often puts people away in jail," Chalker says, "but when it comes to UFO sightings that same testimony is deemed uncountable."

This is where art emerges, taking the reins at the point science must leave them. "The other side of it is that the solutions to these sort of sets of problems are always artistic," David Haines, who is participating in the exhibition with partner Joyce Hinterding, says. "At the end of the day, we're very happy for art to also fabricate and construct the world as much as receive factual inputs. For us, we're also melding this material into fictional constructions."

Haines and Hinterding head into the night to record sounds the human ear cannot. "It's a sort of folk science," Haines says of the antennas and makeshift oscillators.

The work does not interpret the data, meshing the sound with video but leaving the audience to find what Hinterding calls coherences. After living in the Mountains for four years, both artists agree the prevalence of sightings has something to do with the region's association with counter-culture. Treweeke, on the other hand, believes the watching is related to elevation and clear skies - a point Loxley echoes, if not out of politeness for the people involved.

For Chalker, who has spent so long fighting for legitimacy, the question is too hard to answer: there is a hot spot but to explain it would be to solve half the problems with which his science grapples. However, he does not view the interpretations of artists as undermining his science - people think popular culture inspires sightings but it is the other way around.

That much is true for Haines, whose interest is piqued by other people's accounts and an open mind.

"It's the desire also, I think, for extra-reality. It's very easy to be dragged into the everyday. A lot of artists have spent a lot of energy trying to elevate the everyday but I think that artists are always seeking the extraordinary," he says. "I haven't spoken to anyone who has directly seen it but I've spoken to a lot of people who've looked for it and even that's interesting. It's an act of desire as much as anything, it's wanting to see it."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 17:03:50 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 06:53:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2007 12:12:58 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2007 12:48:17 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>Does f-stop truly relate to the exposure time? I remember in
>>Rutledge's book (Plate 9, 800mm lens, f/8 had a 1 minute
>>exposure) that he had time exposure images with standard f-
>>stops. I am a novice about photography. Is there some other
>>setting to keep the iris open for time lapse? Does the f-stop
>>affect over-under exposure?

>The "f stop" and shutter time are independent parameters which
>can be adjusted to determine the exposure level.
>...

Thanks for the detailed explanation.

>>For this camera, out of the about 600 frames of the 10 film
>>magazines, about 50 images were blurred (about 20 blurred images
>>occurred in the UFO sequence film magazine +the one prior),
>>about 10 out of focus (6 in the two film magazines), about 30
>>underexposed (3 in the two magazines), and 3 over exposed. So
>>blurred images seemed to occur more frequently for some reason
>>during these final two film magazines.... Blur implies one axis of
>>motion.

>Linear blur, yes. If all the images are elongated in a certain
>direction then this is motion blur during the shutter time.
>However, to have image extension that is "left-right" as well as
>"up down" one needs more than just one axis of motion. IN this
>case one needs two axis motion and that requires accelerations
>to change the rotation from around one axis to around another,
>perpendicular axis, and that results in "loopiness" of the
>photo. I should point out that in "loopy" motion one often gets
>bright spots which signify (if the light itself is constant)
>momentary slow-downs or stops in the angular rotation (bright
>spots imply longer exposures at various portions of the "loopy"
>image."

One other thing bothering me about the UFO photos was the Skylab
flight attitude. It had to generally fly in a solar inertial
flight mode to maximize the sunlight on the solar arrays. This
means the bottom of the Skylab (and the wardroom window from
which the UFO photos were taken) would be facing into the
direction of motion at sunset. The wardroom window is at 26
degrees from the bottom of the Skylab cylinder.

However, the special case of when the EREP (Earth Resources
Photography) filming was done has the bottom of the Skylab
facing the Earth. This period makes sense to have been able to
capture the UFO images. So, no matter what, the only likely time
to capture these UFO photos is during this kind of flight
attitude.

During the Day 263, from 14:42 to 16:40, the vehicle was taking EREP pictures. (Actual times of imaging from Table 27)
<http://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R9810&id=3&qs=No%3D0%26N%3D4294934893> The transition from the Earth facing to the solar inertial flight mode is 9 minutes. So starting at 16:31, the entire spacecraft is turning 90 degrees using the cold-gas thruster attitude control system until the bottom of the Skylab is in the velocity direction (or close to it at dusk, really the flight mode is to have the bottom of Skylab always facing away from the Sun).

But the astronaut's account says it did not move more than 20 degrees based on the window markings up until it disappeared on entering into shadow. It should have moved 90 degrees if it occurred during the period of 16:31 to 16:40. But to still be able to see it as they entered into shadow, they would have to be in the Earth-facing mode. But they are not. From 16:40 to shadow (16:45), they are in solar inertial flight mode and facing in the direction of motion. During that phase too the motion over a ten minute period should be 40 degrees (360 deg/92 minutes_orbit *10 minutes_sighting).

So this seems to make the time period questionable. It needs to be an EREP period but also needs to be one in which there is no transition to solar inertial.

Also, the maneuvering/flight attitudes open up the possibility of one axis of image smear due to the Skylab turning (either due to solar inertial or transitioning) and the other to astronaut camera movement.

>>If they looked through their camera to take the "structure" >>image, then I assumed they could see the object with its >>structure, even though it may not be visible to the naked eye.

>Possibly Garriott did notice structure at the time he took the >fourth photo, even though the image was still quite small in the >viewing aperture of the camera. But he may also have forgotten >that fact when queried about the event days later. THE >astronauts did say it was "big".

Garriott is still alive. Can someone ask him? Or maybe Oberg can if he is out there reading this.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

NASA Booster In Rain Of Fire Off Nova Scotia

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 20:30:13 -0400
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 06:58:02 -0500
Subject: NASA Booster In Rain Of Fire Off Nova Scotia

Something happened over Nova Scotia or the eastern seaboard the evening of Dec. 10-07. First reports were that a spy satellite/booster launched by NASA failed and burnt up upon re-entry into the atmosphere. The fact that it launched into a northerly direction supports the spy-satellite scenario.

The Rescue Co-Ordination Center [RCC] in Halifax first confirmed this report then recinded it. I learned that they first thought the rocket had completely failed but then changed that to just the booster burning up as it came back in. They received many calls about glowing stuff in the sky, flares and burning type debris as far west as Ontario with a photo of the thing.

I was first made aware of this by the Coast Guard earlier this morning. I contacted the tower at Stanfield Halifax International Airport and was told by a tower controller that - quote - "I'm not allowed to talk about it." exact words [confirmed twice] and was referred to Nav Canada's Media Relations Center in Montreal. I contacted same and got a recorded message. I'm guessing that since there is a spy satellite involved that Nav Canada has been advised to keep the hype down.

I left my cell phone number and my home number but then had to do a CBC interview in Bridgewater on the event - the UFO slant, including Shag Harbour - which should air on the 6 PM news locally and might get picked up on the National. I was interviewed outside for about twenty minutes and as it turned out I got some 30 seconds about the Shag Harbour Incident.

When I arrived back home and there was a message from Nav Canada. Recalled same and I am now waiting for reply but since they close there at 4PM I doubt if I'll hear back. It's 4:02PM their time. The normal NASA news releases are not saying anything about it.

UPDATE: Coast guard contact and radio reports has NASA contacting authorities here in Canada [RCC Halifax]but not the RCMP, to advise that indeed a booster failed and broke up and pieces of that it hit the water off Yarmouth and in a line in a northeasterly track up the Bay of fundy. No reports of impact on the mainland. Rescue units, fire departments and Emergency Response Units were on standby. It was first thought that an airplane might have crashed. The RCMP were flodded with calls from both New Brunswick and Soutwestern Nova Scotia. Close call.

The witnesses were not reporting UFOs but were a bit frightened by the closeness of the event to their shoreline in South West Nova Scotia. The incoming reports were about either a meteor breaking up or perhaps an airplane exploding and crashing-hence the Shag Harbour angle.

Cudos to the witnesses who are so often maligned. Even a 16 year old male who saw the thing coming down reported on the CBC that he thought it was a meteor or worse perhaps an airplane crashing.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:59:08 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 06:59:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 17:32:28 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 00:01:46 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:11:55 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>>>It must be a nightmare to live in a mental universe where such
>>>dark fantasies are mistaken for events occurring in the real
>>>world, which is scary enough.

>>The real world is scarier - and more exciting (at least to me) -
>>than we can even imagine or ever hope to fully understand.

>>Thanks to three faithful priests from Persia and some shepherds
>>near Bethlehem that witnessed his arrival by following a UFO and
>>together with the Egyptians in northeast Africa that gave refuge
>>to this fugitive and the protection given to him by angels (or
>>ETs?), the Christmas conspiracy is one of the biggest of them
>>all.

>With all due respect, Nick:

>Huh?

>>What is reality or accepted truth depends on who is interpreting
>>it.

>No, to determine truth, we collect evidence, analyze it as
>scrupulously as possible, and draw conclusions closely tied to
>it. All else is fantasy and guesswork, such as the evidence-
>untainted conspiracy theories which apparently you find more
>fascinating than things that can be demonstrated to be true or
>are at least arguably so.

>Wishing it - or fashioning romantic paranoia around it - doesn't
>make it so. And worse: those sorts of cartoon fantasies distract
>us from the world's actual problems and horrors which urgently
>demand our attention.

Apparently your method where one selectively chooses what they
consider to be valid evidence and rejects outright what you
consider to be "conspiracy thinking" has failed you in your
quest for the truth about UFOs and the UFO phenomenon.

Maybe this truth will be found if you broaden your scope and are
willing to consider what you call "cartoon fantasies" too.
Remember that the ET explanation for UFOs was once considered a

cartoon fantasy too since it wasn't based on any solid evidence but on much wishful thinking instead.

Our world always had problems and will continue to long after we are gone, but the horrors of the world should not distract us from studying the phenomenon at hand, including from all angles, both probable and improbable. So unless we should redefine our roles as saviours of the world rather than ufologists who are truly interested in UFOs and really want to learn the truth behind this phenomenon which has evaded our scrutiny (at least for this more enlightened but more close minded generation) maybe we should change our approach.

Welcome to my nightmare. Sorry Jerry, but wishing otherwise does not make it so. Maybe our denials and differences of opinion is more of an expression that we are not ready for, or can't handle the truth which we fear it to be.

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 21:34:33 -0400
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 07:04:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 19:08:05 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:47:30 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2007 22:16:59 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>>>My pilot friend didn't think JFK Jr had an SD problem either.
>>>Although JFK Jr was an experienced and cautious pilot, and his
>>>aircraft was well equipped with instruments, my friend told me
>>>that he was flying nearby during that same time period JFK Jr's
>>>aircraft went down and remembers that the visibility was lousy.
>>>Also, having two women in the aircraft could well have caused an
>>>added distraction.

>>>In support of my suspicions of foul play, my pilot friend did
>>>say he heard a report that someone near the destination Kennedy
>>>was trying to reach, either heard an explosion, saw a flash of
>>>light through the haze above him, or both.

>
>

>>Bull pucky. Kennedy Jr. was a 300 hour pilot with no night
>>rating let alone an instrument rating flying a 200mph Piper that
>>he basically had about 100 hours of flight time on. He got
>>behind it in haze over water at dusk while flying to Martha's
>>Vinyard. He went into a spiral, lost a wing and impacted the
>>water at 60mph - his Air Speed Indicator, ASI, showed "witness
>>marks" on the instruments face at that speed. The wreck clearly
>>showed there was no explosion. A large portion of one wing was
>>found a good distance away indicating wing separation. He had
>>the necessary instruments onboard to fly without a horizon as a
>>reference but didn't have the training to do so.

>
>

><snip>

>
>

>>No conspiracy here just classic symptoms of inexperience, the
>>time of day, no IFR training, his training was behind the
>>airplane's capability [200mph] an urge to complete the mission,
>>bad weather and SD. Most times it takes about three things piling
>>up - it's called cascading events - to "get you", Kennedy had 7.

>Bullpucky, not! In WWII the allied pilots and flight crews that
>flew the large bombers loaded to capacity with bombs to distant
>tragets they never visited or even heard of before, often under
>the cover of darkness and clouds, didn't have much more actual
>flying experience than Kennedy Jr had.

>When I was learning to fly in a Cessna 172, my instructor put

>the plane in a spin and a spiral so that I could distinguish
>between the two and be able to recover from them. When I
>expressed concerns that such violent moves may rip the plane's
>>wings off, my instructor, who also did aerobatics, reassured me
>that this was impossible. Of course if my wing support strut was
>tampered with, this would explain why JFK Jr's wing was found a
>good distance away as you say.

When your instructor put you into a spin he then centered
rudder, pulled power and recovered from the spin by adding power
slowly as you came out. When I was taking the course you had to
do spins yourself, a half dozen times, and recover. When your
instructor put the C-172 into a spiral it was just long enough
to show you how quickly the altitude deteriorated and the speed
came up but he did not allow the plane to continue in a fully
developed spiral. He would not tell you that a wing would not
tear off in a fully developed spiral.

Depending on the bank [left or right] the high wing will undergo
terrific torsional stress and will fail eventually. Because it is
such a sneaky buildup exacerbated by not watching your airspeed
and rate of descent in a bank that's why they teach you how to
recognize a spiral.

Kennedy was flying a low-wing Piper Saratoga with a spar
substantially stronger than the strut-supported wing on the 172.
In both cases the spar depends on the D-cell at the leading edge
of the wing. When the lift gets so great at the leading edge at
outer end of the wing that it twists the wing up and back around
the spar it will tear the D-cell then twist the spar, shearing it
which will rip it free somewhere between 1/3rd and halfway in
from the end of the wing. Having lost that and the aileron
balance control cable the plane will then quickly snap around its
longitudinal axis due to the greater lift of the "good" wing. But
there is now no aileron control because the balance cable linking
both ailerons has been torn loose. Leave any plane stressed to
~4.5 positive and ~1.8 negative Gs in a spiral and it will lose a
wing-strut or no strut.

>According to another interpretation of what happened that is based
>on witness testimony, not like yours which is based simply on
>the official account (and we know just how unreliable these can
>be when it comes to UFO incidents!) there apparently was an
>explosion. A reporter for the Vineyard Gazette newspaper told
>WCVB-TV in Boston that he was out walking Friday night about the
>time of the crash and saw "big white flash in the sky" off
>Philbin Beach (see URL below).

>http://whatreallyhappened.com/RANCHO/CRASH/JFK_JR/upi.html

>According to this same URL, visibility at the time was reported
>to be 8 miles, clear enough to fly without instruments. If these
>claims are correct, then it could not have been any one of your
>7 things - or all of them combined - that led to this fatal
>crash (which I suspect was an assassination of another Kennedy
>and another attack on freedom in America).

The visibility might have been 8 miles but at what level?

Kennedy descended into haze and lost the horizon. His airplane a
1996 model Piper Saratoga II HP had a fuel injected IO-540-300-
horsepower engine that would have quickly dragged that airplane
past its cruise of about 190 mph and its limitations when he
lost situational awareness and started spiraling.

Imagine the coil spring in a car [when they used to have them]
that's what a spiral looks like with one wing some 25-35 degrees
above the horizontal and the other below. It's not a violent
sensation that's what is tricky/deadly about spirals. The speed
builds up quickly with your engine hammering away helping to the
aircraft to spiral downwards ever faster until it reaches its
Velocity-never exceed [Vne] speed and it starts to break up.

If Kennedy was following the rules - and wasn't using oxygen -
then he was at or below 8,500 feet at that time of the
day[dusk]. Over ocean you want all the altitude you can get.
8,500 feet is plenty of time to get in 4 to 5 360 degree turns
of a spiral and tear off a wing.

>Ignoring or discounting any eyewitness testimony because it
>conflicts with the official account does not help in our search

>for the truth but it does serve the goals of debunkers who don't
>want us to give further attention to something important, such
>as UFOs and other cover-ups.

I don't buy this one, Nick. I and a lot of pilots think the TWA-800 explanation is lame but I saw the wreckage photos of Kennedy's aircraft and I saw nothing there to suggest an explosion - and I was looking like everyone else back in the day.

Don Ledger

[None of which has much to do with UFOs, gentlemen--ebk]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 08:02:03 -0600
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 09:24:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:59:08 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 17:32:28 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>Apparently your method where one selectively chooses what they
>consider to be valid evidence and rejects outright what you
>consider to be "conspiracy thinking" has failed you in your
>quest for the truth about UFOs and the UFO phenomenon.

My initial reaction is to suck in a lungful of air and raise my hand signifying an intention to speak in Jerry's defense but find at the exhalation that I'm speechless, without speech, sans speech...; I have no speech. Only, echoing in the absence of same is J. Moseley's mocking refrain, "Shockingly Close To The Truth," sadly. Did an era expire not with a bang but by growing up to become our parents?

Sociopathy abounds and where there is sociopathy there abounds also fecund ground for always criminal conspiracies of all types and flavors. Even cosmic ones, if Stanton Friedman, Frank Feschino, Richard Dolan, and Robert Hastings are remotely on the ball, as buffered by my own academic armchair researching:

<http://www.alienview.net/conspire.html>

Hey... 'JFK' through 'Building Seven' to 'Crash at Corona' and 'Shoot Them Down', you know? Hard to countenance or append lunacy given the cutting edge of the current authorities. Authority so far into betrayal of the public trust any real recovery is daunting and, therefore, unlikely.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>
U F O M a g a z i n e -- www.ufomag.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Hillary Rockefeller & 'The Book'

From: John Chambers <wesleyguitars.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 13:14:32 +0000
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 10:00:54 -0500
Subject: Hillary Rockefeller & 'The Book'

Hello,

This is my first post - been a lurker for many years.

I am pleased to see the FOI release of the Hillary Clinton and Lawrence Rockefeller meeting at Camp David. See pictures:

www.checktheevidence.com/Disclosure/RockefellerClintonPhotos.zip

It looks to me like like Rockefeller gave her a UFO book - I have enlarged this below:

<http://images.marketworks.com/hi/56/56410/book2.jpg>

and

<http://images.marketworks.com/hi/56/56410/book2.jpg>

- not so clear

It's only the back of the book. I initially thought it was Greer's ET - but that wasn't released until 2000 - this meeting took place in 1995.

So come on put me out of my misery, what is the book she's holding?

Cheers,

John Chambers

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

UFO Sighting In West Sussex

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:33:38 -0000
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:09:25 -0500
Subject: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

Last month there were some media reports about a UFO sighting that occurred in the UK on October 4. It was claimed that RAF aircraft had been scrambled to intercept the UFO, so a number of people made FOI requests relating to this.

Here's a link to one of the media stories about the sighting:

<http://www.worthingherald.co.uk/6427/UFO-report--RAF-did.3488813.jp>

And here's a link to the MoD's reply (a .pdf file), which states no aircraft were scrambled and says the MoD has no record of the sighting:

<http://tinyurl.com/ysd44r>

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 09:36:40 -0600
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:10:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:59:08 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 17:32:28 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 00:01:46 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 14:11:55 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>Apparently your method where one selectively chooses what they
>consider to be valid evidence and rejects outright what you
>consider to be "conspiracy thinking" has failed you in your
>quest for the truth about UFOs and the UFO phenomenon.

>Maybe this truth will be found if you broaden your scope and are
>willing to consider what you call "cartoon fantasies" too.
>Remember that the ET explanation for UFOs was once considered a
>cartoon fantasy too since it wasn't based on any solid evidence
>but on much wishful thinking instead.

Please spare me the lecture, Nick. I have written at length on
the UFO phenomenon. Few, perhaps, have written and published as
much as I have. Whether my conclusions are ultimately validated
and disproved, I practice what I preach, and even those who
disagree with my opinions respect the seriousness of my
approach. I outline the evidence, try to adhere to what it
suggests to the extent of my intellectual ability, and draw
reasoned conclusions therefrom. I may be right, I may be wrong,
I may be both at once, but I don't make wild, unsupported (or
unsupportable) claims, and I don't lapse into irrational
paranoia.

You, on the other hand, believe that JFK Jr.'s fatal flight was
no accident, that he was murdered - presumably by agents of the
Clinton family, though you never make clear who the actual
villains are, where they met, how they planned and pulled off
their dastardly deed, and so on - so that Hillary Clinton could
become New York senator and, perhaps, President one day. You
provide no evidence, which is no surprise because there none
exists outside your imagination. When challenged, you change the
subject.

Your strange remarks about the circumstances of Jesus's birth
presume without justification that the New Testament account is
literally true - a description of a historical event, and not
simply a faith narrative - and then go on, for no clear or
compelling reason, to associate ETs with it. That's not

conspiratorial thinking, true, but it is surely magical thinking.

I have no doubt that you're a decent, well-intentioned guy, but do you realize that you perfectly fulfill every unflattering stereotype out there about the sort of person who is attracted to ufology? If I thought that everybody out there thinks as you do, my departure from ufology would occur at faster-than-light speed.

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

UFOs In Mexico City During Recent Blackout?

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 10:36:04 -0500
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:13:39 -0500
Subject: UFOs In Mexico City During Recent Blackout?

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
December 12, 2007

Source: www.analuisacid.com
Date: 12 December 2007

UFOs In Mexico City During Recent Blackout?
A report from Ana Luisa Cid

On Tuesday, December 11, 2007, dozens of districts in the Mexican capital and some municipalities in the state of Mexico were affected by a 25-minute blackout. According to reports, the causes were simultaneous explosions in three electric power stations.

Reports from the Ministry of Civil Protection indicate that said explosions, whose causes are still unknown, took place at the substations of the Nonoalco and Tlatelolco plants, as well as the one located in Ecatepec.

The incident was reported at 23:30 hours and people living next to the Tlatelolco Unit stated that they heard loud explosions within the plant shortly before the blackout, which in turn caused several flashes. The possibility of a terrorist attack against the facilities of the Luz y Fuerza company has been officially discarded.

This information was obtained from the El Universal newspaper, where the picture taken by Valente Rosas was published, showing a luminous object over the skies of the nation's capital during the blackout.

While the use of pyrotechnics around this date are common due to the feast of the Virgin of Guadalupe, the structure does not correspond to that of fireworks, in my opinion, due to its size and morphology. In any event, I think that the possibility of an airplane with a sweeping effect must also be dismissed.

Until contact can be made with the newspaper's photographer and more information offered, it should be noted that two possible UFO sightings occurred that day: the first in the Coapa area to the south of the city, and the second toward the airport.

I had a personal sighting at 11:30 at night as I drove along Avenida de los Cien Metros in the Gustavo A. Madero district. What I saw, in the company of my family, was an object made up of two shining lights, resembling the planet Mars, but double--one sphere above and another below, both of them very large and shiny, traveling at relatively low altitude. The object remained static. It was, however, difficult to capture it on video due to the motion of the car and the impossibility of pulling over on an expressway.

It should be noted that this is not the first time that the UFO phenomenon is linked to blackouts in Mexico. Renowned researcher Pedro Ferriz states that then-president Luis Echeverria told him that he and his wife were witnesses to a sighting during the blackouts in Cuernavaca, Morelos, on September 23, 1965, describing the object as similar to a mechanical pencil. The

president added that they were in the company of Amalia Hernandez, founder of the Ballet Folklorico de Mexico.

Do UFOs cause blackouts? We really don't know. Those who support this theory opine that UFOs exert powerful electromagnetic influences, particularly near power stations.

[Translator's note: More information on the Mexican blackouts of the 1960s and 1970s can be found in "Forbidden Mexico" by Scott Corrales]

Translation (c) 2007. S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 12](#)

Re: Gary McKinnon Radio Drama

From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:58:31 -0000
Archived: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:25:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Gary McKinnon Radio Drama

>From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2007 15:38:30 -0000
>Subject: Gary McKinnon Radio Drama

>Listeners may be interested that there is a radio play being
>broadcast by the BBC Radio 4 service in the UK this coming
>Wednesday afternoon about Gary McKinnon the UFO hacker
>facing deportation.

>This site will lead you to a link where you will be able
>to listen to this play for one week after transmission:

><http://www.freegary.org.uk>:80/

Further to this I now understand - see below - there will be a
legal documentary program called Unreliable Evidence the same
evening.

THE MCKINNON EXTRADITION

A new Afternoon Play will tell the true story of Gary Mckinnon,
a British citizen who is fighting extradition to the US, which
wants to put him on trial on charges of hacking into government
computers. The American prosector has said he wants to see
McKinnon "fry" and even if they can't execute him, they are
pressing for 60 years in jail. This play will go hand in hand
with an edition of Unreliable Evidence, the legal discussion
programme, fronted by former barrister Clive Anderson.

<http://tinyurl.com/2uxkts>

Gary's mother Janis has been in touch with a friend of mine
called Matthew Williams.

Below - in the interests of Gary's story getting heard -
I'll paste her letter to Matthew

Subject: Gary McKinnon From Janis

Hi Mathew, you probably know that Radio 4 are doing a play about
Gary on 12th December at 2.15pm and that a related programme
about unfair extradition will be presented by Clive Anderson.
It's called "Unreliable Evidence" and will be aired at 8pm on
Radio 4 on the same evening.

I don't know if Clive Anderson is the friend of yours that you
spoke of and whether or not you helped to get this off the
ground but if so; I was hoping you could pass on a letter that I
sent to the judges which was used in evidence in Gary's case, as
it proves that the diplomatic note is not worth the paper it is
written on it.

One letter includes evidence I used and the second letter is a
statement I had to write to the court as they refused to believe
that I had written the first letter entirely on my own without

help from any lawyer or solicitor. (which included evidence regarding another case where the US had reneged on a promise not to request the death penalty)

Let me know if you're unable to get this to Clive Anderson and I'll try and get it to him myself.

www.abovethetitle.com "The McKinnon Extradition"

Many Thanks

Janis (Garys mum)

Below is Gary's Mum's letter to the judge:

Dear Judge,

I am the mother of Gary McKinnon and I am greatly concerned for my son's future safety. I would therefore like to present a letter, which includes some of my deepest concerns and is followed by a statement of facts that I would like to present to the court. I would be grateful if you could possibly consider these points before passing judgement on my son's extradition case.

Gary is a kind and gentle human being with no previous criminal convictions.

He had a long-term girlfriend of fourteen years and would often take her younger brothers and nieces to and from school in Crouch End before going to work in the morning. His relationship broke up as a direct result of this case.

Gary is a self-taught computer enthusiast who was interested in finding out about the feasibility of anti gravity technology. He only had access to his girlfriend's very basic computer, which had a dial up connection.

Gary would never have deliberately damaged any computer files.

I understand that without proof of a certain amount of financial damage the US authorities could not prosecute Gary.

Gary maintains that he did not cause the alleged damage.

In the original US indictment, Gary was accused of unauthorised computer access to US military establishments and to several civilian establishments, including US universities.

When the US universities/civilian establishments, denied that Gary had caused any damage, the US government proceeded to remove all the civilian establishments from the indictment against Gary.

I am extremely concerned that the US government seems now to be trying to portray my son Gary as a terrorist.

Gary is now clearly included in the American military's handbook of terrorism when referring to cyber terrorism, as was previously brought to your attention by Edmund Lawson, my son's barrister.

Gary is and always has been a gentle, kind and compassionate person who cares deeply about the world in which we live.

The 9/11 event deeply upset Gary and he could not understand why the US military had not scrambled fighter jets in an attempt to protect it's citizens and did not have helicopters hovering outside the building in an attempt to rescue people who were jumping from the windows of the stricken building.

I am afraid that the United States Government may be negatively influenced by any belief they have that Gary may previously have shared an increasingly held conspiratorial view of the events of 9/11 and that this belief by the US government may have been instrumental in the US arresting Gary several years after his alleged computer misuse.

I believe the US government arrested Gary after they had

gained a legal advantage when the new extradition act was introduced by the UK government despite it not being ratified by the US government.

This treaty is extremely unlikely to ever be ratified by the US as it is against their constitution.

I understood that treaties could not be retrospective? So I do not understand how this un-ratified treaty can now apparently be used retrospectively UK citizens are being treated as second-class citizens, as the UK cannot extradite American citizens without presenting Prima Facie evidence.

It is accepted that lengths of sentences are used by the government as deterrents to crime.

When Gary was first questioned, the UK police informed him that he was likely to face a community service sentence, however the CPS decided several years ago, not to prosecute Gary.

For Gary now to be told that he faces a possible sixty years in a US prison is extremely frightening.

It is obvious that virtually no one would attempt to contravene the computer misuse act if they knew that a sentence of even two years or more was a possibility. Sixty years is a terrifying prospect; however in today's climate of fear and scare mongering, it is nevertheless a strong possibility that this length of sentence could be imposed. I feel this is so out of proportion to the alleged crime of computer misuse.

The UK police took Gary's hard drives to America and these were never returned to him. I believe that taking and holding alleged evidence in another country can be detrimental to Gary's right to be tried in his own country.

We trust British Justice implicitly and do not agree that America has a similar judicial system. The thought of my son being extradited to America fills me with fear. I am afraid that he may be sent to a military facility such as Guantanamo Bay or that he may even face the death penalty as in a secret meeting with Gary's lawyers at the US Embassy, threats were made against Gary if he would not agree to a plea bargain and they were told that one state wanted Gary to "Fry".

The fact that my son Gary has now been included in the US military handbook of terrorism proves that my fears are not unfounded.

I have included details of the following case, which I feel proves that assurances given by the US government cannot be relied upon. The US government have apparently reneged on guarantees given to France, not to request the death penalty in the case of Zacarias Moussaoui.

I have highlighted the important sections in bold.

FACTS: Zacarias Moussaoui, a French citizen is now facing the death penalty in America despite assurances previously being given to the French government that this would not happen.

The reason given for consideration of the death sentence being carried out on Zacarias Moussaoui was that because he apparently lied to the FBI three weeks before the September 11th attacks, that his lies may have stopped the prevention of deaths in the 9/11 attacks. (See facts below)
(To consider sentencing someone to death for the crime of lying is yet another chilling prospect)

War on terrorism

April 3, 2006: a US jury found Zacarias Moussaoui eligible for the death penalty, and the convicted Sept. 11 conspirator shouted as he was led out of the court: "You'll never get my blood. God curse you all."

The same 12-person federal panel was due to return three days later to begin a second phase of his sentencing trial and decide whether he would be executed for his role in the hijacked

airliner attacks or sentenced to life in prison. After about 17 hours of deliberation, the jury found that Moussaoui lied to the FBI following his arrest three weeks before the Sept. 11 attacks and the lies led to deaths in the hijacked airliner attacks that killed nearly 3,000 people.

"Your findings mean we move on to phase two where the jury... ultimately (has) to make a final decision as to what sentence will be imposed," said US District Judge Leonie Brinkema. Moussaoui was the only person to be charged in the United States in connection with Sept. 11. In 2005 the 37-year-old Frenchman of Moroccan descent pleaded guilty to six counts of conspiracy in connection with the deadly hijackings. Three of the counts carried a possible death sentence. (Sources: Reuters, 03/04/2006)

March 6, 2006: lawyers for the US government demanded the death penalty in the trial of Zacarias Moussaoui who they said could have chosen to prevent the September 11 attacks. Moussaoui, a 37-year-old French citizen, sat quietly during the opening of the sentencing phase of his trial in Alexandria, Virginia, scrutinising the jury who must decide whether he is to be executed or imprisoned for life.

"He lied so the plot could proceed unimpeded," prosecuting attorney Rob Spencer told the court. "With that lie, he caused the deaths of nearly 3,000 people. He rejoiced in the death and destruction. Had Moussaoui just told the truth, it would all have been different."

As relatives of those killed on September 11 watched on a network of closed circuit TVs across the eastern US, Spencer described "a loyal al-Qaida soldier" who had detailed foreknowledge of the attacks. But Moussaoui's defence team - who were appointed by the court, and whom he refused to recognise - instead painted a picture of a fantasist who knew nothing of 9/11, and whose self-confessed dreams of launching other terrorist attacks were miles beyond his capability. "That is Zacarias Moussaoui in a nutshell," defence lawyer Edward MacMahon said. "Sound and fury, signifying nothing."

To achieve the death penalty, the prosecution had to convince the jury that Moussaoui had prior knowledge of September 11. Then, last April, he pleaded guilty to conspiring with al-Qaida to hijack planes and commit other crimes - but he continues to maintain his plans were unrelated to September 11. He says he planned to hijack a 747 in order to free Omar Abdel-Rahman, the blind sheikh being held in US custody. His confession rendered earlier wrangling irrelevant, and means the jury must decide only his sentence. (Sources: The Guardian, 07/03/2006)

March 3, 2006: the French justice minister reiterated the US had guaranteed France none of the information it provided for the US case against al-Qaida conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui would be used to seek the death penalty.

Pascal Clement, speaking to reporters after a meeting with US Attorney General Alberto Gonzales in Paris, stressed France's long-standing opposition to the death penalty, and said the two officials had discussed Moussaoui.

Moussaoui, a Frenchman, pleaded guilty in a US court in April to conspiring with al-Qaida to fly planes into US buildings, but said he wasn't involved in al-Qaida's September 11, 2001 plot. He said he was instead training to fly a 747 jetliner into the White House as part of a possible later attack.

"I'm quite aware, of course, of the severity of the facts for which he is blamed and has pleaded guilty," Clement said, referring to Moussaoui. "However, I reminded the attorney general of France's position on the death penalty."

"As you know, France has obtained the guarantee that the information which was transmitted would not be used - directly or indirectly - toward a request for the death penalty," he said. (Sources: Dow Jones International News, 03/03/2006)

FACTS

Of the 50 states that make up the United States of America, 38

have the death penalty.

Federal military law also provides for capital punishment. Some states have laws that prescribe the death penalty for offences that do not involve the death of someone. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - Retentionist

Government: Presidential-parliamentary democracy (federal) State of civil and political rights: Free Constitution: 17 September 1787, in force since 4 March 1789 Legal System: based on common law Legislative System: bicameral Congress (Senate and House of Representatives)

Judicial System: Supreme Court
Religion: 47% Protestant; 21% Catholic; 6% Christian; 3% Orthodox; 2% Jewish; 2% Muslim

Method of execution: Lethal Injection, Electrocution, Hanging, Firing Squad, Lethal Gas

Executions: 10

Executions since 1976: 1014

Prisoners on death row: 3.471 (as of October 1, 2004)

[http://www.handsoffcain.org/bancadati/schedastato.php?idstato=3D8000503&idco=ntinente=3D26](http://www.handsoffcain.org/bancadati/schedastato.php?idstato=3D8000503&idcontnente=3D26)

Legislation

March 9, 2006: President George W. Bush signed into law a Patriot Act renewal that will allow the government to keep using terror-fighting tools passed after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

The legislation will allow states to obtain approval of their systems of representation in death penalty cases from the U.S. Attorney General rather than from the federal courts, as required under a previous law.

Habeas corpus petitions alleging constitutional error in death verdicts will be put on a fast track for resolution. (Under the old law (the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act), only one state's (Arizona) system of appointment and compensation for defense counsel had been deemed adequate by the courts.)

Critics of the new measure fear that U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, a strong death penalty proponent, will allow the faster appeals in many states that have failed to meet basic standards for competent defense representation. They also worry that the short timelines will deter private attorneys from taking capital cases in federal court, and could leave some people on death row without counsel altogether. (Sources: Ap, 10/03/2006; The (Calif.) Daily Journal, Ap, 08/03/2006)

On March 31, 2004, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ordered the United States to "review and reconsider" the cases of 51 Mexicans facing execution. The Hague-based court ruled that Washington violated international law by not informing the 51 Mexicans that they were entitled to consular or legal help from their government as it must under the 1963 Vienna Convention. Mexico had taken the case to the ICJ on January 21, 2003. Mexico's suit before the ICJ, also known as the World Court, concerned capital cases in California, Texas, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma and Oregon.

On February 28, 2005, the White House ordered state courts to examine appeals made by 51 Mexican citizens held on death row. Several days later, on March 7, 2005, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, informed UN General Secretary Kofi Annan that the United States was withdrawing from the Vienna Treaty's Protocol on Consular Relations. The United States would continue to recognise the right of foreign citizens arrested in the US to meet with an official of their own country but they would not give the International Court of Justice the power to make rulings on appeals made by foreign citizens who claim they were denied of such rights. In 2004, the issue of the death penalty did not create any great divisions on the domestic political level. In the campaign for the White House, President George W. Bush, firm backer of executions, did not show any shift in his stance. The contender for the White House, Jhon Kerr, Catholic, had first declared himself against executions but then corrected himself saying he was in favour of the death penalty for

terrorists.

MY LETTER CONTINUED..

It seems that the world is gripped by a state of fear that seems out of proportion to the facts. I am very afraid that my son Gary is being unfairly used as an example in order to prevent unauthorised access to computers by other computer users. However I believe that the threat of any danger will not come from people like Gary but will come from people who are terrorists and will probably not be deterred whatever deterrents are imposed.

The US Government is responsible for their own Internet security and will like any other government, have to continually tighten its security in order to combat any possible threats.

I am greatly concerned that the US government's security is so poor.

Gary is far from the computer expert the US claims him to be and there are a great many computer administrators and teenagers with knowledge that far exceeds Gary's.

I am very afraid for my son's safety and of any possible extradition to America. We are not a wealthy family and would find it financially difficult to visit our son in America should he be sent there and kept in custody for up to several years whilst awaiting trial.

The possible length of sentence of ten years per count (I believe there was at least seven counts against Gary) is terrifying and we feel it is greatly out of proportion to the alleged computer misuse offence. The possible sentence of sixty years fills our family with dread and we do feel that the US government intends to make an example of our son Gary.

My husband and I foster large sibling groups of children for many London local authority's. We have fostered twenty-three children in less than four years and have turned around the lives of many children, some originally with severe behavioural problems.

All of our ex foster children are very fond of Gary and enjoyed his visits. He is a very patient person and would sometimes help the children with their reading and would listen to accounts of their achievements.

It is therefore all the more sad for us to see our own gentle and caring son in this dreadful predicament.

Gary has been using his time productively although he is virtually unable to work with computers due to his bail conditions. He has been giving some of his time free of charge to impart advice on Internet security.

I feel it's important to point out that Gary was free to use the Internet for several years after being questioned by the UK police in early 2002 and prior to his arrest in 2005 and he did not abuse this in any way.

Instead Gary chose to spend much of his time writing music.

Gary composes music and some of his musical compositions are used in a film, which is regularly screened on the Community channel, which is a government-sponsored channel on Sky TV. Although the film is musically orientated, it also reflects on many serious social issues.

Other musical compositions by Gary are to be used for planned animations of a children's book, which helps to educate children about London Squares and the landmarks that surround them. The book is used in some primary schools to assist in teaching children about road safety and the importance of staying close to family and not getting lost.

Gary is our only child and is an essential part of our lives and of our future.

Gary is once again in a secure and happy relationship and he has

(depending on the outcome of this case) a glowing future ahead of him. His partner Lucy is thirty-nine years old and they are keen to marry and start a family as Lucy's biological clock is currently ticking away.

Gary is a good and very caring person and we have all carried the heavy burden of this case for the past four years. We have always been a happy family but the cloud hanging over our heads has been a sentence in itself.

Bearing in mind the frightening possibilities that could take place were Gary to be extradited; I beg the court to consider allowing my son Gary to be tried in the UK, in his own country.

Yours Sincerely

Janis Sharp.

Below is a statement by Janis asserting she DID write the above letter.

(I have taken out her address so she isn't hassled but I will make it available to anybody genuinely trying to help Gary)

STATEMENT OF WITNESS

Criminal Justice Act, 1967, sect 9; M.C Rules, 1981, r.70)
(Magistrates' Court Act, 1980, s102)

Statement of : Janis Sharp
Age of Witness (DOB) : Over 21
Occupation and qualifications of witness : Mother
of defendant
Postal Address :

This statement, consisting of 3 pages each signed by me, is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Statement of: Janis Sharp

I, Janis Sharp, am making this statement regarding a letter written by me, initially to Judge Nicholas Evans. This letter (with very minor updates) was subsequently passed on to both Judges currently presiding over my son Gary McKinnon's appeal hearing.

For reasons which I fail to understand; Justice Nicholas Evans, Lord Justice Maurice Kay and Mr. Justice Goldring, apparently are having difficulty in believing that I have written this letter on my own without the help or input of a solicitor

I therefore confirm that I wrote the said letter entirely on my own and included information I obtained from the internet regarding the case of Zacarias Moussaoui.

I was disturbed by the fact that on April 3rd 2006 Zacharias Moussaoui was found by the American court to be eligible for the death penalty "for lying". This was despite the American government having given France an assurance that the death penalty would not be called for and that the evidence provided by France would not be used in this way.

Only the vote of one juror prevented the death sentence being imposed.

No part of my letter was written by a solicitor or by anyone else, although some quotes, including those from the Zacarias Moussaoui case (obtained by me from the internet) may have been quoted to Reuters etc. by a legal source.

I am puzzled as to why the Judiciary find it difficult to believe that a mother could write such a letter and I feel that they must underestimate the intelligence of the average

parent.

My education as unremarkable. I attended North Kelvinside School in Glasgow and I left school when I was fifteen years old. I married four days after my sixteenth birthday and gave birth to my son Gary when I was seventeen years old. My leanings were towards an artistic career but the prospect of going on to University held no appeal for me.

I have since composed and released many songs and have written and directed films, one of which has had more than forty screenings on television.

My husband and I have also fostered thirty children in the past four years and we have written and illustrated a children's book which has been relatively successful.

I am a reasonably intelligent person and am aware of what is happening in the world around me.

My son's life is virtually at stake and it is not difficult to research other legal cases on the internet and to absorb, understand and quote information that relates to the extradition law, etc.

In regard to my sons case I have used the internet to the full and continue to do so, as it is vitally important that I have as much knowledge as possible, to pass on to anyone who may be in a position to help my son.

I watched the debate on Extradition held in the House of Commons and was shocked that John Reid and Joan Ryan appeared to have little understanding of Labours own extradition treaty with the United States.

I wrote to almost every MP regarding my sons' case and provided them with information relating to the unratified extradition treaty with America.

Fortunately Dominique Grieve was already aware (as was I) that we are the only country in the world that will extradite their own citizens to America without prima facie evidence being required.

Initially the House of Commons had voted against the lop sided treaty but this was only a token vote.

During the second debate at the House; Dominique Grieve's eloquent arguments against the one sided extradition treaty, were remarkable in their content but unfortunately; a great many of the MP's present did not have the courage or honour to vote as they believed but instead simply abstained during the actual vote. This was a great disappointment to us.

Although the American senate have "recommended" the ratification of the extradition treaty with the UK; the treaty remains unratified.

Ratification cannot take effect or become law unless the President of America signs the treaty. This has not happened and as this treaty goes against the American constitution; it is highly improbable that this will ever happen.

Despite this; the UK government is currently extraditing British citizens on the strength of an unratified treaty denying UK citizens of their right to prima facie evidence having to be provided prior to extradition. UK citizens are thereby effectively being treated as second class citizens in the world.

In his judgment, by declaring the prosecution's allegations against my son as fact; Justice Evans was basically and publicly pronouncing my son guilty of the charges levelled at him by the US, without my son's legal team having the opportunity to contest the allegations and to defend the case against him.

It has now been five years since my son was first arrested and this has devastated our family and has been a gruelling sentence in itself.

The fact that the US government waited until the UK government signed this "treaty" and made it retrospective before re-

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Great Beasts Peppered From Space

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 18:55:32 -0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 03:55:21 -0500
Subject: Great Beasts Peppered From Space

Source: BBC - London, UK

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7130014.stm>

Tuesday, 11 December 2007

Great Beasts Peppered From Space
By Jonathan Amos
Science reporter, BBC News, San Francisco

Startling evidence has been found which shows mammoth and other great beasts from the last ice age were blasted with material that came from space.

Eight tusks dating to some 35,000 years ago all show signs of having being peppered with meteorite fragments.

The ancient remains come from Alaska, but researchers also have a Siberian bison skull with the same pockmarks.

The scientists released details of the discovery at a meeting of the American Geophysical Union in San Francisco, US.

They painted a picture of a calamitous event over North America that may have severely knocked back the populations of some species.

Blast direction

"We think that there was probably an impact which exploded in the air that sent these particles flying into the animals," said Richard Firestone from the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

"In the case of the bison, we know that it survived the impact because there's new bone growth around these marks."

Large quantities of mammoth tusk material are now in collections

And geoscience consultant Allen West added: "If the particles had gone through the skin, they may not have made it through to vital organs; but this material could certainly have blinded the animals and severely injured them."

The mammoth and bison remains all display small (about 2-3mm in size) perforations.

Raised, burnt surface rings trace the point of entry of high-velocity projectiles; and the punctures are on only one side, consistent with a blast coming from a single direction.

Viewed under an electron microscope, the embedded fragments appear to have exploded inside the tusk and bone, say the researchers. Shards have cut little channels.

The sunken pieces are also magnetic, and tests show them to have a high iron-nickel content, but to be depleted in titanium.

The ratios of different types of atoms in the fragments meant it was most unlikely they had originated on Earth, the team told the AGU meeting.

Magnetic hunt

The discovery follows on from the group's previous research which claimed a more recent space collision - some 13,000 years ago.

The researchers reported the discovery of sediment at more than 20 sites across North America that contained exotic materials: tiny spheres of glass and carbon, ultra-small specks of diamond and amounts of the rare element iridium that were too high to be terrestrial.

The scientists also found a black layer which, they argued, was the charcoal deposited by wildfires that swept the continent after the space object smashed into the Earth's atmosphere.

"It was just a tiny magnet on a string, but very strong. It would swing over and stick firmly to these little dots" --Allen West

"We had found evidence of particle impacts in chert, or flint, at a Clovis Indian site in Michigan," Dr Firestone said.

"So, we got the idea that if these impacts were in the chert, then they might likely also have occurred in large surfaces such as tusks; and we decided it was worth a shot to go look for them."

Allen West began the hunt at a mammoth tusk sale in his home state of Arizona.

He immediately found one tusk with the tell-tale pockmarks and asked the trading company if he could look through its entire collection. He sorted literally thousands of items.

"There are many things that can cause spots, such as algae, and there were a few of those; but I was only interested in the ones that were magnetic," he recalled. "It was just a tiny magnet on a string, but very strong. It would swing over and stick firmly to these little dots."

The search turned up a further seven ivory specimens of interest, together with the bison skull.

Further clues

But having gone out and tested the hypothesis of tusk impacts, and having apparently uncovered such items - the team was then astonished to find the animal remains were about 20,000 years older than had been anticipated.

The researchers are now considering a number of possibilities - one that could even tie the older remains to the younger event.

The embedded particles have a high iron-nickel content

"People who collect these items today in Siberia and Alaska frequently find the tusks sticking out of the permafrost or eroding out of a riverbank," explained Mr West.

"Maybe, these were tusks from dead animals that were just exposed on the surface, so when this thing blew up in the atmosphere, it would have peppered them. The date could really be anywhere from 13,000 to 35-40,000 years ago."

The team believes there must still be peppered tusks out there that can be dated to 13,000 years ago, and the hope is that the AGU presentation will prompt museums and collectors to look through their archives.

"There should also be a layer of this same meteoritic material in the sedimentary record. It's probably very thin. If we can locate the right place and it hasn't been turbated, we should be able to find this layer; and it shouldn't be too different from the impact layer we found for the 13,000-year event," said Dr Firestone.

Neither proposed impact can yet be tied definitively to any craters - if there ever were any. The team also needs to explain how the bison and mammoth remains can show similar damage when they were widely separated geographically.

Past puzzle

The intriguing question is how space impacts might fit into the extinction story of the ice age beasts. The mammoth, their elephant cousins the mastodon, sabre-toothed tigers, some bears, and many other creatures all disappeared rapidly from the palaeo-record about 10,000 years ago.

Their loss has traditionally been put down to either climate change and/or the efficient hunting technologies adopted by migrating humans.

Could impacts have also weakened these populations?

Ice Age Puzzle

Large beast populations crashed 10,000 years ago
Includes mammoth, mastodon, sabre-toothed tigers, giant sloth
Scientists have several theories to explain the extinctions
Human hunters had adopted a deadly spear-point technology
Climate changes may have hastened animals' demise
Do space impacts also now need to be considered?

It might be just one more element to factor into what is a really complex picture, commented Dr Ian Barnes from Royal Holloway University of London, UK.

The British researcher studies the DNA of ancient animals to try to glean details of how their populations changed over time.

He said there were some interesting markers in the genetics of different creatures some 30,000 to 45,000 years ago - but it was extremely hard to draw firm conclusions.

"For us the difficulty is that we see patterns but we don't understand what the underlying process is; so it becomes difficult to ascribe causation," he explained.

"Just as in a modern crime scene, it's very difficult to piece all the evidence together and say precisely what was going on; which event led to any particular outcome."

But he added: "Certainly, you can't imagine it helped the animals having a large meteorite hit the Earth's atmosphere and pellet them with shot."

[Jonathan.Amos-INTERNET.nul](#)

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:57:33 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 04:06:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:10:05 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>Neither NORAD or NASA had any tracking projections of satellite
>objects in close encounters with Skylab 3. They had 14 years of
>orbital data and thus plenty of warning of any close approaches.
>It was not something launched just a day or two before Skylab's
>USO encounter on Sept 20, 1973.

>Why didn't
>NORAD track or project any close approaches to Skylab 3 with its
>COMBO computer program and formal agreement with NASA to predict
>and warn of all close approaches of satellites and space debris
>throughout every manned NASA space mission??

Is this definitive? Is there a report indicating this? I haven't
seen such reports. Do we have these for even ISS?

From the orbital elements lists one can deduce that they are
unable to associate unique objects to some radar data. So they
have to somehow associate successive orbits (when lucky enough
to pass thru the radar beam) of radar data to the same object
prior to generating definitive orbital elements for the object.

Of course, it is also possible the radar cannot lock on the
object for some reason (size/orientation) or it doesn't pass
thru the radar beam.

If they use simply the raw radar data and don't have to actually
identify the object, then they can propagate the objects orbit
using the X-Y-Z position and velocity. Thus, they may not have
publishable orbital elements, but can determine the possible
intersection of objects. Small objects may still be difficult to
handle or those in odd orbits.

>What software did you use and which NORAD Spacetrack elsets did
>you use? Which objects approached within 20 km of Skylab 3
>within the week before and after Sept 20 and for how long? 10
>minutes? If you have a list of such space objects and have the
>elsets we can tell how recent the elsets data were and get an
>idea how good the projected close approaches to Skylab 3. NORAD
>said there had been no close approach warnings to manned
>spacecraft as of 1973. A 12-mile close pass would be highly
>significant and potentially dangerous - because tracking and
>projection errors could mean the real distance was 0-km
>(impact).

I don't remember any collision avoidance ability for Skylab. I
found one report that states Skylab didn't need it, but no other
mention.

<http://tinyurl.com/3ccx6c>

"...and an active orbit collision prediction and avoidance capability does not appear justified at this time - especially in view of the rather low probability of a collision." It also says:

"The future position of a piece of debris that is tracked intensively is accurate to about one kilometer for reasonable prediction times." (about 4 orbits).

Using Satellite Took Kit and the Space Track orbital elements, 4032 objects were in orbit/tracked during the Sept 1973 time period. Of these, 2621 had orbital elements during the Sept 1973 time period. The rest (1411) had no orbital elements for whatever reason. Raw radar data could have been used way back when to make the orbit propagation, but no orbital elements with a unique name could be generated.

Out of the 2621, 268 come within 100 km of Skylab during Sept 1973. Out of these 268, 17 have a pass duration of greater than 1 minute and 4 have a pass duration of greater than 5 minutes.

These are:

#6637/Skylab Fairing (18 elements):
Sept9, duration=9 min...Min range=63km
Sept9, 11 min...13km
Sept 9, 9 min...62km
#6642/SAS-2:Solar Array Assembly wing part (16 elements) :
Sept4, 9 min...93km
Sept4, 24 min...31km
Sept 4, 33 min...27km
Sept 4, 17 min... 77km
Sept 4, 22 min...63km
Sept 26, 13 min...45km
Sept 26, 12 min...52km
#6643/Solar Array Assembly debris (15 elements) :
Sept11:twice, 10 min...34km
#6644/Solar Array Assembly debris (12 elements) :
Sept3, 7 min...53km
Sept11, 6 min...56km
Sept 17, 5 min...57km

Skylab itself had 6 elements over the month. I think that one needs elements for at least every other day over the month (~15 elements) for most smaller objects. Even Skylab needs more than 6.

Out of the 268, regarding close proximity <20km range, there were 30 events and 23 objects with the closest ones at 3km. None were on Sept 20

#2897 (7 elements) was at a range of 3km on Sept16
#6733 (17 elements) was at a range of 3km on Sept23
#6645 (22 elements) was at a range of 4km on Sept19
#1823 (16 elements) was at a range of 4km on Sept16
#6794 (19 elements) was at a range of 5km on Sept26
#4242 (14 elements) was at a range of 5km on Sept13
#2800 (10 elements) was at a range of 7km on Sept28
#6806 (41 elements) was at a range of 7km on Sept4/7
#3861 (18 elements) was at a range of 6km on Sept3
#2931 (19 elements) was at a range of 9km on Sept30
#6781 (16 elements) was at a range of 9km on Sept11

If NORAD was doing COMBO runs for Skylab then their estimates should have been good even with those old computers since they had raw data to make propagations. Present day models could be somewhat better as the technology improved since the '70s, but even so, NORAD should have better predictions that what we try to do using relatively infrequent orbital elements. Another reason no public flags were raised on the above possible close approaches is that perhaps their collision warning distance was lower than 3 km, thus no alarms were given..

With 1411 objects without orbital elements and particularly with three Skylab debris/jettisoned objects with no orbital elements for September 1973, we can never say for certain there was no orbital debris/satellite that passed close by Skylab on Sept 20. This is especially true for non-trackable items (non metallic trash bags). NORAD is unlikely to provide access to raw data, even old data. However, the data does show it is possible to

have close passes and long durations, particularly for Skylab-related objects.

I find it curious that NORAD never lists and captured meteors or other natural rocks. Are there really none?

The Skylab objects without useful orbital elements are:

6704,1973-027N,"SAS/EVA debris"; which had good orbital elements until Aug 24, 1973, then was apparently "lost" until Jan 4 1974 and resumed good orbital elements and they predicted re-entry on 4-13-74. 6705,1973-027P,"SAS/EVA debris"; which had good orbital elements until Sep4,1973 then was "lost" yet they predicted reentry on 2-24-74. 6774,1973-027V,"S-063 camera/experiment"; which had only two orbital elements (Aug 7 and 16, 1973) yet they predicted re-entry on Sept 20, 1973.

It is possible these are small objects, although the last one seems large enough to need to be jettisoned from the scientific airlock.

I hope this helps answer your queries. If you need more data let me know.

>>There is a possibility that this
>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>going in shadow.

>Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos?
>Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at
>about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles
>height.

Another thing I thought of was that apogee (high point in the orbit) and perigee (low point) would not be equal for an object just prior to re-entry. So, the object could get heated up to glowing at a lower altitude during perigee and then be at or above the Skylab apogee. Then it just has to glow until it comes into range at the higher apogee. Keeping a glow for an hour seems far fetched.

Based on your updated SL3 web page, I want to re-emphasize the conflict of dates of the laser experiment photos. The mission report for Skylab 3...

<http://tinyurl.com/2jnrmg>

shows on page 5-3 that the dates of the laser photos are Sept 19 (good ones) and Sept 20 (blurred ones). This conflicts with the laser experiment report which states the images were from Sept 4. This is pretty important since on Sept 4 we had some fairly long duration "close" passes. I think the Skylab transcripts could help pinpoint/ confirm the times/days.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:00:03 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 04:08:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 11:30:00 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

>Source: Amercian Chronicle.Com - California, USA

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

>December 10, 2007

>Spies, Lies, And Polygraph Tape: CIA's Disturbing
>Extraterrestrial Affair
>Gary S. Bekkum

>"I remain a skeptical agnostic. More skeptical as time
>advances, but careful to note that even if paranormal phenomena
>are entirely bogus, some individuals are surely able to instill
>the belief in unexplained capabilities. How they do this and
>what are the vulnerabilities to such enticements is worth
>knowing." -- Ken Kress, CIA officer assigned to the Stanford
>Research Institute psychic spy research project in the early
>1970s.

>The real-life tall-tale of espionage you are about to read spins
>around a confrontation between a former CIA official and
>officers of the United States Air Force.

>Twenty years later, the game continues where disturbing worlds
>collide.

<snip>

>At the center of the latest controversy is an obscure book by
>former USAF intelligence officer Robert M. Collins.

>Exempt From Disclosure revisits tales of conspiracy and
>intrigue that have been the mainstay of legends whispered within
>the USAF since at least the early 1980s, when I was first told
>by "Sarge" about Air Force involvement in an extraterrestrial
>affair.

>Open-source materials published on line document the involvement
>of former senior intelligence persons in the search for the U.S.
>Government's role in alleged alien contact. One source, who
>remains active in government business, including a role as a CIA
>consultant and involvement with the Department of Homeland
>Security, confirmed knowledge of high-level rumors of
>extraterrestrial contact.

>According to Exempt from Disclosure, beginning in 1986,
>researcher Bill Moore and Jaime Shandera, a TV producer,
>initiated meetings with interested parties including Ernie
>>Kellerstrass of General Dynamics, Wright Patterson Air Force
>Base, Rick Doty, a former USAF counter-intelligence officer who
>had been assigned to cold-war Eastern Europe, Dr. Hal Puthoff, a
>physicist with several government contracts on his resume, and
>the author, Captain Robert Collins.

How much of this is true? How much makes sense? How much is verifiable?

I can provide at least some corroboration based on information obtained from "Hawk" (Kellerstraus) some 20 years before EfD was published. In fact, the story in EfD begins where the "Hawk Tales" left off.

See:

<http://www.brumac.8k.com/HAWKTALES/>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming5.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 22:08:05 -0600
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 04:12:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:24:20 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lflaming5.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>><snip>

>>I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion,
>Fair enough, but you're missing the point.

But I think you're missing my point. You said the witnesses' statements were will-o-the-wispy, which they were. But someone gave a considerably more detailed description of the object in Halt's memo that could not be reasonably described as a will o' the wisp. The description of a metallic object did not come from any of the written statements. It appears the witnesses may have tailored their descriptions from the very beginning, perhaps depending on the audience.

It would be interesting to hear from Halt exactly who told him that the object was metallic and triangular in shape, and if it was Penniston, whether he said anything about actually touching the object to anyone else at the time. I don't think anyone has ever asked Halt that question.

>The claim now is that they "left out" the detail of actually touching it because they feared for their careers and so all conspired to claim falsely that 50 meters was as close as they got. But the difference, in terms of career damage, between reporting that you have "positively identified" an object as a mechanical device "out of the realm of explanation" from 50 meters away, and reporting that you have so identified it from 1 meter away, seems to me to be an overly sophisticated one that could never reasonably have been expected to serve as a sensible defence.

Penniston later said that he had touched the object and that there was some sort of writing on it. I don't think it's out of the question that he might have been a little uncomfortable saying that, especially if he felt that his interrogators didn't want to hear that kind of crazy talk. It wasn't necessarily a coldly logical calculation about career advancement.

In another case that comes to mind, Lonnie Zomora originally said that he saw two people in coveralls near the UFO in the Soccoro incident. After being ridiculed for seeing little people in UFOs, he later omitted the "people" from his description and said only that he had seen two pairs of coveralls near the object. It apparently didn't occur to him that the image of two pairs of empty pants standing by a UFO was even more ridiculous than that of two little people, with or without pants. I don't think that proves Zamorra was lying; UFO witnesses sometimes seem to change their stories in ways that don't make a lot of

sense when they're under pressure. Maybe Penniston was lying, but I think the evidence of that so far as I'm aware is less than conclusive.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Ely UFO Crash Cover-Up In Chapter Of 'Weird' Book

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 08:35:49 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 08:35:49 -0500
Subject: Ely UFO Crash Cover-Up In Chapter Of 'Weird' Book

Source: The Ely Times - Nevada, USA

<http://www.elynews.com/articles/2007/12/12/lifestyle/life02.txt>

Wednesday, December 12, 2007

Ely UFO Crash Cover-Up In Chapter Of 'Weird' Book
By John Plestina
Ely Times Reporter

The alleged crash of an alien starship near Ely during the 1950s is remembered in *Weird Las Vegas And Nevada, Your Alternative Travel Guide To Sin City And The Silver State*. The eclectic collection spins strange yarns and tales of Nevada.

The new book by Joe Oesterle and Tim Cridland chronicles weird and not so weird rumors and tales of Las Vegas and most other parts of Nevada in a 247-page hardcover volume. Cridland lives in Las Vegas.

The book looks at Las Vegas' past and present local legends. Notorious gangsters, the Rat Pack and Liberace are not excluded. Neither is Elvis (the Elvis that is buried in Memphis and the living Elvises that are found at wedding chapels along Las Vegas Boulevard). There are numerous other accounts of bazaar happenings including the belief by some people that the ghost of actor and comic Redd Fox haunts the house he lived in on Eastern Avenue in Las Vegas. Other venues include Cold War nuclear testing, divorces, wedding chapels and bodies ending up in the desert during the days when the Mob ran Las Vegas. Many were alleged to have been buried along Blue Diamond Road which runs from Southwest Las Vegas to Pahrump.

Now about Ely, there is a chapter titled *Secret UFO Crash at Ely*. The preceding chapter is called *Nevada UFO Roundup*.

The book tells the 55-year-old tale of a young woman (not identified) from Ely who allegedly witnessed a flying saucer crash in August, 1952. According to the book, several local people arrived at the scene before a secret federal (possibly military) team and claimed that they saw the remains of a dead alien crew. Some say the body count was the highest of any crash of a starship that was not of this world. The book also presents accounts that the crash was a U.S. military aircraft (possibly being tested and secret at the time) and the military did not want to reveal its existence or considered the crash an embarrassment. The book also says that the crash might be a reason that a radar station was built on South Ridge after the crash. Of course, the government squashed whatever happened in the interest of national security or to avoid an embarrassment.

Ely Times Editor Kent Harper is quoted in the chapter about the crash in White Pine County.

While no one is implying that a Klingon Bird of Prey might have swooped down to take a close up look at Ely and then crashed in the desert, it makes interesting reading. Most of all, believe it or not, the reader can form opinions while enjoying the book.

No one is trying to upstage Roswell, either. The city of about 40,000 people in southern New Mexico was the site of the alleged crash of a UFO five years before whatever crashed near Ely and the (if you want to believe it) recovery of the bodies of an alien crew.

Ely is not ready for a UFO Festival like Roswell has every summer.

"Weird Las Vegas and Nevada, Your Alternative Travel Guide to Sin City and the Silver State" is a recent release by Sterling Publishing Company, Inc., of New York.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 12:08:25 -0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 08:39:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 22:08:05 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:24:20 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>><snip>

>>>I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion,

>>>Fair enough, but you're missing the point.

>But I think you're missing my point. You said the witnesses'
>statements were will-o-the-wispy, which they were. But someone
>gave a considerably more detailed description of the object in
>Halt's memo that could not be reasonably described as a will o'
>the wisp.

I do see your point, Lan, but it's a misunderstanding. I
described the reported behaviour of the object during the
pursuit as like the classic behaviour of a will o' the whisp:
As they seemed to get closer to it they found it wasn't where
they previously thought it was.

This is very explicit in the description of Chandler:

"Each time Penniston gave me the indication that he was about to
reach the area where the lights were, he would give an extended
estimated location. He eventually arrived at a 'beacon light',
however, he stated this was not the light or lights that he had
originally observed."

I think it is well understood that this type of behaviour is the
defining characteristic of a will o' the whisp, hence the use of
the simile in common speech.

The different point you are making concerns the detail in the
descriptions, but to use the term will-o-the-wisp in that
context would not be useful, neither did I so use it. The
descriptions of a bank of blue lights topped by a red light;
Burrughs' drawing showing this arrangement of lights on a
triangular shape; Penniston's confirmation of having "positively
identified" it from 50 meters as a "mechanical device" - these
all add up to a sighting of something aptly characterised as a
structured object not a vague glow.

Which of course brings us back to my original point: This being
so, what has been gained by the imposture of pretending that 50
meters separated them from this object instead of 1 meter? Why
say you have positively identified as a machine what you wish

people to either a) not know about at all or b) think was merely some ambiguous little light?

>The description of a metallic object did not come from
>any of the written statements.

Strictly speaking this is correct, but to stand on the distinction that a "mechanical device" is not necessarily "metallic" seems to me to be an over-refinement of logical nicety. This assumption would have been a natural one for Halt to make from the statement alone. But it would be unrealistic to think that no communication occurred beyond what was written down. Halt may also have got this impression verbally from Penniston and/or indirectly from others such as Buran and Chandler who spoke with Penniston afterwards (although Penniston now says the surface was actually like "onyx").

>It appears the witnesses may have
>tailored their descriptions from the very beginning, perhaps
>depending on the audience.

Or someone tailored their descriptions on their behalf. Yes, that is the hypothesis. I'm not yet convinced by the evidence for it.

>It would be interesting to hear from Halt exactly who told him
>that the object was metallic and triangular in shape, and if it
>was Penniston, whether he said anything about actually touching
>the object to anyone else at the time. I don't think anyone has
>ever asked Halt that question.

If you argue that Halt got the "metallic" originally from Penniston (which I don't dispute is possible), and that this indicates a close-up fingertip inspection just as Penniston has recently claimed, then why did Halt give this information in a report which was supposedly designed to suppress the fact that there had been a close inspection of a truly metallic object?

Or if Penniston and the others were falsifying their own stories for an innocent Halt, to deny that they had seen a device, why did Penniston include a detail which could hardly have been better designed to reinforce his own description of a "definitely mechanical device"?

Maybe Halt just assumed that a device would be metallic. Burroughs drawing showed a triangular shape. The arrangement of blue and red lights reported represents a triangular shape. Penniston explicitly described the object as a "mechanical device", which it would be unnatural for Halt not to characterise as "metallic" (notwithstanding Penniston's recent preference for "onyx"). Thus, a metallic triangle.

On the other hand Penniston did report a shape explicitly in his original drawings. But the shape he drew was not triangular. It was rectangular or (in perspective) drum shaped, with a line of blue running around the middle, a red light on the flat top and a fan of blue lights emanating from the bottom.

Maybe he drew this to represent how he thought it looked when he was too far away to see it properly? Does that make any kind of sense?

Perhaps Penniston did do another drawing that showed it as a triangle but that one was suppressed, because they were happy to be associated with a drum shaped flying saucer, just not with a conical one?

Maybe there were two sightings and possibly two objects? It's true that Penniston now claims he had his closer encounter when separated from the other two (not by a great distance) on the way back through the trees. He says that he (and others with cameras and instruments whose exact origin and movements I'm not sure about) spent 45 minutes examining the object. His original statement mentioned 45 mins also. It was the length of time that had elapsed when he walked back to the vehicle. It isn't clear if he meant this to be the entire out-and-back length of the excursion, beginning some time shortly after the initial alert at about 0300, or just the walk back from the point at which Buran at CSC had terminated their search at 0354, but in either case it obviously isn't possible to fit in a 45-minute period of UFO-examining. Once again, it can't be a case of "some details"

being cautiously "left out" by some of the participants, but has to be a major fabrication of the timeline of this entire corpus of interlocking accounts including those by Buran back at CSC and Chandler

Yes, one could ask Halt to recollect the exact circumstances of how he got the words "metallic" and "triangular". But as I understand Nick (Pope)'s position it is that Halt would have been responsible for, or at least acquiescent in, the fabricated statements he collected, as indicated by the fact that his own original statement is now also claimed to have been untrue. I would be surprised if his new statement added anything that disagreed in a probative way with what Penniston is now claiming.

>>The claim now is that they "left out" the detail of actually touching it because they feared for their careers and so all conspired to claim falsely that 50 meters was as close as they got. But the difference, in terms of career damage, between reporting that you have "positively identified" an object as a mechanical device "out of the realm of explanation" from 50 meters away, and reporting that you have so identified it from 1 meter away, seems to me to be an overly sophisticated one that could never reasonably have been expected to serve as a sensible defence.

>Penniston later said that he had touched the object and that there was some sort of writing on it. I don't think it's out of the question that he might have been a little uncomfortable saying that, especially if he felt that his interrogators didn't want to hear that kind of crazy talk. It wasn't necessarily a coldly logical calculation about career advancement.

Well, just omitting some detail about which you are "a little uncomfortable" is one thing. I think you would have to hypothesise an imposture of a more elaborate kind to explain how the original account came to be.

>In another case that comes to mind, Lonnie Zomora originally said that he saw two people in coveralls near the UFO in the Socorro incident. After being ridiculed for seeing little people in UFOs, he later omitted the "people" from his description and said only that he had seen two pairs of coveralls near the object. It apparently didn't occur to him that the image of two pairs of empty pants standing by a UFO was even more ridiculous than that of two little people, with or without pants. I don't think that proves Zamorra was lying; UFO witnesses sometimes seem to change their stories in ways that don't make a lot of sense when they're under pressure. Maybe Penniston was lying, but I think the evidence of that so far as I'm aware is less than conclusive.

That's an interesting example, and a point of view worth thinking about.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 12:08:36 -0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 08:45:00 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:33:38 -0000
>Subject: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

>Last month there were some media reports about a UFO sighting
>that occurred in the UK on October 4. It was claimed that RAF
>aircraft had been scrambled to intercept the UFO, so a number of
>people made FOI requests relating to this.

>Here's a link to one of the media stories about the sighting:

>[http://www.worthingherald.co.uk/6427/UFO-report--RAF-](http://www.worthingherald.co.uk/6427/UFO-report--RAF-did.3488813.jp)
>did.3488813.jp

>And here's a link to the MoD's reply (a .pdf file), which states
>no aircraft were scrambled and says the MoD has no record of the
>sighting:

><http://tinyurl.com/ysd44r>

Nick and List,

Having spoken briefly to Leo Lindsay about this sighting - it
seems this FOIA statement leaves a lot to be desired.

Leo himself labels it a "cover-up".

He is certain these were fighter planes.

"There were going straight at the objects", he says.

He says that by then the discs had moved away and were seen as
lights.

"One plane went straight through where the light was" he says.

A few minutes later he says, another single plane was on the
scene, did a U turn around a small fluffy white cloud, and then
flew away.

Half an hour later he saw six fighter planes in formation flying
towards where he saw the objects and the first two planes come
together.

He tells me his sighting which had three other witnesses
including his wife Rosie lasted 15 minutes to half an hour and
looking through binoculars he described the objects as "some
sort of mechanical discs", smooth, except for "caps" on the tops
which were uneven and glistened "like diamonds" Leo, a 60 year
old builder, has never read a UFO book but says he's now
determined "not to let this case drop" He claims to have inside
information via a contact that these jets were scrambled by the
RAF.

Leo is amazed that nobody else so far has reported seeing the
same phenomena, despite the publicity and his phone number in
the newspaper.

He told me "I felt exhilarated and privileged by this sighting".

I know a UK UFO investigator is preparing a full report on this case.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 08:46:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 22:08:05 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:24:20 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>><snip>

>>>I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion,

>>>Fair enough, but you're missing the point.

>But I think you're missing my point. You said the witnesses'
>statements were will-o-the-wispy, which they were. But someone
>gave a considerably more detailed description of the object in
>Halt's memo that could not be reasonably described as a will o'
>the wisp. The description of a metallic object did not come from
>any of the written statements. It appears the witnesses may have
>tailored their descriptions from the very beginning, perhaps
>depending on the audience.

>It would be interesting to hear from Halt exactly who told him
>that the object was metallic and triangular in shape, and if it
>was Penniston, whether he said anything about actually touching
>the object to anyone else at the time. I don't think anyone has
>ever asked Halt that question.

>>The claim now is that they "left out" the detail of actually
>>touching it because they feared for their careers and so all
>>conspired to claim falsely that 50 meters was as close as they
>>got. But the difference, in terms of career damage, between
>>reporting that you have "positively identified" an object as a
>>mechanical device "out of the realm of explanation" from 50
>>meters away, and reporting that you have so identified it from 1
>>meter away, seems to me to be an overly sophisticated one that
>>could never reasonably have been expected to serve as a sensible
>>defence.

>Penniston later said that he had touched the object and that
>there was some sort of writing on it. I don't think it's out of
>the question that he might have been a little uncomfortable
>saying that, especially if he felt that his interrogators didn't
>want to hear that kind of crazy talk. It wasn't necessarily a
>coldly logical calculation about career advancement.

>In another case that comes to mind, Lonnie Zomora originally
>said that he saw two people in coveralls near the UFO in the
>Soccoro incident. After being ridiculed for seeing little people
>in UFOs, he later omitted the "people" from his description and
>said only that he had seen two pairs of coveralls near the

>object. It apparently didn't occur to him that the image of two
>pairs of empty pants standing by a UFO was even more ridiculous
>that that of two little people, with or without pants. I don't
>think that proves Zamorra was lying; UFO witnesses sometimes
>seem to change their stories in ways that don't make a lot of
>sense when they're under pressure. Maybe Penniston was lying,
>but I think the evidence of that so far as I'm aware is less
>than conclusive.

Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been puzzling me intermittently over the years.

A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin has been absolutely right to draw attention to these inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic. Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

Lan's attempts to explain these inconsistencies away could even be absolutely right, but without hard evidence as corroboration, it is hard to see how it comes down to anything other than a matter of opinion over the relative credibility of different versions of an individual's changing story. For every 'excuse' that can be adduced, there is an equally plausible counter-example. To indicate just one, I find it hard to suppress cynicism when retired military personnel 'improve' their story in a way that makes them more of a celebrity. Retirement can be a great anticlimax for such people, and to be involved in books, conferences, interviews, TV documentaries, debates etc. represents a wonderful antidote to that anticlimax. In such a context, the temptation, for some, to spice up a story must be overwhelming.

All of which leaves me wondering why a more promising angle on the case has been comparatively neglected. I refer to its apparent correlation with the Cash/Landrum incident. This did produce some hard physical evidence in the form of medical conditions (somehow more convincing than broken branches, 'rabbit-holes' and plaster casts of indentations), and might offer lines of enquiry that are more productive than trying to pin down exactly why a witness's story has changed. I know Jenny Randles was interested in the Cash/Landrum dimension, but, I believe, became disillusioned when it failed to offer any corroboration of her nuclear accident scenario hypothesis.

Are any List members able to shed any light on other work that might have been done on this? I've been trying for some time to get John Schuessler's book on the Cash/Landrum incident, but to no avail - in any case, I don't think he explores the Rendlesham connection any more than most Rendlesham authors have explored the Cash/Landrum end.

--

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:22:57 -0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:14:09 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

>From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 12:08:36 -0000
>Subject: UFO Sighting In West Sussex

>He is certain these were fighter planes.

>"There were going straight at the objects", he says.

>He says that by then the discs had moved away and were seen as
>lights.

>"One plane went straight through where the light was" he says.

>A few minutes later he says, another single plane was on the
>scene, did a U turn around a small fluffy white cloud, and then
>flew away.

>Half an hour later he saw six fighter planes in formation flying
>towards where he saw the objects and the first two planes come
>together.

I suppose it's worth noting that the MoD statement strictly speaking does not deny that planes may have been in the area, only that no planes were "scrambled to investigate". If aircraft were already airborne nearby - on exercise, training, logging aircrew flight hours or enroute between stations, for example - they could be redirected to investigate but they would not have been scrambled specifically for that purpose

Similarly, if the event was not construed as a being a UFO incident by RAF elements involved (for example, if the objects were identified on the spot or were deployed as part of said hypothetical exercise) then there would be reason for the activity to be "reported to this [MoD] office".

A total of eight fighters over the space of half an hour seems a lot though.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Did UFO Encounter Cost Woman Her Life?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:21:43 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:21:43 -0500
Subject: Did UFO Encounter Cost Woman Her Life?

Source: The McDowell News - Marion, North Carolina

<http://tinyurl.com/yo6a9r>

Thursday, December 13, 2007

Did UFO Encounter Cost Woman Her Life?

By Mike Conley
mconley.nul

Could a UFO sighting not only be frightening but deadly as well? Some researchers into the strange phenomenon think so and hold up Betty Cash's incredible story as an example.

On Dec. 30, 1998, the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), an organization dedicated to studying UFO and alien sightings, issued a news release about the death of Betty Cash. She had passed away exactly 18 years after her alleged close encounter.

"Mrs. Cash was a hero in the fight against government UFO cover-ups and brought hope to other victims of UFO incidents," read the news release. "She was devoted to family and friends and never allowed her illness to prevent her from helping others to cope with the trauma of UFO close encounters."

On the evening of Dec. 29, 1980, Cash, friend Vickie Landrum and Vickie's 7-year-old grandson Colby were driving home to Dayton, Texas after going out for dinner. They were traveling down an isolated two-lane road through some woods. At about 9 p.m., they all saw a light above the trees. At first, they assumed it was coming from an airplane.

A few minutes later, they saw what looked to be the same light as before, but it was now much closer and very bright. The light supposedly came from a huge, diamond-shaped object, which hovered above the treetops in front of their car. The object was sending out a lot of heat and a bright flame.

Vickie Landrum told Cash to stop the car. She was afraid that they would be burned if they got any closer. Cash considered turning the car around, but abandoned this idea because the road was too narrow and she was worried the car would get stuck on the shoulder of the road, according to a Web site.

Cash and Landrum got out of the car to get a closer look. The UFO was shaped like a huge upright diamond, with the top and bottom cut off so that they were flat rather than pointed. Small blue lights ringed the center and flames shot out of the bottom.

Cash and Landrum later said the heat was strong enough to make the car's metal body painful to the touch. Cash claimed she had to use her coat to protect her hand from being burnt when she finally got back into the car. When she touched the dashboard, Landrum's hand left an imprint into the heated vinyl. Little

Colby was scared and wanted his grandmother to protect him.

The hovering UFO then moved higher into the sky. As it flew over the treetops, Cash and Landrum claimed that a group of military helicopters approached the object and surrounded it in tight formation. Cash started up her car and left the scene. She claimed to see glimpses of the UFO and the helicopters receding into the distance, according to the Web site.

That night, Cash, Landrum and her grandson all got sick. They suffered from nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, general weakness, a burning sensation in their eyes and feeling as though they had been sunburned. Over the next few days, Cash's symptoms got worse when she developed blisters and hair loss. She was taken to the local emergency room for treatment on Jan. 3, 1981. The Landrums fared somewhat better, though both suffered from lingering weakness, skin sores and hair loss.

A radiologist who later examined their medical records believed that all three of them suffered radiation poisoning.

Starting with the UFO sighting, Cash's health got worse and worse. She was forced to close her business and never worked again. She spent a great deal of time in the hospital, often in intensive care.

"Although they and others observed a large number of military helicopters along with the UFO, the U.S. government refused to acknowledge the event or assist them in any way," read the news release from the MUFON.

Cash and Landrum even tried to sue the U.S. government for \$20 million, but a U.S. District Court judge dismissed the case.

So on the 18th anniversary of the sighting, Betty Cash died at the age of 69. Her health had not been the same since the encounter.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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) > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

A 'Follow The Energy' Approach for Astrobiology

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:32:30 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:32:30 -0500
Subject: A 'Follow The Energy' Approach for Astrobiology

Source: SpaceRef.Com - Reston, Virginia, USA

<http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.rss.html?pid=24225>

Monday, December 10, 2007

PRESS RELEASE

Date Released:

Source: Mary Ann Liebert Inc.

A 'Follow The Energy' Approach for Astrobiology

All conceivable life forms, whether earthly or extraterrestrial, require an energy source, and scientists are increasingly employing a "Follow the Energy" approach in the search for signs of habitability and life beyond Earth, as described in a report in the December 2007 Special Issue (Volume 7, Number 6) of *Astrobiology*, a peer-reviewed journal published by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. The paper is available free online at www.liebertpub.com/ast.

Tori Hoehler, from NASA Ames Research Center, Jan Amend, from Washington University in St. Louis, and Everett Shock, from Arizona State University, present the concepts behind this strategy in a paper entitled, "A 'Follow the Energy' Approach for Astrobiology." As pointed out by the authors, given that energy is a universal imperative for life, an increased understanding of energy flow in terrestrial biology and ecology represents a firm foundation on which to develop an energy-based approach to a variety of astrobiological questions. In describing how energetic considerations can simultaneously refine, quantify, and broaden our concepts of habitability and biosignatures, the authors propose that a "Follow the Energy" strategy adds important new elements to the "Follow the Water" approach, which has guided the last decade of exploration for life beyond Earth. The paper also serves to introduce a special issue of *Astrobiology* that highlights a diverse suite of current energy-themed research in astrobiology.

"A Follow the Energy approach leads to a new understanding as to where and how to search for evidence of life in the geological record, whether on Earth or beyond," says journal Editor, Sherry L. Cady, Ph.D., Associate Professor in the Department of Geology at Portland State University. "We are becoming more sophisticated in our ability to determine where life is most likely to be productive in an ecosystem and which signatures it may leave behind. This, along with an assessment of the preservation potential of an environment, affords a more efficient way to get the job done, an important consideration when carrying out remote paleontological investigations."

Astrobiology is an authoritative peer-reviewed journal published bimonthly in print and online. The journal provides a forum for scientists seeking to advance our understanding of life's origins, evolution, distribution and destiny in the universe. A complete table of contents and a full text for this issue may be viewed online at www.liebertpub.com/ast.

Astrobiology is the leading peer-reviewed journal in its field. To promote this developing field, the Journal has teamed up with The Astrobiology Web to highlight one outstanding paper per issue of Astrobiology. This paper is available free online at www.liebertpub.com/ast and to visitors of The Astrobiology Web at www.astrobiology.com.

Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., is a privately held, fully integrated media company known for establishing authoritative peer-reviewed journals in many promising areas of science and biomedical research. Its biotechnology trade magazine, Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology News (GEN), was the first in its field and is today the industry's most widely read publication worldwide. A complete list of the firm's 60 journals, books, and newsmagazines is available at www.liebertpub.com.

A "Follow the Energy" Approach for Astrobiology, Astrobiology, 2007, ahead of print pgs. 819-823

Contact: Vicki Cohn,
Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.,
(914) 740-2100, ext. 2156,
[vcohn.nul](mailto:vcohn@liebertpub.com)

Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.
140 Huguenot St., New Rochelle, NY 10801-5215
www.liebertpub.com
Phone: (914) 740-2100
(800) M-LIEBERT
Fax: (914) 740-2101

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 14:26:10 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:38:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 09:36:40 -0600
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:59:08 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>>Apparently your method where one selectively chooses what they
>>consider to be valid evidence and rejects outright what you
>>consider to be "conspiracy thinking" has failed you in your
>>quest for the truth about UFOs and the UFO phenomenon.

>>Maybe this truth will be found if you broaden your scope and are
>>willing to consider what you call "cartoon fantasies" too.
>>Remember that the ET explanation for UFOs was once considered a
>>cartoon fantasy too since it wasn't based on any solid evidence
>>but on much wishful thinking instead.

>Please spare me the lecture, Nick. I have written at length on
>the UFO phenomenon. Few, perhaps, have written and published as
>much as I have. Whether my conclusions are ultimately validated
>and disproved, I practice what I preach, and even those who
>disagree with my opinions respect the seriousness of my
>approach. I outline the evidence, try to adhere to what it
>suggests to the extent of my intellectual ability, and draw
>reasoned conclusions therefrom. I may be right, I may be wrong,
>I may be both at once, but I don't make wild, unsupported (or
>unsupported) claims, and I don't lapse into irrational
>paranoia.

Your well thought out and well researched contributions in this
field are noteworthy and have greatly influenced the direction
of current ufological thinking, including my own, having read
much of what you have written. This big influence you have in
ufology comes with a responsibility though. Since you are honest
by admitting that your opinions or conclusions about UFOs may be
wrong, you owe it to yourself and your readers to do a little
more listening and reading too in what you too quickly and
unjustifiably dismiss as wild unsupported/unsupported claims.

You certainly don't need me to lecture you that the whole UFO
phenomenon is not just reports of strange objects in the sky but
also the way UFOs are perceived by the public and how they are
incorporated into our way of thinking and the important roles
certain UFO personalities, yourself included, have in our
current understanding of this phenomenon.

>You, on the other hand, believe that JFK Jr.'s fatal flight was
>no accident, that he was murdered - presumably by agents of the
>Clinton family, though you never make clear who the actual
>villains are, where they met, how they planned and pulled off
>their dastardly deed, and so on - so that Hillary Clinton could
>become New York senator and, perhaps, President one day. You
>provide no evidence, which is no surprise because there none

>exists outside your imagination. When challenged, you change
>the subject.

I never made such a claim or even implied that Hillary Clinton may have had a part in the death of JFK Jr but there is a lot more than what you think are just unsupported claims and irrational paranoia about those that think and know differently. If you are curious to know what I think and know, please contact me off-list since this matter does not have a direct connection to UFOs or ufology.

From your own opinions and beliefs which you volunteered to express since your first e-mail reply to me and support in subsequent e-mails to the UFO UpDates List, I think we can safely conclude that the book (with an occult "all seeing eye" in the back cover?) Hillary Clinton is holding in the pictures recently made public of her walking with Laurence Rockefeller during their meeting to discuss UFOs was not your book 'The Encyclopedia of UFOs'! ;o)

>Your strange remarks about the circumstances of Jesus's birth
>presume without justification that the New Testament account is
>literally true - a description of a historical event, and not
>simply a faith narrative - and then go on, for no clear or
>compelling reason, to associate ETs with it. That's not
>conspiratorial thinking, true, but it is surely magical
>thinking.

My remarks about Jesus' birth and the ET connection was included because of the holiday season that is approaching. Although you and others may not believe the first Christmas account found in the New Testament but there is no denying the obvious UFO/ET connections to our only ET holiday that I am sure you and your family and friends will be celebrating too like most of the rest of the world, believers or not!

As for whether the Biblical and other extra-Biblical accounts and ancient texts are literal accounts of actual historical events or not, I think this is also something we can discuss and debate off-List too. I have many reasons to believe the Bible is an incredibly accurate historical source. I am convinced that the reason it has remained unchanged to the present, despite challenges and attacks by scholars wiser and more critical than even you over many thousands of years, is because of its ET and supernatural qualities and origin.

For those that want some further insights can read what has already been written on the subject of UFOs and the Bible by some very credible and respected authors, including some ufologists. If you or others would like to learn about my personal quest for Noah's Ark while living with Kurdish rebels in eastern Turkey just across the border of Iran or working for the Royal Family of Saudi Arabia while visiting the mountain that God descended on to meet with Moses and finding much evidence (still being kept secret) for the existence of ancient Israel in the Asir Mountains north of Yemen where I lived for nearly four years can also contact me off-list since much of what I have learned is still unpublished and widely known.

>I have no doubt that you're a decent, well-intentioned guy, but
>do you realize that you perfectly fulfill every unflattering
>stereotype out there about the sort of person who is attracted
>to ufology? If I thought that everybody out there thinks as you
>do, my departure from ufology would occur at faster-than-light
>speed.

Everyone get drawn to something for different reasons. What others or I think about UFOs should not deter you away from your personal quest for the truth. Having a balance of views and a medium such as the UFO UpDates List to share them will be able to test our views and beliefs and possibly come to the truth, whatever it may be. Unless you are afraid that the truth may prove to be very different and unacceptable to you, I see no reason for you, or any researcher/scholar, to quickly depart from ufology - a field of study that has been a big part of your life - because the views you hold may now be in the minority.

Have a Merry ET Christmas and I look forward to your e-mails and many more important contributions to ufology in books, journal articles and on the UFO UpDates List in the years to come.

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:42:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it
>has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been
>puzzling me intermittently over the years.

>A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin
>has been absolutely right to draw attention to these
>inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic.
>Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether
>confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground
>over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it
>applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions
>Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it
>makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable
>response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable
>specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it
>perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of
>the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

Probably. This debate has been around for a long time. People unfamiliar with this might get the impression from this discussion here that Penniston made a story up for the recent Larry King show. He did not. I think it's been 10 or 15 years since Penniston first claimed he'd touched the object and seen writing on it.

Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most important and credible evidence and they're only slightly less sensational than Penniston's later story. Halt certainly didn't write his memo or make the recording in order to get on TV years later. Even if Penniston's later claim that he touched the object is a lie, it doesn't affect the significance of the memo or the recording. And the fact that the witnesses' written descriptions are more vague than what's described in the memo does indicate that they were toning down what they put in writing, regardless of whether Penniston was jazzing things up in his later statements.

I agree that Penniston's more sensational description doesn't add much to the evidence embodied in the Halt memo, but it doesn't detract from it either. I think what people say at the time of an incident like this should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or revisions they make years later. (Unless they are astronauts like Buzz Aldrin, who are allowed to totally contradict their initial UFO descriptions years later without anyone being impolite enough to point it out.)

>Are any List members able to shed any light on other work that
>might have been done on this? I've been trying for some time to
>get John Schuessler's book on the Cash/Landrum incident, but to
>no avail - in any case, I don't think he explores the Rendlesham
>connection any more than most Rendlesham authors have explored
>the Cash/Landrum end.

I have Schuessler's book. I think I bought it from him directly. Amazon has a used copy for 249 dollars, which is a ridiculous price. Whoever is trying to sell it for that much is crazy.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:01:30 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:45:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:57:33 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>>>There is a possibility that this
>>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>>going in shadow.

>>Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos?
>>Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at
>>about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles
>>height.

>Another thing I thought of was that apogee (high point in the
>orbit) and perigee (low point) would not be equal for an object
>just prior to re-entry. So, the object could get heated up to
>glowing at a lower altitude during perigee and then be at or
>above the Skylab apogee. Then it just has to glow until it
>comes into range at the higher apogee. Keeping a glow for an
>hour seems far fetched.

This would require that the object penetrate the atmosphere
enough to get very hot (glowing "red") and then retain the heat
as it climbed back up through the atmosphere and into the
"cold" of space. It would have have the surface to volume ratio
relatively large because the surface "provides" the heating (as
it interacts with the air, but the volume stores the heat (heat
capacity). Being small means, in turn, that it has to get close
to the SL3 while still hot in order to be seen and photographed
for about 10 minutes. A good question would be this: can any
orbital object (not a meteor) penetrate the atmosphere deeply
enough to become red hot (and a bright red at that) and then
leave the atmosphere and climb 100 miles or so (while in a
decaying orbit) while retaining its brilliance, or would it
simply continued to burn up in the atmosphere once it gets low
enough to heat up to "red hot."

>Based on your updated SL3 web page, I want to re-emphasize the
>conflict of dates of the laser experiment photos. The mission
>report for Skylab 3...

><http://tinyurl.com/2jnrmg>

>shows on page 5-3 that the dates of the laser photos are Sept 19
>(good ones) and Sept 20 (blurred ones). This conflicts with the

>laser experiment report which states the images were from Sept
>4. This is pretty important since on Sept 4 we had some fairly
>long duration "close" passes. I think the Skylab transcripts
>could help pinpoint/ confirm the times/days.

The above tinyurl didn't work, but I searched the ntrs.nasa site
and found the report you reference here.

I am quite certain that the report is wrong in saying that the
laser experiments occurred on the 54th and 55th days (Sept 19
and 20). The guys who actually ran the laser (at Goddard) would
know what days they operated the laser (Sept 4 and 5) which are
days 39 and 40 of SL3.

The report provided a little more information on the "red
satellite" sighting in section 10.5 labelled "Visual
Observations and Unusual Events." It says that the object
changed to a more reddish hue during the last 20 seconds of
visibility. This would make some sense if the object was red
colored (reflecting red).

Before entering the shadow transition region (where the sunlight
is reddened by the atmosphere) the object would be illuminated
by "white" light (direct sunlight). But while going through the
sunlight- reddened region, it would be illuminated by red light,
bringing out the red even more, but also being less bright.

This would seem to argue for red reflection rather than red
light emission.

However if the object were both reflecting sunlight like metal
("white" reflection) and also emitting bright red light (not a
"normal" satellite) then the resulting color would be a
"diluted" red (red emission plus white light reflection) while
above the shadow transition region. When the object went into
the reddened sun region the net color would no longer be a
"diluted" red but rather a "saturated" red (red emission plus
red reflection).

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Edward Condon

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:01:18 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:49:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Edward Condon

>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 16:08:31 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Edward Condon

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2007 13:26:09 -0400
>>Subject: Edward Condon [was: Newly Released CIA Documents On UFOs?]

<snip>

>Then follow the Congressional Hearings, Hynek's proposal of a
>thorough study, and the opportunity for the Air Force to get off
>the hook by passing the buck to some University study.

>The problem was that nobody wanted to touch the subject with a
>ten foot pole:

>"Harvard University, the [MIT], the University of North
>Carolina, and the University of California all declined the
>invitation. None wanted to involve itself with a subject so
>controversial - worse, disreputable - as UFOs." [Clark, p. 593].>

>A little more of this before a reluctant Condon finally accepted
>he task.

>We all know what happened after that. Condon became one of the
>worst debunkers in history. Clark, ! pp597-598:

>"... At one point, Hall flew to Boulder and personally handed
>Condon a comprehensive report on NICAP's investigation of the
>Portage County sightings, an extraordinary multiple-witness case
>in Ohio, involving a two-state police-car chase of a large low-
>flying UFO. Much later Hall came to realize that Condon had paid
>no attention to the document. The case would not even be
>mentioned in the committee's final report.

>"The only thing that did interest Condon was the crackpot
>contingent of the saucer world. On June 20, the (sic) openly
>expressed displeasure of all staff members notwithstanding, he
>attended the cartoonish 'Congress of Scientific Ufologists' in
>New York City. He regaled scientific colleagues and lecture
>audiences with tales of contactees and other eccentrics. He even
>dispatched field investigators to sites where contactees had
>predicted landings."

>This is entirely out of character for Condon! . He was a better
>person than that:

>"What kind of man was h e? Grace Marmor Spruch's profile in
>Saturday Review (1 February 1969) says it well:>

>"The composite Condon is a moral, impassioned man, with a depth
>of concern for mankind not common in scientists; a man fiercely
>principled and anti diplomatic; a man who believes and feels in
>sharp contrasts, and who will let the world know his position
>without ambiguity. Fuzzimindedness is an anathema to him and he
>insists on saying so at every opportunity. But this rasping

>trait is wedded to an extreme generosity and kindness.
>Throughout his life he has given freely of his time, his
>counsel, his finances, and his home." "

><http://library.wustl.edu/units/spec/exhibits/crow/condonbio.html>

Thanks, Vincent, for your discourse on Condon. When the Condon thread was active several weeks ago I pondered adding my two cents, but decided against it. But now I am "impelled" to comment by the above statement that "fizzimindedness is an anathema" to Condon. And yet, what he did regarding the McMinnville case can only be considered either "fizzimindedness" or well-thought-out "cheating!"

Brad Sparks has already commented on this but I want to make it more explicit. Many of you will recall that astronomer William Hartmann analyzed the Trent photos, visited the Trents and the site of the photos, etc. He placed the Trent case (May 11, 1958, near McMinnville, Oregon) at the top of the heap, saying (paraphrase) that tall factors investigated seemed consistent with the claim of the witnesses that an "extraordinary flying object": had passed by and they had photographed it.

Now, one would think that a scientific study with the ostensible goal of establishing whether or not at least some UFOs are "Extraordinary Flying Objects" (i.e., as portrayed to the public... but we all know what the trick was, don't we Robert Low) would devote "FBI level" investigation to a case which, in the opinion of one of the investigators, was likely real (Hartmann did say he couldn't prove it wasn't a hoax, but that seemed highly unlikely given the context and the people involved - the Trents). Instead, Hartmann's analysis was glossed over or "covered up" by Condon in his summary of the study.

Yes, Condon did refer to this particular case. In section 12 of his executive summary he wrote, regarding the McMinnville photos, "But in this case the UFO images turned out to be too fuzzy to allow worthwhile photogrammetric analysis." He then goes on to point out other photo studies done by Hartmann. He wrote, (Hartmann) studied a "selection of 18 older cases" which led to the identification of a "number of widely publicized photographs as innocent misidentifications of things photographed under unusual conditions."

So, Condon was clearly aware of the results of Hartmann's research. And clearly Condon "trusted" Hartmann's opinions, at least for the supposedly identified sightings. But apparently not for the Trent case!

Note the word "photogrammetric."

Now, I assume that Condon actually read Hartmann's analysis. If he didn't he is "forgiven" for a mistake and guilty of nonfeasance of duty (not doing what the project director should do). But more likely he is guilty of something else: cover up.

You see, HARTmann did not base his photo analysis on photogrammetry but rather on photometry.

Photogrammetry requires measurements of locations of images in order to calculate angles between the images of interest. Accurate photogrammetry requires sharply focused pictures... well at least sufficiently sharp pictures, in order to measure the angles between sighting lines to objects in the pictures.

Photometry, on the other hand, does not use angles. It is the measurement of relative brightnesses of objects in the pictures. HARTmann used the image brightness of the bottom of the UFO image in Trent photo 1 to argue that the object was about a kilometer away.

Whether or not his argument was correct or justified is not relevant here; anyone who wants to see the full discussion can go to my web site:

<http://brumec.8k.com> and search for Trent or McMinnville.

The point is this: Hartmann used photometry which does not require sharply focused images (if the images are large enough for film density measurements, as the Trent images are), yet Condon rejected the pictures based on photogrammetry.

The average reader might not know the difference between photogrammetry and photometry. And, in any case, the reader would have had to read Hartmann's analysis to know that photogrammetry played no role in Hartman's brightness argument. But, anyone who took the time to read Hartmann's analysis would also see his conclusion!

I deduce from the following that Condon did not want readers to read Hartmann's conclusion.

Condon was not the average reader. I am certain! that Condon knew the difference between photogrammetry and photometry.

Condon was a very smart guy! I have some of his physics books.

Therefore I can only conclude that Condon deliberately tried to direct the reader's attention away from the McMinnville case the only way he could and still sound "scientific" by claiming (with a straight face, and through clenched teeth, I presume) that the Trent photos were "too fuzzy for worthwhile" (photogrammetric) "analysis."

Bad Boy, Ed. Go to the Back of the Klass.

Incidentally, when Hartmann found out what Condon said about the Trent case Hartmann was "dismayed" (to put it lightly).

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 20:15:42 +0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 22:51:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 23:00:03 -0500
>Subject: Re: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

>>From: Frank Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 11:30:00 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Spies, Lies & Polygraph Tape

>>Source: Amercian Chronicle.Com - California, USA
>><http://tinyurl.com/yuzmas>

>>December 10, 2007

>>Spies, Lies, And Polygraph Tape: CIA's Disturbing
>>Extraterrestrial Affair
>>Gary S. Bekkum

>>"I remain a skeptical agnostic. More skeptical as time
>>advances, but careful to note that even if paranormal phenomena
>>are entirely bogus, some individuals are surely able to instill
>>the belief in unexplained capabilities. How they do this and
>>what are the vulnerabilities to such enticements is worth
>>knowing." -- Ken Kress, CIA officer assigned to the Stanford
>>Research Institute psychic spy research project in the early
>>1970s.

>>The real-life tall-tale of espionage you are about to read spins
>>around a confrontation between a former CIA official and
>>officers of the United States Air Force.

>>Twenty years later, the game continues where disturbing worlds
>>collide.

><snip>

>>At the center of the latest controversy is an obscure book by
>>former USAF intelligence officer Robert M. Collins.

Is this a serious book? Robert Collins, Richard Doty and the
Aviary. I don't think so. Unless the reader is interested in how
professional disinformation agents spin their tales. I have
interacted with Collins; have read Greg Bishop's book on how
Doty operated in the Bennewitz Affair. Enough said.

KK

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

About Those Rocky/Hillary Chats...

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 23:03:58 -0500
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 23:03:58 -0500
Subject: About Those Rocky/Hillary Chats...

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void - The Herald Tribune, Sarasota,
Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/25rf71>

December 13. 2007 9:31AM

About Those Rocky/Hillary Chats...

By Billy Cox

billy.cox.nul

When the super-rich seek you out, there's a tendency to overlook their darkest quirks, for obvious reasons. Even in a worst-case scenario like John du Pont.

A good decade before his 1997 conviction for shooting Olympic gold medalist wrestler Dave Schultz to death during an eruption of clinical paranoia, neighbors and acquaintances knew the heir to the DuPont chemical fortune was a case-study wingnut.

Du Pont indulged all manner of bad craziness, pulling guns on people, driving cars into ponds and even, one Christmas Eve, grinding an armored tank onto adjoining property. His face bloody from getting swatted by the tree branches in his path, du Pont then asked a neighbor lady if her husband "could come out and play?"

The neighbor lady was one of the few who said no. After all, du Pont was renowned for spreading the wealth around, most notably to Villanova University, where he helped build a new gymnasium.

Deep pockets make a lot of people look the other way for longer than they otherwise might. Few are immune. Not even the White House.

If the Presidential candidates who tended to laugh off UFO questions last month represent mainstream America - and let's say they do, just for argument - then it might be perceived as a little dangerous for a chief executive to huddle with someone advocating the declassification of the officially nonexistent. No matter how rich he or she is.

But, as a growing body of documentation indicates, that's exactly what billionaire Laurance Rockefeller did during the first term of the Clinton administration, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy. And lately, thanks to the efforts of Canadian UFO investigator Grant Cameron, National Archives photos of Rocky's meetings with Bill and Hillary Clinton are adding visual confirmation of those meetings - online at:

www.presidentialufo.com/news_update.htm

The particulars of the first lady's chats with the late philanthropist remain a mystery. And that's largely because the

MSM has apparently exhausted its shallow capacity for UFO interrogatories. Even if pressed, the Clinton camp would likely dismiss those Rockefeller sessions as "wide-ranging discussions" with a harmlessly eccentric old buzzard.

More puzzling to Stephen Bassett is the way Republicans have held their fire on the senator from New York on this issue.

As a registered lobbyist, Bassett has been pressing for disclosure hearings on Capitol Hill for 10 years. But in the sludge-spattered theater of politics as entertainment, where UFOs still pose a juvenile stigma for anyone urging an adult conversation, Bassett says it's odd that no conservatives have elected to prod Clinton with the latest revelations from the National Archives, which are dispensing free ammo for anyone wanting to frame Laurance Rockefeller as Hillary's John du Pont.

"You have to ask yourself why?" Bassett says. "Limbaugh, Beck, Hannity, not a peep from any of them. All it takes is one right-winger, like Ann Coulter, who's not on the talking points to take a shot at Hillary as the UFO whacko, and we're in play. But that hasn't happened. Why's that?"

That's another whole riff altogether.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 23:47:25 EST
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 07:40:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:01:30 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:57:33 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2007 02:10:14 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

<snip>

>>>>There is a possibility that this
>>>>particular object is low enough in altitude to get heated up and
>>>>glow red. Therefore, it could be self illuminated via heat
>>>>radiation. This could not explain why the object got dark upon
>>>>entering shadow unless there is fortuitous timing of the
>>>>object's disintegration. Another possibility is that it is
>>>>heating up and giving off gases/particles that catch the sun-
>>>>light, increasing its effective size. Then fade out would match
>>>>going in shadow.

>>>>Do you see any earth background in the Skylab red object photos?
>>>>Any trace of the earth's limb anywhere?? A re-entry occurs at
>>>>about 60-100 miles, far far below the Skylab at 273 miles
>>>>height.

>>>>Another thing I thought of was that apogee (high point in the
>>>>orbit) and perigee (low point) would not be equal for an object
>>>>just prior to re-entry.

Satellites and space objects nearing reentry circularize their
orbits so perigees and apogees would be almost the same.

>>>>Based on your updated SL3 web page, I want to re-emphasize the
>>>>conflict of dates of the laser experiment photos. The mission
>>>>report for Skylab 3...

>>>><http://tinyurl.com/2jnrmg>

>>>>The report provided a little more information on the "red
>>>>satellite" sighting in section 10.5 labelled "Visual
>>>>Observations and Unusual Events." It says that the object
>>>>changed to a more reddish hue during the last 20 seconds of
>>>>visibility.

From about 275 miles up in the Skylab-3 the earth's horizon is
about 1400 miles away and the effectively 20 mile thickness of
atmosphere (approximately) is about 0.8 degree thick. The sun's
diameter is 0.5 degree thus the sun's light reddened through the
atmosphere will cover an angle of about 1.3 degrees. At its
orbital velocity of 4.75 miles per second the Skylab would cover
1.3 degs of earth-central angle (90 miles) in 19 seconds.

Brad Sparks

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 08:23:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it
>>has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been
>>puzzling me intermittently over the years.

>>A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin
>>has been absolutely right to draw attention to these
>>inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic.
>>Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether
>>confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground
>>over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it
>>applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions
>>Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it
>>makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable
>>response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable
>>specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it
>>perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of
>>the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

>Probably. This debate has been around for a long time. People
>unfamiliar witht this might get the impression from this
>discussion here that Penniston made a story up for the recent
>Larry King show. He did not. I think it's been 10 or 15 years
>since Penniston first claimed he'd touched the object and seen
>writing on it.

>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most important
>and credible evidence and they're only slightly less sensational
>than Penniston's later story. Halt certainly didn't write his
>memo or make the recording in order to get on TV years later.
>Even if Penniston's later claim that he touched the object is a
>lie, it doesn't affect the significance of the memo or the
>recording. And the fact that the witnesses' written descriptions
>are more vague than what's described in the memo does indicate
>that they were toning down what they put in writing, regardless
>of whether Penniston was jazzing things up in his later
>statements.

>I agree that Penniston's more sensational description doesn't
>add much to the evidence embodied in the Halt memo, but it
>doesn't detract from it either. I think what people say at the
>time of an incident like this should be given far more weight
>than any new alleged details or revisions they make years later.
>(Unless they are astronauts like Buzz Aldrin, who are allowed to
>totally contradict their initial UFO descriptions years later
>without anyone being impolite enough to point it out.)

<snip>

Lan and Gerald,

You are two people on this List whose views and opinions I always benefit from. Anyone who knows me knows how skeptical I am of people who engage in sensationalism, embellishment, or any of their cousins. I personally size up witnesses at every opportunity.

During the recent National Press Club press conference I had occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is highly professional about military matters. I heard his presentation which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

I know Charles Halt even better. Several years ago I interviewed him at length for the account of the Rendlesham Forest affair that was published in my book *The UFO Evidence, Volume II*. After that I have talked with him many times, attended meetings with him, exchanged communications and information with him regularly, and advised him on media affairs. He is as honest and direct as the day is long. And it is significant that he finished his Air Force career in the Pentagon as a highly placed officer in the Inspector General's office.

Some people on this List seem unable to grasp the human factors aspects of close encounter UFO sightings, which generally scare the pants off of the astonished witnesses. In this country, at least, the ridicule factor is very powerful. So in the heat of the moment, fearing ridicule and/or loss of reputation, witnesses often (I repeat, often) are reluctant to come forth with the full details of their experiences. I know this as a fact, and know many highly placed witnesses who don't dare speak out.

In the military this Ridicule Factor can be especially powerful. You do things by the book, and you are required to follow certain protocols, and you don't go around telling wild stories. So if you are a senior security policeman and see a rather unearthly metallic craft in the woods and touch it, you are in a quandary. The behavior of both Penniston and Halt in initially holding back the details about what they experienced is completely understandable.

Another important point in regard to character is this:

Here we are 27 years later and Colonel Halt absolutely trusts and respects Jim Penniston. They have remained in close touch; they were together at the press conference and more or less gave a joint presentation. Obviously, what happened in the woods in England was a life-altering experience for both of them and still is having a profound effect on them.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 10:42:22 -0000
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 08:30:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 14:26:10 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 09:36:40 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2007 19:59:08 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>>>Apparently your method where one selectively chooses what they
>>>consider to be valid evidence and rejects outright what you
>>>consider to be "conspiracy thinking" has failed you in your
>>>quest for the truth about UFOs and the UFO phenomenon.

>>>Maybe this truth will be found if you broaden your scope and are
>>>willing to consider what you call "cartoon fantasies" too.
>>>Remember that the ET explanation for UFOs was once considered a
>>>cartoon fantasy too since it wasn't based on any solid evidence
>>>but on much wishful thinking instead.

>>Please spare me the lecture, Nick. I have written at length
>>on the UFO phenomenon.

<snip>

>You certainly don't need me to lecture you that the whole UFO
>phenomenon is not just reports of strange objects in the sky but
>also the way UFOs are perceived by the public and how they are
>incorporated into our way of thinking and the important roles
>certain UFO personalities, yourself included, have in our
>current understanding of this phenomenon.

>>I have no doubt that you're a decent, well-intentioned guy, but
>>do you realize that you perfectly fulfill every unflattering
>>stereotype out there about the sort of person who is attracted
>>to ufology? If I thought that everybody out there thinks as you
>>do, my departure from ufology would occur at faster-than-light
>>speed.

>Everyone get drawn to something for different reasons. What
>others or I think about UFOs should not deter you away from your
>personal quest for the truth. Having a balance of views and a
>medium such as the UFO UpDates List to share them will be able
>to test our views and beliefs and possibly come to the truth,
>whatever it may be. Unless you are afraid that the truth may
>prove to be very different and unacceptable to you, I see no
>reason for you, or any researcher/scholar, to quickly depart
>from ufology - a field of study that has been a big part of your
>life - because the views you hold may now be in the minority.

>Have a Merry ET Christmas and I look forward to your e-mails and

>many more important contributions to ufology in books, journal
>articles and on the UFO UpDates List in the years to come.

Well said Nick!

It has always irritated me on this list when researchers bicker
and criticise others for merely voicing theories which are
outside the box.

We shouldn't have to steer our thoughts along conventional lines
merely to keep the subject 'respectable'.

Let's face it, the whole issue of UFOs is out of the box anyway
to many mainstream scientists.

I quote Professor Sir Alex Jeffries (spelling?), the discoverer of
DNA genetic profiling, on UK radio today:

"The most exciting areas of science are the things you don't
know you don't know"

Dave Haith

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 15:00:33 +0000
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 21:01:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>Lan and Gerald,

>You are two people on this List whose views and opinions I
>always benefit from. Anyone who knows me knows how skeptical I
>am of people who engage in sensationalism, embellishment, or any
>of their cousins. I personally size up witnesses at every
>opportunity.

>During the recent National Press Club press conference I had
>occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at
>meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very
>conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is highly
>professional about military matters. I heard his presentation
>which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel
>Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

>I know Charles Halt even better. Several years ago I interviewed
>him at length for the account of the Rendlesham Forest affair
>that was published in my book The UFO Evidence, Volume II.
>After that I have talked with him many times, attended meetings
>with him, exchanged communications and information with him
>regularly, and advised him on media affairs. He is as honest and
>direct as the day is long. And it is significant that he
>finished his Air Force career in the Pentagon as a highly placed
>officer in the Inspector General's office.

>Some people on this List seem unable to grasp the human factors
>aspects of close encounter UFO sightings, which generally scare
>the pants off of the astonished witnesses. In this country, at
>least, the ridicule factor is very powerful. So in the heat of
>the moment, fearing ridicule and/or loss of reputation,
>witnesses often (I repeat, often) are reluctant to come forth
>with the full details of their experiences. I know this as a
>fact, and know many highly placed witnesses who don't dare speak
>out.

>In the military this Ridicule Factor can be especially powerful.
>You do things by the book, and you are required to follow
>certain protocols, and you don't go around telling wild stories.
>So if you are a senior security policeman and see a rather
>unearthly metallic craft in the woods and touch it, you are in a
>quandary. The behavior of both Penniston and Halt in initially
>holding back the details about what they experienced is
>completely understandable.

>Another important point in regard to character is this:

>Here we are 27 years later and Colonel Halt absolutely trusts
>and respects Jim Penniston. They have remained in close touch;
>they were together at the press conference and more or less gave
>a joint presentation. Obviously, what happened in the woods in
>England was a life-altering experience for both of them and

>still is having a profound effect on them.

All extremely pertinent points Dick, and important to keep in mind when attempting to unravel the contradictory accounts that have emerged over time.

Assuming you are absolutely correct about Penniston & Halt's bona fides in the matter, I feel there are still a few points worth making.

If Penniston & Halt have revealed more through the years as they have gradually come to terms with a traumatic experience, then there are grounds to suspect that there might be yet more to come from them. Given their excellent character references, plain old-fashioned military/patriotic loyalty might now be an even greater factor than trauma in causing them to withhold further information.

I believe that this is a powerful argument for researchers to consider the Cash/Landrum case's potential as a key to resolution. If pursuit of that were to reveal some solid connections with Rendlesham, and, at the same time, reveal some key data, then that might enable Penniston and Halt to speak more freely.

Now, I'm aware that I'm creating an extended chain of hypothesis and supposition here, and may appear to some to be fanciful for so doing, but I feel that sometimes an indirect approach can offer the quickest and best way forward. It would be interesting to hear from anybody with first-hand experience of Cash/Landrum research and investigation on this. Is there any more to the connection than the circumstantial evidence of contemporaneous events, military and apparent military involvement and similar vehicular descriptions?

-- Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 09:32:06 -0600
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 21:02:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>From: Dave Haith <visions.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <UFOupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 10:42:22 -0000
>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>From: Nick Balaskas <Nikolaos.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 14:26:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 09:36:40 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Pilots' Out-Of-Body Experiences

<snip>

>It has always irritated me on this list when researchers bicker
>and criticise others for merely voicing theories which are
>outside the box.

I'm sorry that your irritation level is so low and that your
definition of "theories" is, shall we say, expansive.

>We shouldn't have to steer our thoughts along conventional lines
>merely to keep the subject 'respectable'.

In other words: Anything, however crazy, goes, and the critics
are right: people drawn to ufology don't know the first thing
about how to think critically or how to frame an argument or
hypothesis.

My point is made, sad to say.

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 10:53:44 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 21:04:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:01:30 -0500
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 15:57:33 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>Another thing I thought of was that apogee (high point in the
>>orbit) and perigee (low point) would not be equal for an object
>>just prior to re-entry. So, the object could get heated up to
>>glowing at a lower altitude during perigee and then be at or
>>above the Skylab apogee. Then it just has to glow until it
>>comes into range at the higher apogee. Keeping a glow for an
>>hour seems far fetched.

>This would require that the object penetrate the atmosphere
>enough to get very hot (glowing "red") and then retain the heat
>as it climbed back up through the atmosphere and into the
>"cold" of space. It would have to have the surface to volume ratio
>relatively large because the surface "provides" the heating (as
>it interacts with the air, but the volume stores the heat (heat
>capacity). Being small means, in turn, that it has to get close
>to the SL3 while still hot in order to be seen and photographed
>for about 10 minutes. A good question would be this: can any
>orbital object (not a meteor) penetrate the atmosphere deeply
>enough to become red hot (and a bright red at that) and then
>leave the atmosphere and climb 100 miles or so (while in a
>decaying orbit) while retaining its brilliance, or would it
>simply continued to burn up in the atmosphere once it gets low
>enough to heat up to "red hot.'

I can't find any technical papers on the topic, but anecdotal
reports indicate it is not too unusual to see re-entry glow on
objects for even a half an orbit prior to re-entry.

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-2001/0177.html>

Highly elliptical orbits can have the object glow
and pass out of the heat up zone and survive.

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1996/0151.html>

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1996/0153.html>

However, without doing the calcs, the observations above imply
if objects do pass out of dense part of the atmosphere during
perigee, then they cool off rapidly.

So I think this ends this possibility.

>>Based on your updated SL3 web page, I want to re-emphasize the
>>conflict of dates of the laser experiment photos. The mission
>>report for Skylab 3...

>><http://tinyurl.com/2jnrmg>

>>shows on page 5-3 that the dates of the laser photos are Sept 19
>>(good ones) and Sept 20 (blurred ones). This conflicts with the
>>laser experiment report which states the images were from Sept
>>4. This is pretty important since on Sept 4 we had some fairly
>>long duration "close" passes. I think the Skylab transcripts
>>could help pinpoint/ confirm the times/days.

>I am quite certain that the report is wrong in saying that the
>laser experiments occurred on the 54th and 55th days (Sept 19
>and 20). The guys who actually ran the laser (at Goddard) would
>know what days they operated the laser (Sept 4 and 5) which are
>days 39 and 40 of SL3.

I am not so sure the Goddard report is right mainly because of
the long amount of time between the blurred laser photos and
the UFO photos. Given all the time they have to take pictures
since there are alot of EREP passes between Sept 4 and
Sept 20, it seems highly unlikely they would not film the Earth's
surface. We need the transcript to be sure. How can we
be definitive about the dates when there are conflicting officially
reported values?

>The report provided a little more information on the "red
>satellite" sighting in section 10.5 labelled "Visual
>Observations and Unusual Events." It says that the object
>changed to a more reddish hue during the last 20 seconds of
>visibility. This would make some sense if the object was red
>colored (reflecting red).

>Before entering the shadow transition region (where the sunlight
>is reddened by the atmosphere) the object would be illuminated
>by "white" light (direct sunlight). But while going through the
>sunlight- reddened region, it would be illuminated by red light,
>bringing out the red even more, but also being less bright.

>This would seem to argue for red reflection rather than red
>light emission.

>However if the object were both reflecting sunlight like metal
>("white" reflection) and also emitting bright red light (not a
>"normal" satellite) then the resulting color would be a
>"diluted" red (red emission plus white light reflection) while
>above the shadow transition region. When the object went into
>the reddened sun region the net color would no longer be a
>"diluted" red but rather a "saturated" red (red emission plus
>red reflection).

Regarding red satellite/orbiting objects, a search on the web
shows that the Lacrosse satellites 1-4 launched between 1989-
2000 into inclinations from 57 deg to 68 deg appear to be red-
orange due to being covered with Kapton thermal insulation.
<http://www.satobs.org/spysat.html>

ROSAT is another example shown in this image.

<http://wave.xray.mpe.mpg.de/rosat/calendar/1993/nov>

<http://satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1995/0105.html>

Visual satellite observers have reported some possible others
(unclear whether due to being close to eclipse exit/entry
though):

Meteo 1-11r (72-22B, 05918)

<http://satobs.org/seesat/Apr-2001/0169.html>

ERBS (84-108B/15354)

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Sep-2001/0173.html>

Cosmos 2082

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Nov-2006/0229.html>

Adeos 2

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Jul-2004/0107.html>

SL-16 rocket (#25861)

<http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1999/0202.html>

So it is possible but infrequent.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Great Beasts Peppered From Space

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 15:05:18 -0700
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 21:12:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Great Beasts Peppered From Space

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 18:55:32 -0000
>Subject: Space debris, 35,000 yr old.

>Source: BBC - London, UK

><http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7130014.stm>

>Tuesday, 11 December 2007

>Great Beasts Peppered From Space
>By Jonathan Amos
>Science reporter, BBC News, San Francisco

<snip>

>"We think that there was probably an impact which exploded in
>the air that sent these particles flying into the animals," said
>Richard Firestone from the Lawrence Berkeley National
>Laboratory.

<snip>

>The mammoth and bison remains all display small (about 2-3mm in
>size) perforations.

>Raised, burnt surface rings trace the point of entry of high-
>velocity projectiles; and the punctures are on only one side,
>consistent with a blast coming from a single direction.

>Viewed under an electron microscope, the embedded fragments
>appear to have exploded inside the tusk and bone, say the
>researchers. Shards have cut little channels.

>The sunken pieces are also magnetic, and tests show them to have
>a high iron-nickel content, but to be depleted in titanium.

A bit off the UFO topic, but I must point out that this
"peppered-by-meteoric-buckshot" hypothesis seems quite
untenable, at least as described in this article.

Let us suppose that, in order to penetrate bone, the projectile
speed at impact would have to be at least 50 m/sec. Further
assume that each projectile is a randomly oriented iron cube,
with a mean presented area equivalent to that of a 2mm diameter
hole (yielding an edge length of ~1.4mm and mass ~24 mg).

Aerodynamic drag effects will slow the projectiles exponentially
with distance traveled in air. It is straightforward to show
that the 'upstream' speed of such low-mass projectiles would
have to be enormous in order to obtain the required impact
speed... many 10's of km/sec at an upstream range of ~100
meters. But the projectile would quickly burn up at such speeds,
and hence never arrive at the impact point.

Considering more realistic (higher drag) projectile shapes -
akin to typical bomb casing fragments - would make the speed
requirements even more extreme.

If in fact impact damage is what is being observed in these tusks and bones, the above considerations suggest that these animals were in fairly close proximity to the source of projectiles.

Mike

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Who Speaks For Earth?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 09:55:38 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 09:55:38 -0500
Subject: Who Speaks For Earth?

Source: SeedMagazine.Com - Montreal, Quebec, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/yqhdpr>

December 12, 2007

Who Speaks For Earth?
by David Grinspoon

After decades of searching, scientists have found no trace of extraterrestrial intelligence. Now, some of them hope to make contact by broadcasting messages to the stars. Are we prepared for an answer?

Alexander Zaitsev, Chief Scientist at the Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute of Radio Engineering and Electronics, has access to one of the most powerful radio transmitters on Earth. Though he officially uses it to conduct the Institute's planetary radar studies, Zaitsev is also trying to contact other civilizations in nearby star systems. He believes extraterrestrial intelligence exists, and that we as a species have a moral obligation to announce our presence to our sentient neighbors in the Milky Way=97to let them know they are not alone. If everyone in the galaxy only listens, he reasons, the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) is doomed to failure.

Zaitsev has already sent several powerful messages to nearby, sun-like stars=97a practice called "Active SETI." But some scientists feel that he's not only acting out of turn, but also independently speaking for everyone on the entire planet. Moreover, they believe there are possible dangers we may unleash by announcing ourselves to the unknown darkness, and if anyone plans to transmit messages from Earth, they want the rest of the world to be involved. For years the debate over Active SETI versus passive "listening" has mostly been confined to SETI insiders. But late last year the controversy boiled over into public view after the journal Nature published an editorial scolding the SETI community for failing to conduct an open discussion on the remote, but real, risks of unregulated signals to the stars. And in September, two major figures resigned from an elite SETI study group in protest. All this despite the fact that SETI's ongoing quest has so far been largely fruitless. For Active SETI's critics, the potential for alerting dangerous or malevolent entities to our presence is enough to justify their concern.

"We're talking about initiating communication with other civilizations, but we know nothing of their goals, capabilities, or intent," reasons John Billingham, a senior scientist at the private SETI Institute in Mountain View, California. Billingham studied medicine at Oxford and headed NASA's first extraterrestrial search effort in 1976. He believes we should apply the Hippocratic Oath's primary tenet to our galactic behavior: "First, do no harm." For years Billingham served as the chairman of the Permanent Study Group (PSG) of the SETI subcommittee of the International Academy of Astronautics, a

widely accepted forum for devising international SETI agreements. But despite his deep involvement with the group, Billingham resigned in September, feeling the PSG is unwisely refusing to take a stand urging broad, interdisciplinary consultation on Active SETI. "At the very least we ought to talk about it first, and not just SETI people. We have a responsibility to the future well-being and survival of humankind."

Billingham is not alone in his dissent. Michael Michaud, a former top diplomat within the US State Department and a specialist in technology policy, also resigned from the PSG in September. Though highly aware of the potential for misunderstanding or ridicule, Michaud feels too much is at stake for the public to remain uninvolved in the debate. "Active SETI is not science; it's diplomacy. My personal goal is not to stop all transmissions, but to get the discussion out of a small group of elites."

Michaud is the original author of what became the "First SETI Protocol," a list of actions to take in the event of a SETI success. In the late 1980s, several international organizations committed to its principles: First, notify the global SETI community and cooperate to verify the alien signal. Then, if the discovery is confirmed, announce it to the public. Finally, send no reply until the nations of the world have weighed in. A future "Second SETI Protocol" was meant to refine the policy for sending messages from Earth, but the effort quickly became complicated. Everyone agreed that if a message were received, broad global dialogue concerning if and how to respond must take place before any reply could be sent. The rift arose over whether or not the Protocol should also address Active SETI transmissions made before any signal is detected.

At a meeting last year in Valencia, Spain, a divided PSG voted to change Michaud's draft of the Second Protocol. They deleted language calling for "appropriate international consultations" before any deliberate transmissions from Earth, overriding the concerns of Billingham and Michaud and triggering Nature's editorial. As Michaud describes it, "Last fall, this became an unbridgeable gap. They brought it to a vote but there was no consensus. Those with dissenting views were largely cut out of the discussion." Michaud and Billingham feel that by not explicitly advocating a policy of international consultations, the SETI PSG is tacitly endorsing rogue broadcasters.

Seth Shostak, the current chair of the SETI PSG, maintains that Nature got it wrong, that in Valencia there was no organized effort to discourage open and transparent debate about the wisdom of sending signals. As the SETI Institute's senior astronomer, Shostak has been involved in the science and policy of SETI for many years, and often seems to act as public spokesman for the Institute and for SETI in general. He says it's inappropriate for the PSG to set global guidelines for Active SETI. "Who are we to tell the rest of the world how to behave? It would be totally unenforceable."

Michaud and Billingham agree that the PSG can't make policy for the whole world. But rather than sweep the question under the rug, they believe it is the responsibility of the SETI community to facilitate the wider conversation that must take place. "We feel strongly that the discussion must involve not just astronomers, but a broad spectrum of social scientists, historians, and diplomats," explains Billingham.

"This was simply about jurisdiction," Shostak insists. The First Protocol, he says, is about self-policing; the Second isn't. "If we found a signal, it would be a result of our own research. Therefore we felt it was responsible to have an agreed-upon policy about what to do next." Shostak also worries that drafting guidelines for sending messages to aliens could generate bad press. SETI has always struggled for respectability. In the 1970s and 80s, NASA supported some listening programs, but government funding was cut off in 1993 amid congressional ridicule. Thanks to private funding, SETI has rebounded since then, but is still vulnerable to association with tabloids and talk radio guests claiming personal contact with aliens. Publicizing the real debate over rules of conduct for talking to extraterrestrials, Shostak reasons, wouldn't do much to help counter this vision.

Long before he was an eager practitioner of Active SETI, Alexander Zaitsev was already a respected astronomer investigating planets using huge blasts of radar energy from the 70-meter radio telescope at the Evpatoria Deep Space Center in Crimea, Ukraine. Planetary radar studies rely on powerful, focused beams to "illuminate" distant objects, though much of this energy misses its target. The beams would be fleeting if seen from other stars that, by chance, lay along their path. But aimed and modulated to contain pictures, sounds, and other multimedia, they very easily become calling cards from Earth. On balance, it's relatively simple to send signals, so why have we just been listening?

SETI doctrine states that anyone we hear from will almost certainly be much more advanced than we are. Simply put, our capabilities are so rudimentary that any chance of detecting an alien transmission would require that it be broadcast powerfully and continually on millennial timescales. We can't predict much about alien civilizations, but we can use statistical mathematics to derive simple, robust relationships between the number of putative civilizations, their average longevity, and their population density in the galaxy. The chance of getting a signal from another baby race like ours is infinitesimally small. As Shostak says, "We've had radio for 100 years. They've had it for at least 1,000 years. Let them do the heavy lifting."

This is one reason why most SETI pioneers advocated a "first, just listen" approach. But there is another: What if there is something dangerous out there that could be alerted by our broadcasts? This ground has been explored in numerous scientific papers and, of course, in countless works of science fiction. Few people alive today embody the convergence of hard science and fictional speculation better than David Brin, an author of both peer-reviewed astronomy papers and award-winning science fiction novels. In an influential 1983 paper titled "The Great Silence," Brin provided a kind of taxonomy of explanations for the lack of an obvious alien presence. In addition to the usual answers positing that humanity is alone, or so dull that aliens have no interest in us, Brin included a more disturbing possibility: Nobody is on the air because something seeks and destroys everyone who broadcasts. Like Billingham and Michaud, he feels the PSG is dominated by a small number of people who don't want to acknowledge Active SETI's potential dangers.

Even if something menacing and terrible lurks out there among the stars, Zaitsev and others argue that regulating our transmissions could be pointless because, technically, we've already blown our cover. A sphere of omnidirectional broadband signals has been spreading out from Earth at the speed of light since the advent of radio over a century ago. So isn't it too late? That depends on the sensitivity of alien radio detectors, if they exist at all. Our television signals are diffuse and not targeted at any star system. It would take a truly huge antenna—97larger than anything we've built or plan to build—to notice them.

Alien telescopes could perhaps detect Earth's strange oxygen atmosphere, created by life, and a rising CO2 level, suggesting a young industrial civilization. But what would draw their attention to our solar system among the multitudes? Deliberate blasts of narrow-band radiation aimed at nearby stars would—97for a certain kind of watcher—97cause our planet to suddenly light up, creating an obvious beacon announcing for better or worse, "Here we are!"

In fact, we have already sent some targeted radio messages. Even now they are racing toward their selected destinations, and they are unstoppable. Frank Drake sent the first Active SETI broadcast from the large radio telescope in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, in November 1974. In its narrow path, the Arecibo message was the most powerful signal ever sent from Earth. But it was aimed at M13, a globular star cluster about 25,000 light years away. At the earliest, we could expect a reply in 50,000 years.

More recently, Zaitsev and his colleagues sent a series of messages from their dish at Evpatoria. In 1999 and 2003 they sent "Cosmic Call" I and II, transmissions containing pictograms meant to communicate our understanding of the universe and life on Earth. In 2001, Zaitsev and a group of Russian teenagers created the "Teen-Age Message to the Stars," which was broadcast in August and September of that year in the direction of six

stars between 45 and 70 light years from Earth. The Teen-Age Message notably included greetings in Russian and English, and a 15-minute Theremin symphony for aliens. Unlike Drake's Arecibo message, Zaitsev's messages target nearby stars. So if anyone wishes to reply, we may receive it in the next century or two.

Along with the famous plaques attached to Pioneer 10 and 11 and the two phonograph records carried by Voyager 1 and 2=97four spacecraft that will soon leave our Solar System=97these messages are mostly symbolic efforts unlikely to betray our presence to the denizens of planets orbiting other stars. Our civilization is still hidden from all but those ardently searching for our kind, or those so far beyond our level of sophistication that we couldn't hide from them if we wanted to. To date, all our "messages to aliens" are really more successful as communications to Earth, mirrors reflecting our dreams of reaching far beyond our terrestrial nursery.

For now, the dissenters have given up on the SETI PSG, but there's still hope for a solution to the standoff. At the PSG's 2007 meeting held in Hyderabad, India this September, the group implicitly accepted the reality of Active SETI risks by adopting a standard called the "San Marino Scale," a formula for assessing the risk of a given broadcast program. Michaud admits that the scale "is a useful starting point for discussion."

When pressed, everyone involved in the recent controversy agrees that harmful contact scenarios cannot be completely ruled out. Active SETI critics like Billingham, Michaud, and Brin don't support a blanket ban on transmissions, and even Zaitsev accepts that open and multinational discussion is needed before anyone pursues transmission programs more ambitious and powerful than his own. The major disagreement is actually over how soon we can expect powerful transmission tools to become widely available to those who would signal at whim.

At present, the radio astronomy facilities potentially capable of producing a major Active SETI broadcast are all controlled by national governments, or at least large organizations responsible to boards and donors and sensitive to public opinion. However, seemingly inevitable trends are placing increasingly powerful technologies in the hands of small groups or eager individuals with their own agendas and no oversight. Today, on the entire planet, there are only a few mavericks like Zaitsev who are able and willing to unilaterally represent humanity and effectively reveal our presence. In the future, there could be one in every neighborhood.

So far SETI has turned up no evidence of other intelligent creatures out there seeking conversation. All we know for certain is that our galaxy is not full of civilizations occupying nearly every sun-like star and sending strong radio signals directly to Earth. In the absence of data, the questions of extraterrestrial intelligence, morality, and behavior are more philosophy than science. But even if no one else is out there and we are ultimately alone, the idea of communicating with truly alien cultures forces us to consider ourselves from an entirely new, and perhaps timely, perspective. Even if we never make contact, any attempt to act and speak as one planet is not a misguided endeavor: Our impulsive industrial transformation of our home planet is starting to catch up to us, and the nations of the world are struggling with existential threats like anthropogenic climate change and weapons of mass destruction. Whether or not we develop a mechanism for anticipating, discussing, and acting on long-term planetary dangers such as these before they become catastrophes remains to be seen. But the unified global outlook required to face them would certainly be a welcome development.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 10:01:30 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 10:29:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 15:00:33 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>Lan and Gerald,

>>snip>

>>During the recent National Press Club press conference I had
>>occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at
>>meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very
>>conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is highly
>>professional about military matters. I heard his presentation
>>which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel
>>Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

<snip>

>>Another important point in regard to character is this:

>>Here we are 27 years later and Colonel Halt absolutely trusts
>>and respects Jim Penniston. They have remained in close touch;
>>they were together at the press conference and more or less gave
>>a joint presentation. Obviously, what happened in the woods in
>>England was a life-altering experience for both of them and
>>still is having a profound effect on them.

>All extremely pertinent points Dick, and important to keep in
>mind when attempting to unravel the contradictory accounts that
>have emerged over time.

>Assuming you are absolutely correct about Penniston & Halt's
>bona fides in the matter, I feel there are still a few points
>worth making.

>If Penniston & Halt have revealed more through the years as they
>have gradually come to terms with a traumatic experience, then
>there are grounds to suspect that there might be yet more to
>come from them. Given their excellent character references,
>plain old-fashioned military/patriotic loyalty might now be an
>even greater factor than trauma in causing them to withhold
>further information.

>I believe that this is a powerful argument for researchers to
>consider the Cash/Landrum case's potential as a key to
>resolution. If pursuit of that were to reveal some solid
>connections with Rendlesham, and, at the same time, reveal some
>key data, then that might enable Penniston and Halt to speak
>more freely.

>Now, I'm aware that I'm creating an extended chain of hypothesis
>and supposition here, and may appear to some to be fanciful for
>so doing, but I feel that sometimes an indirect approach can

>offer the quickest and best way forward. It would be interesting
>to hear from anybody with first-hand experience of Cash/Landrum
>research and investigation on this. Is there any more to the
>connection than the circumstantial evidence of contemporaneous
>events, military and apparent military involvement and similar
>vehicular descriptions?

Gerald,

I agree that it is well worth investigating any possible link between Rendelsham Forest and Cash-Landrum. The primary investigator, John Schuessler is still around and could answer any questions in that regard. However, I disagree with the premise of your argument, that Halt and Penniston have only slowly elaborated their stories and may have more to tell in the future.

The only confusion and apparent contradictions (and I emphasize apparent) that I am aware of occurred long ago. They have been telling the same story consistently for many years and are long past any fear of ridicule or negative reaction now. Thus, they showed up for this national press conference and both men have talked openly about their experiences on many TV programs for years now.

There is one area where more may come out in the future, but it does not have to do with the sighting experiences themselves. Think of the U.S. and torture (which makes me wince). From what I have picked up in fragmentary form, the investigators in this case (whom to his puzzlement worked around Halt and never followed up directly with him) allegedly used some rather harsh interrogation methods on the enlisted personnel.

Some more may come out from the other witnesses eventually, but they appear to have been thoroughly intimidated. And this brings us full circle back to Roswell where more than allegedly (strong testimony is on record) Air Force investigators threatened civilian witnesses, shall we say, rather severely. Justifiably, one begins to suspect without being able to prove it that someone knows a lot more about UFOs than we are being told, and something even more than a simple cover-up is in place.

Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Planetary Politics

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 10:38:25 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 10:38:25 -0500
Subject: Planetary Politics

Source: The New York Times - New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2y9wmb>

December 16, 2007

Sunday Book Review

Across The Universe
Planetary Politics

By Dave Itzkoff
Published: December 16, 2007

Have the worlds of science fiction and presidential politics ever been more closely aligned than they were in 2007? This was the year when Rudolph Giuliani told a young questioner on the campaign trail that we'll be prepared" if the United States is attacked by aliens from another planet; when Dennis Kucinich blithely confessed during a Democratic debate that he'd seen a U.F.O.; and when Mitt Romney revealed in an interview that L. Ron Hubbard's "Battlefield Earth" was one of his favorite novels.

But really, is it all that remarkable that Romney would identify with the story of a virtuous hero who saves Earth from a foreign invasion force? Or that several candidates have embraced science fiction when so many of them could benefit from its lessons? As the primary season approaches, we offer a few sci-fi suggestions to some of the Democratic and Republican contenders - and to a few major players on the periphery who could use the remedial reading.

Rudolph Giuliani
Former Mayor of New York

Should tell reporters he's read Childhood's End by Arthur C. Clarke: An advanced intelligence arrives from above, creating a utopia by integrating all of humanity into a single mind that thinks and acts as one.

Might also consider reading The War of the Worlds by H. G. Wells: During a cataclysmically destructive event, an observant bystander happens to be in the right place at the right time and thereafter never stops talking about it.

Barack Obama
Senator from Illinois

Should tell reporters he's read Behold The Man by Michael Moorcock: Obsessed with Messianic ideas, a man with issues about his lineage travels back in time to discover he is actually the Messiah.

Might also consider reading The Bicentennial Man by Isaac

Asimov: An especially lifelike robot is faced with an existential dilemma - give up his mechanical immortality and be accepted as human, or be shunned by mankind for all time.

Mike Huckabee
Former Governor of Arkansas

Should tell reporters he's read *By His Bootstraps* by Robert A. Heinlein: A hard-working man learns he will one day ascend to a position of great power if he can just trick history into repeating itself.

Might also consider reading *A Sound of Thunder* by Ray Bradbury: A clumsy milquetoast with a shaky grasp of science goes hunting for dinosaurs and ruins the future for everybody.

John Edwards
Former Senator from North Carolina

Should tell reporters he's read *The Dispossessed* by Ursula K. Le Guin: Traveling between two worlds, a well-meaning intellectual learns that bureaucracy and conformity are the inevitable consequences of a society that rejects private ownership.

Might also consider reading *Sometimes They Come Back* by Stephen King: The survivor of a vicious assault in which he saw his brother taken down is set upon by the reincarnations of the thugs who originally attacked him.

Hillary Rodham Clinton
Senator from New York

Should tell reporters she's read *Dune* by Frank Herbert: Left adrift to wander in a desert wasteland, the scion of a deposed dynasty retakes the family's lost throne in thrilling and violent fashion.

Might also consider reading *Herbert's Children of Dune*: A calculating despot undergoes the ultimate act of political triangulation by transforming himself into a part-human, part-worm creature and going on to rule for what feels like 3,500 years.

John McCain
Senator from Arizona

Should tell reporters he's read *Starship Troopers* by Robert A. Heinlein: An impressionable young man is drafted into an intergalactic military campaign and finds that war solves all problems.

Might also consider reading *The Forever War* by Joe Haldeman: An impressionable young man is drafted into an intergalactic military campaign and finds that war doesn't solve anything.

Dennis Kucinich
Congressman from Ohio

Should tell reporters he's read *Dragon's Egg* by Robert L. Forward: In an unexplored corner of the galaxy, a neutron star, inhabited by tiny, tightly concentrated creatures that seem to exist in only two dimensions, develops and prospers.

Might also consider reading *The Running Man* by Richard Bachman: A desperate participant in a brutal TV contest appears to be the only person who doesn't realize there's no way he can win it.

Fred Thompson
Former Senator from Tennessee

Should tell reporters he's read *Oryx and Crake* by Margaret Atwood: After rousing from a lengthy slumber, a mysterious hermit emerges from his cave to pass on his religious and moral teachings to his circle of subhuman followers.

Might also consider reading Non-Stop by Brian W. Aldiss: Having been away from their native soil for countless years, a starship passenger and his fellow travelers lose their ability to live among a civilized society and regress to a feral state.

Ron Paul
Congressman from Texas

Should tell reporters he's read The Invisible Man by H. G. Wells: Thanks to his singular affliction, an oddly dressed, unstable man is able to make life difficult for his many rivals.

Might also consider reading White Light by Rudy Rucker: A nonconformist stumbles on crucial truths about how the universe might really work; his colleagues dismiss his findings as the result of too much drinking and pot smoking.

Michael Bloomberg
Mayor of New York

Should tell reporters he's read The World Inside, by Robert Silverberg: As it turns out, a grossly overpopulated city that corrals its citizens into massive skyscrapers, encourages random sexual encounters and has no justice system to speak of can still function pretty well.

Might also consider reading The Sirens Of Titan, by Kurt Vonnegut: The richest man in America travels to the farthest reaches of outer space, where his wealth cannot shield him from the human race's ultimate insignificance in the universe.

Al Gore
Former Vice President of the United States

Should tell reporters he's read The Andromeda Strain by Michael Crichton: Working in quiet isolation, a team of scientists manages to avert catastrophe through the systematic application of reason.

Might also consider reading Foundation by Isaac Asimov: A supergenius with a knack for predicting the future determines that things on Earth are about to get very bad very soon. In return for his service, he is arrested.

George W. Bush
President of the United States

Should tell reporters he's read Ender's Game by Orson Scott Card: A gifted child from a privileged family defeats a race of inhuman warriors without ever having to leave the comfort of his war-simulator machine.

Might also consider reading A Scanner Darkly by Philip K. Dick: A troubled law enforcer invites a series of increasingly desperate, damaged characters into his home and lives to regret the decision.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: Michael Woods <mike.woods.nul>
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 2007 03:27:43 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 11:00:02 -0500
Subject: New Videos Of Objects In Space

Hello Listers,

I hit the Rense website regularly. I know it's filled with Jew-haters and those convinced anyone slightly to the right of Karl Marx is a neo-con in a conspiracy to turn North America over to immigrants (!) before the New World Order takes over. The opinions on that site are so out-there I almost always have a laugh when I hit that site. Yesterday, an article there wiped the smile off my face. This is something all Listers should check out. I'll be interested in everyone's opinion on what they are, whose they are, if they're real or fake, etc.

Here's the link, let the brawl begin:

<http://www.rense.com/general79/wdx1.htm>

Mike Woods
returning from his quit-smoking exile

Pray there's intelligent life somewhere out in space;
There's bugger all down here on Earth.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:25 -0000
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:09:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it
>>has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been
>>puzzling me intermittently over the years.

>>A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin
>>has been absolutely right to draw attention to these
>>inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic.
>>Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether
>>confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground
>>over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it
>>applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions
>>Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it
>>makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable
>>response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable
>>specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it
>>perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of
>>the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

My tentative conclusion (I would rather say my strong feeling at this stage) has been fairly clearly stated. It is that the original statements have the ring of truth. Some unexplained event was witnessed by three people, involving an apparently ordered arrangement of multiple blue, red and white lights that appeared to fly among the trees, and at least one of the three was convinced they were attached to a mechanical device seen as close as 50m distance.

Gerald's opinion that the evidence is too ambiguous to be fruitfully argued about is not one I share in this case. I think confusion is a gift to both entrenched poles of opinion, who will rush to agree with the wisdom of not poking too hard at the status quo. Neither party wishes to be mired in the low ground of confusion between their positions, and to point to that confusion as a reason for avoiding contention is to allow oneself to be exploited by their intellectual inertia. Eventually the deepening bog will swallow them all if the original evidence is allowed to be forever compromised by revisionism based on fresh embroideries.

Are there more important issues and more interesting cases? I might well agree that there are, but the huge prominence of this one in ufological "discourse" (I didn't bring it up remember) tells me that ufology in general doesn't agree and ufology in general - and that includes this List - needs to take responsibility for the reasons why a case which is "fundamentally problematic" and "plagued by inconsistencies", as Gerald describes it, continues to get such exposure (I

understand that more documentaries are underway as we speak) and to command such esteem out of proportion to that status, both on this List as well as off.

>Probably. This debate has been around for a long time. People >unfamiliar with this might get the impression from this >discussion here that Penniston made a story up for the recent >Larry King show. He did not. I think it's been 10 or 15 years >since Penniston first claimed he'd touched the object and seen >writing on it.

10 or 15 years during which Penniston's new version continues to be repeated uncritically. That doesn't mean it must be false, it is asking for it to be treated critically. Why is it that after 10 or 15 years merely to raise a question about Penniston's changed story on this List caused the questioner to get instantly jumped on with the aggressive assertion that anyone who claims Penniston ever said anything inconsistent is either badly confused or a liar? Seeing such an attitude only makes one more inclined to be sympathetic to those who claim the Rendlesham affair has the momentum of major myth

(I mention this here in so discourteous a fashion in order to respect the custom of "some on this list" which is to direct comments obliquely via third parties out of the corners of their mouths and evade direct address.)

Below, you obliquely criticise ufologists for declining to confront Buzz Aldrin's inconsistent evolving story (rightly so, if that is the way of things), yet you appear to give the nod here to Gerald's suggestion that in the case of Penniston possibly "jazzing up" his story, well, it doesn't really matter. You justify this because...

>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most important >and credible evidence and they're only slightly less >sensational than Penniston's later story.

Excuse me, but the "most important and credible evidence" in respect of the Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag incident, in which Halt plays no part at all, is not a second-hand summary by Halt but the original first hand accounts by these men, and the original statements of two other men (Buran and Chandler) who monitored the event by way of Penniston's radio commentary at the time. If you focus on these you will be cleaving to your own principle (as stated below, and with which I generally agree) that "what people say at the time of an incident like this should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or revisions they make years later".

Secondary to these accounts we then have the summary prepared by Halt. This is the sensational para.1 of Halt's memo, a second-hand summary of the statements by Penniston and the others concerning events Halt did not witness, and adding nothing substantial to the pre-existing accounts by Penniston and co. I have already agreed that use of the word "metallic" instead of "mechanical" could conceivably reflect additional information passed verbally by Penniston and co in interview, but this is far from either necessary or material since the one would normally imply the other. Halt's account agrees that "as [they] approached the object... it disappeared". The estimated size is probably the only feature that does not appear in the originals. From Halt's para.1:

"... The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest. The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape, approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high. It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath. The object was hovering or on legs. As the patrolmen approached the object it maneuvered through the trees and disappeared. At this time the animals on a nearby farm went into a frenzy. The object was briefly sighted approximately an hour later near the back gate."

Halt's para 3 describes events he himself witnessed on the next night and is claimed by himself and by its apologists to contain deliberate fabrication (just like the five other original witness statements) supposedly designed to obfuscate "sensational" parts of his story, so obviously these are exactly

what it does not include at all. It says:

"3. Later in the night a red sun-like object was seen through the trees. It moved about and pulsed. At one point it appeared to throw off glowing particles and then broke into five separate white objects and disappeared. Immediately thereafter, three star like objects were noticed in the sky, two objects to the north and one to the south, all of which were about 10 degrees off of the horizon. The objects moved rapidly in sharp, angular movements and displayed red, green and blue lights. The objects to the north appeared to be elliptical through 8-10 power lens. They then turned to full circles. The objects in the north remained in the sky for an hour or more. The object to the south was visible for two to three hours and beamed down a stream of light from time to time. "

As for Halt's tape, nowhere, so far as I know, does it describe anything nearly as "sensational" as the sighting of a structured landed craft by Penniston and co the previous night. There are lights and beams, and lots of excitement, but no structured landed craft. In short this seems a much less interesting event than the sightings of the first night.

The most pertinent and reliable evidence we have in relation to the first night is, you will agree, the original statements of those involved. The facts above do not support your contentions that the Halt memo (which BTW also contains an erroneous date) is "by far the most important and credible evidence" or that it contains evidence about that night of a more "sensational" nature than the original accounts. It does not. And why would it, if (as Halt and his apologists now claim) his account was censored to remove sensational aspects of the reports, not to make them more sensational than they already were?

>Halt certainly didn't write his
>memo or make the recording in order to get on TV years later.
>Even if Penniston's later claim that he touched the object is a
>lie, it doesn't affect the significance of the memo or the
>recording.

This paragraph risks confusing the two separate sightings on two different nights. Halt's tape has nothing to do with the Penniston, Burroughs, Cabansag event that is the topic of this thread. As I already pointed out, the part of Halt's memo that is relevant to that event is a summary of information already in the witness's statements.

>And the fact that the witnesses' written descriptions
>are more vague than what's described in the memo does indicate
>that they were toning down what they put in writing, regardless
>of whether Penniston was jazzing things up in his later
>statements.

This is incomplete reasoning. If it were true that Halt's summary was more sensational than the content of the original reports, then one possible interpretation would be that the witnesses had decided to tone down their own accounts, just like Halt supposedly toned down his own (indeed the suggestion that has been made is that they all did this in concert for the same reasons). Another would be that Halt's second-hand summary was an exaggeration based on Halt's false impression of the original story. That would be more economical than the topsy-turvey idea that an inflated second-hand summary demonstrates that the original evidence must have been self-censored.

No matter. In any case, your hypothesis assumes Halt's summary is more sensational, and is not toned down like the originals. Why would this be? Surely he didn't just forget that they were supposed to be keeping mum? This is after all paral of the very same memo in which he has (ex hypothesi) carefully toned down his own account of the next night for the same motives.

Fortunately this daft idea is not required to make sense, because the story in the original statements is in fact just the same story as the one summarised by Halt: The "positively identified mechanical device" moving erratically through the trees and observed as close as 50m, the drawing of a clearly artificial structured machine with a red light on top, the bank of blue lights below, the illuminated trees, the animal disturbance... it's all there.

>I agree that Penniston's more sensational description doesn't
>add much to the evidence embodied in the Halt memo, but it
>doesn't detract from it either.

The Halt memo is not first-order evidence in this case. Forget
the Halt memo. It doesn't say anything different anyway.

Penniston's "more sensational description" does add
significantly to the statements originally given by the five
direct and indirect witnesses insofar as it requires Burroughs
(at least) to have been unmistakably in the very close presence
of an absolutely wierd machine. Burroughs, as I understand,
declines to go along with this and sticks by his original
testimony.

Either Penniston, Burroughs, Cabansag, Buran and Chandler
falsified their original statements or they did not. The
evidence that they did is a claim first made (according to your
above dates) some 15-or-so years later. It has been asserted
that this falsification was merely a matter of the primary
witnesses (Penniston and Burroughs, with Cabansag) later
deciding (or being persuaded) to "leave out" the "detail" of
actually touching and inspecting an object when they made their
statements. But this is untrue. A wholesale reconstruction of
events and times by all parties would be required, including
Chandler and Buran. And by any normal standards of evidence, a
witness's claim to ratchet up the strangeness quotient of his
testimony by materially altering it after 15 years ought at
least to pass the test of being consistent. Who would disagree
with this?

Penniston's original statement that the walk back from the point
of termination took 45 mins is consistent with the fact that the
time of termination of the search by Buran at 0354 allows a
maximum outbound trip on foot of about 45 mins (if allowing
only about 10 min for the original Burroughs expedition and the
decision to send Penniston and Cabansag back with him) and
probably less than 45 mins, but obviously there is no room here
for his now-claimed 45-minute-long inspection of the object at
some point during this ~90-min round trip of 4 miles (max) on
foot at a plausible average 2.7 mph. In this case it is the
later embellishment that appears inconsistent.

What else is inconsistent? What about Burroughs' statement on
the BBC Inside Out programme in 2003 that he believed Penniston
and Halt were both "dramatising" the original story? I can't
testify to this remark but I've been "reliably informed" that it
was made. If anyone has chapter and verse perhaps they could
share it?

What about the fact that Penniston's notebook entry with
sketches of "symbols" and notes supposedly drawn on the spot
during his arm's-length encounter appears to carry the wrong
date (Dec 27, a day out) and the wrong time (0020, about 3 hours
out)? Is this related to the fact that Burroughs, who according
to Penniston was also on the spot, denies that Penniston made
any notes? Has Penniston or anyone offered an explanation of
this? I have only seen these matters raised; I would be
interested to see them addressed.

What about Burroughs, who is quoted as rebutting the lighthouse
theory thus: "there are some people that try to twist it - If
you read the statements, especially mine they are clearly
distinguished between what we saw at the beginning... and then
we did see a beacon light and we followed it. Nowhere [in my
statement] does it say that I felt the beacon light was the
object." What does this imply? He is asking us to pay careful
attention to the detail of the original statements, as though
they were true. As he understands his own statement it clearly
does not allow confusion between the UFO and the lighthouse
beacon. That would be a sceptical "twisting" of what is written,
he says. This is not at all a man admitting that his statement
was made up (as others now claim it must have been) in order to
implicate the lighthouse.

>I think what people say at the
>time of an incident like this should be given far more weight
>than any new alleged details or revisions they make years
>later. (Unless they are astronauts like Buzz Aldrin, who are
>allowed to totally contradict their initial UFO descriptions

>years later without anyone being impolite enough to point it
>out.)

We appear to be in agreement on this at least. But if it is really the general feeling among ufologists that it's not too important if witnesses jazz up their stories, even if it becomes necessary to gut original documents of their credibility in order to accommodate the jazz, then frankly I despair.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:57 -0000
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:12:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>Lan and Gerald,

>You are two people on this List whose views and opinions I
>always benefit from. Anyone who knows me knows how skeptical I
>am of people who engage in sensationalism, embellishment, or any
>of their cousins. I personally size up witnesses at every
>opportunity.

>During the recent National Press Club press conference I had
>occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at
>meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very
>conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is
>highly
>professional about military matters. I heard his presentation
>which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel
>Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

Dick

I realise that you're not speaking to me but you will excuse this intervention. I acknowledge your long experience in speaking with witnesses and I have no reason to think you are not amongst the best judges of character. However you will also acknowledge that personal impressions cannot trump the evidence in the historical record, so you will understand that my own point of view is to note your opinion of the man's character but to continue to place emphasis on the consistency of the written and spoken evidence.

Which causes me to agree with Gerald that the latter contains difficult and inconsistent issues that are not satisfactorily resolved. These are all, so far as I can tell, introduced by claims made years after the event. I would be first in the queue to hear explanations.

Since you have recently questioned Penniston at length in order to satisfy yourself that "no way is he embellishing or exaggerating" I'm confident that you will be able to tell the list how he explained to you the discrepant time and date on the notebook which he claims to have written by the light of the UFO in real time, but which Burroughs denies he ever wrote.

Of course if Penniston has embellished his story that does not mean the original event was not significant. That something unexplained happened on Dec 26 appears clear, to me, from the original documents. But I seem to be alone. The rest of you appear bent upon totally devaluing those documents by promoting the story that they were faked, which is the only way of accommodating new and more exciting claims made years afterwards.
The irony of this is devastating.

>Some people on this List seem unable to grasp the human factors
>aspects of close encounter UFO sightings, which generally scare

>the pants off of the astonished witnesses. In this country, at
>least, the ridicule factor is very powerful. So in the heat of
>the moment, fearing ridicule and/or loss of reputation,
>witnesses often (I repeat, often) are reluctant to come forth
>with the full details of their experiences. I know this as a
>fact, and know many highly placed witnesses who don't dare
>speak out.

They weren't thinking straight, not reacting rationally in the heat of the moment. Yet Chandler's testimony indicates that they had the presence of mind to make up a lie on the spot about not getting closer than 50m and report this over the radio to CSC in real time so that it would lend credence to what Penniston was planning to claim.

Or else Chandler's statement and Buran's statement were fabricated too, so that this 50m detail and the time-line in which it is embedded was all carefully constructed at leisure after the fact - even though neither Chandler nor Buran was a witness and had nothing directly to gain by it, yet definitely had something to lose by putting their signatures to lies on official reports, as you point out:

>In the military this Ridicule Factor can be especially powerful.
>You do things by the book, and you are required to follow
>certain protocols, and you don't go around telling wild
>stories.

Yes of course in the military you know to do things by the book, follow regs and don't purvey fantasies. So it's natural, I suppose, for security police who are sticklers for protocol to conspire to fabricate official statements and sign off on an untrue wild story for fear of ridicule and to protect their reputations. In fact it comes naturally to Buran and Chandler to do this to protect someone else's reputations.

>So if you are a senior security policeman and see a rather
>unearthly metallic craft in the woods and touch it, you are in
>a quandary.

Are you in much less of a quandary if you only see it from 50m away? Perhaps so, because you could then claim that you couldn't honestly say if it was an unearthly machine or not. Yes, and you could then, if you were a bit slow, totally subvert the point of that strategem by claiming that you "positively identified" it as an unearthly machine in any case. All you would have achieved then is to make the same claim and expose yourself to all that "ridicule and loss of reputation" whilst having hog-tied yourself by watering down your own evidence for this "wild story" which according to you military men just don't go around telling. And what a shame when you had all those nice close-up photographs too.

>The behavior of both Penniston and Halt in initially
>holding back the details about what they experienced is
>completely understandable.

If you say so.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: **Santiago Yturria Garza** <syturria.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 12:40:23 -0600
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:24:23 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: Michael Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 14 Dec 2007 03:27:43 -0500
>Subject: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>I hit the Rense website regularly. I know it's filled with Jew-
>haters and those convinced anyone slightly to the right of Karl
>Marx is a neo-con in a conspiracy to turn North America over to
>immigrants (!) before the New World Order takes over. The
>opinions on that site are so out-there I almost always have a
>laugh when I hit that site. Yesterday, an article there wiped
>the smile off my face. This is something all Listers should
>check out. I'll be interested in everyone's opinion on what they
>are, whose they are, if they're real or fake, etc.

>Here's the link, let the brawl begin:

><http://www.rense.com/general79/wdx1.htm>

>Mike Woods >returning from his quit-smoking exile

This is an old story and certainly not a world's exclusive. Jose Escamilla made a short documentary not long ago about this case named Interstellar and it's at his pay per view website named The Borderlands Network. The Interstellar film didn't work at all. This is the link:

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

John Lenard Walson is a false name and I know who this guy is. He lives in the UK and I researched his case since 2003. As the Interstellar film didn't work this person moved to YouTube and other websites promoting his alleged videos. Also posted many images in different public forums generating a big controversy. Finally he got Rense and that's it.

But the images have not been authenticated due to the absence of evidences and elements to sustain this specific topic of alien spacecrafts in space. Nobody knows who John Lenard Walson is and his whereabouts, except me. The story will continue as I predict in the same tone but without showing who, where and how these images are filmed.

Santiago

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 15:17:17 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:25:43 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: Michael Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 14 Dec 2007 03:27:43 -0500
>Subject: New Videos Of Objects In Space

<snip>

>I hit the Rense website regularly. I know it's filled with Jew-
>haters and those convinced anyone slightly to the right of Karl
>Marx is a neo-con in a conspiracy to turn North America over to
>immigrants (!) before the New World Order takes over. The
>opinions on that site are so out-there I almost always have a
>laugh when I hit that site. Yesterday, an article there wiped
>the smile off my face. This is something all Listers should
>check out. I'll be interested in everyone's opinion on what they
>are, whose they are, if th! ey're real or fake, etc.

>Here's the link, let the brawl begin:

><http://www.rense.com/general79/wdx1.htm>

<snip>

How about this link with Jose Escamilla's side of the story?

<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread321150/pg1>

<snip>

>Mike Woods
>returning from his quit-smoking exile

<snip>

Did you make it?

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Zamora & Hynek [was: Penniston NP Conference &

From: Ray Stanford <dinosaurtracker.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 15:36:19 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:36:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Zamora & Hynek [was: Penniston NP Conference &

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 12:08:25 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lffleming5.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2007 22:08:05 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 22:24:20 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>>From: Lan Fleming <lffleming5.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 13:29:21 -0600
>>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>><snip>

>>>>I haven't been following the ins and outs of this discussion,

>>>>Fair enough, but you're missing the point.

>>But I think you're missing my point. You said the witnesses'
>>statements were will-o-the-wispy, which they were. But someone
>>gave a considerably more detailed description of the object in
>>Halt's memo that could not be reasonably described as a will o'
>>the wisp.

>I do see your point, Lan, but it's a misunderstanding. I
>described the reported behaviour of the object during the
>pursuit as like the classic behaviour of a will o' the whisp:
>As they seemed to get closer to it they found it wasn't where
>they previously thought it was.

<snip>

Then, Lan Fleming said:

>>In another case that comes to mind, Lonnie Zamora originally
>>said that he saw two people in coveralls near the UFO in the
>>Socorro incident. After being ridiculed for seeing little people
>>in UFOs, he later omitted the "people" from his description and
>>said only that he had seen two pairs of coveralls near the
>>object. It apparently didn't occur to him that the image of two
>>pairs of empty pants standing by a UFO was even more ridiculous
>>that that of two little people, with or without pants. I don't
>>think that proves Zamorra was lying; UFO witnesses sometimes
>>seem to change their stories in ways that don't make a lot of
>>sense when they're under pressure. Maybe Penniston was lying,
>>but I think the evidence of that so far as I'm aware is less
>>than conclusive.

Please pardon my differing, Lan, but Lonnie Zamora didn't alter
his account of seeing two figures about the size of ten-year-old
children wearing what looked like white coveralls beside the

northwest landing gear of the object, and saying that one of them seemed to jump, as though startled, when his police car topped the ridge to the east of the landed craft.

It was Allen Hynek who 'hatched' the distorted version in his news conference of Wednesday, April 29, 1962, at the El Rio Motel in Socorro. Maybe Allen did that to please USAF Major William Conner, from the Office of Public Information, of Kirkland Air Force base, who was present. My 'gut' feeling was that Conner was there pretty much as an 'enforcer', to see that Allen 'sang the Air Force's song' composed for public consumption.

Let us keep in mind that at the time Hynek was under contract with the USAF as a 'scientific consultant' when he generated the farce of ostensibly empty 'white coveralls', as transcribed verbatim from my tape recording of the 4-29-64 news conference, and as reported on page 67 in my 1976 book on the Socorro case:

Walter Shrode of radio KSRC in Socorro, had asked Hynek: "And the object and, uh, the people that he sighted and their size?"

Allen Hynek responded: "He told me nothing about having seen any people. And, uuh, this I read in the newspapers, but he, uuh, was, uuuh, apparently not, well as far as I know he, he did not say anything specifically about having seen any people. Not to me, at any rate. And I did ask him about it. I know that there was an earlier report that he had seen people, but, uuh, to me he said nothing specific about people"

Shrode: "Did he describe seeing any objects that appeared to be, uh, in white coveralls, sir?"

Hynek (his voice weak and hesitating): "He indicated that, uuuuuuhh, uuh,, he saw something, uuh, along the side of the instrument or the device that resembled white coveralls. Yes."

Shrode glanced at me, rolling his eyes up. There was no need to force Hynek to humiliate himself any further. Disgusted (as he told me later), Shrode closed the for-the-record (official) portion of the conference.

About four months later, on Wednesday, August 26, 1964, when I again interviewed Lonnie Zamora, with Bob McGarey as a witness, Zamora confirmed that the two figures he had seen beside the landed object's northwest landing gear resembled, "...two ten-year-old kids in white coveralls." Additionally, Lonnie hinted that he was beginning to wonder if the craft and its occupants might have been from "space". Specifically, he said "...From the officials I've talked to, [I] don't see how it could'a been anything, you know, that we [That "we" was strongly emphasized by Zamora's voice tone.] made. Seemed like they [government officials] might know that too. I'd say it might be from space, yes. I don't know, but you might say that."

Twelve years later (1976), Allen Hynek came to Austin, Texas, bringing visitors to my UFO-monitoring optical and electronic laboratories on our 400-acre lab site, equipped with optical, spectral, magnetic, gravitic, and radar tracking and recording systems. I was deeply appreciative when he voluntarily confessed his 'sins' of the April 29, 1964, news event and told my wife, me, and those he had brought (Mimi Hynek, Dave Baldwin, and Carl Teutsch), "Ray, you gave me exactly what I had coming!"

I'd earlier sent Allen a copy of my book on the Socorro case, which he had read just before that 1976 visit to my project's Austin offices and our UFO tracking facilities, N-W of Austin, off Volente Road, in the 'hill country'.

In evidence of his sincere and good-spirited acknowledgement that in the book I had dealt properly with him, Hynek went on to provide me a letter with nice, positive praise intended for use in promoting my Socorro book, written on Northwestern University Department of Astronomy stationery. Electronic copies of that letter may be obtained from me 'for the asking', at:

dinosaurtracker.nul

Copies are offered not to promote my 1976 Socorro book - which is hard to find - but in substantiation of Hynek's fairness, openness, and attitude change about and likely in large part

resulting from, what he heard and learned of the very evidential Zamora-Socorro CE III.

In my opinion, Allen Hynek should be forgiven for his 'sin' of having started the 'white coveralls only' myth, since once out of constraints of his USAF contract he - in 1976 - voluntarily rectified his 1964 news event statements in the presence of witnesses. That and my other encounters with that true gentleman of ufology commend him, in my opinion, as someone to whom our field will long owe gratitude, for, in fact, many diverse reasons.

To anyone on this List who might not really like Allen Hynek, I simply suggest that you try to walk a mile or more in his shoes, and realize the man's fine personal character, even when tested by criticism of colleagues.

Thanks for reading this, and may every reader have a safe and positive holiday season, including a splendid 2008.

Ray Stanford,

BTW: Yes, like it or not, I'm still alive at ~ 70, while regularly tracking dinosaurs and other Mesozoic vertebrates (via Maryland's Early Cretaceous tracks and trackways), in-the-while having found and recognized an absolutely new taxon (= genus-and-species) of dinosaur (per se, not tracks), already scientifically described and soon to be published in a refereed and major paleontological - palaeontological, if you're of the U.K. - journal.

Also, believe it or not, I'm still, even just two weeks ago, noticing, tracking, and photographing occasional daylight UFOs that violate the D.C./Maryland area's highly-monitored air space. Any of my D.C. area UFO photos deemed scientifically significant will be published in a time and context of my choice. Please, no one, shout "Put them on rense.com or on You Tube!" Any good, significant UFO evidence deserves a better context and introduction.

Here-and-now, I just wanted to set the Zamora record straight by writing my above submission, which based on my first-hand, recorded, face-to-face discussions with Lonnie Zamora and Allen Hynek.

For the record, my Socorro interviews began on the evening of Tuesday, April 28, 1964, four days after the April 24, 1964, Socorro "close encounter of the third kind", to use Hynek's own terminology.

rs

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:47:26 -0500
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:47:26 -0500
Subject: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri

Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

<http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

14 December 2007

Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

Dec 14, 2007 (LBO) =96 Celebrated science fiction writer and space prophet Arthur C. Clarke yearns to see aliens and peace in his adopted home in Sri Lanka, a video statement released ahead of his 90th birthday said.

Clarke is widely known for his 1945 proposal to put up geostationary communications satellites =96 an orbiting relay station that moves at the same rate as the earth so that it appears to be stationary from the ground =96 of which now there are more than 300 going around in 'Clarke' orbits.

He also wrote futuristic fiction where humankind met advanced space faring civilizations from other worlds.

Clarke who is celebrating his birthday on December 16 said his fondest wish was to see evidence of extra =96terrestrial (ET) life.

"I have always believed that we are not alone in the universe," Clarke said.

"But we are still waiting for ETs to call us =96 or give us some kind of a sign. We have no way of guessing when this might happen =96 I hope sooner rather than later."

He also wanted to see cleaner energy and an end to the 'addiction' to crude oil. Clarke had written about energy from nuclear fusion - the process that goes on inside a sun - that could be an unlimited source of energy, while petroleum could be used to synthesize food.

He said communications had progressed rapidly in his lifetime and the mobile phone had turned humanity into an "endlessly chattering global family".

"Communication technologies are necessary, but not sufficient, for us humans to get along with each other," he said.

"This is why we still have many disputes and conflicts in the world. Technology tools help us to gather and disseminate information, but we also need qualities like tolerance and compassion to achieve greater understanding between peoples and nations."

He said the 20th century was the most barbaric in human history and he would like humans to overcome "tribal divisions" and begin to think like one family.

Clarke said his final wish was to see lasting peace in his adopted country of Sri Lanka which has been wracked by ethnic strife for decades.

"I've been living in Sri Lanka for 50 years =96 and half that time, I've been a sad witness to the bitter conflict that divides my adopted country," he said.

"I dearly wish to see lasting peace established in Sri Lanka as soon as possible. But I'm aware that peace cannot just be wished - it requires a great deal of hard work, courage and persistence."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:01:40 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 08:59:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:25 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it
>>>has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been
>>>puzzling me intermittently over the years.

>>>A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin
>>>has been absolutely right to draw attention to these
>>>inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic.
>>>Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether
>>>confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground
>>>over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it
>>>applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions
>>>Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it
>>>makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable
>>>response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable
>>>specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it
>>>perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of
>>>the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

>My tentative conclusion (I would rather say my strong feeling at
>this stage) has been fairly clearly stated. It is that the
>original statements have the ring of truth. Some unexplained
>event was witnessed by three people, involving an apparently
>ordered arrangement of multiple blue, red and white lights that
>appeared to fly among the trees, and at least one of the three
>was convinced they were attached to a mechanical device seen as
>close as 50m distance.

>Gerald's opinion that the evidence is too ambiguous to be
>fruitfully argued about is not one I share in this case. I think
>confusion is a gift to both entrenched poles of opinion, who
>will rush to agree with the wisdom of not poking too hard at the
>status quo. Neither party wishes to be mired in the low
>ground of confusion between their positions, and to point to
>that confusion as a reason for avoiding contention is to allow
>oneself to be exploited by their intellectual inertia.
>Eventually the deepening bog will swallow them all if the
>original evidence is allowed to be forever compromised by
>revisionism based on fresh embroideries.

>Are there more important issues and more interesting cases? I
>might well agree that there are, but the huge prominence of this
>one in ufological "discourse" (I didn't bring it up remember)
>tells me that ufology in general doesn't agree and ufology in
>general - and that includes this List - needs to take

>responsibility for the reasons why a case which is
>"fundamentally problematic" and "plagued by inconsistencies", as
>Gerald describes it, continues to get such exposure (I
>understand that more documentaries are underway as we speak) and
>to command such esteem out of proportion to that status, both on
>this List as well as off.

>>Probably. This debate has been around for a long time. People
>>unfamiliar with this might get the impression from this
>>discussion here that Penniston made a story up for the recent
>>Larry King show. He did not. I think it's been 10 or 15 years
>>since Penniston first claimed he'd touched the object and seen
>>writing on it.

Right on!

>10 or 15 years during which Penniston's new version continues to
>be repeated uncritically. That doesn't mean it must be false, it
>is asking for it to be treated critically. Why is it that after
>10 or 15 years merely to raise a question about Penniston's
>changed story on this List caused the questioner to get
>instantly jumped on with the aggressive assertion that anyone
>who claims Penniston ever said anything inconsistent is either
>badly confused or a liar? Seeing such an attitude only makes one
>more inclined to be sympathetic to those who claim the
>Rendlesham affair has the momentum of major myth

>(I mention this here in so discourteous a fashion in order to
>respect the custom of "some on this list" which is to direct
>comments obliquely via third parties out of the corners of their
>mouths and evade direct address.

Oh, feeling sensitive are we? I have no problem with addressing
you directly and will do so below.

<snip>

>>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most important
>>and credible evidence and they're only slightly less
>>sensational than Penniston's later story.

>Excuse me, but the "most important and credible evidence" in
>respect of the Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag incident, in
>which Halt plays no part at all, is not a second-hand summary by
>Halt but the original first hand accounts by these men, and the
>original statements of two other men (Buran and Chandler) who
>monitored the event by way of Penniston's radio commentary at
>the time. If you focus on these you will be cleaving to your own
>principle (as stated below, and with which I generally agree)
>that "what people say at the time of an incident like this
>should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or
>revisions they make years later".

This is one of your repeated false premises, that revisions made
many years later are involved. Then you become very rigid after
accepting - in your own mind - that your false premise is Gospel
truth.

>Secondary to these accounts we then have the summary prepared by
>Halt. This is the sensational para.1 of Halt's memo, a second-
>hand summary of the statements by Penniston and the others
>concerning events Halt did not witness, and adding nothing
>substantial to the pre-existing accounts by Penniston and co. I
>have already agreed that use of the word "metallic" instead of
>"mechanical" could conceivably reflect additional information
>passed verbally by Penniston and co in interview, but this is
>far from either necessary or material since the one would
>normally imply the other. Halt's account agrees that "as [they]
>approached the object... it disappeared". The estimated size is
>probably the only feature that does not appear in the originals.
>>From Halt's para.1:

<snip>

>Halt's para 3 describes events he himself witnessed on the next
>night and is claimed by himself and by its apologists to contain
>deliberate fabrication (just like the five other original
>witness statements) supposedly designed to obfuscate
>"sensational" parts of his story, so obviously these are exactly
>what it does not include at all. It says:

>"3. Later in the night a red sun-like object was seen through
>the trees. It moved about and pulsed. At one point it appeared
>to throw off glowing particles and then broke into five separate
>white objects and disappeared. Immediately thereafter, three
>star like objects were noticed in the sky, two objects to the
>north and one to the south, all of which were about 10 degrees
>off of the horizon. The objects moved rapidly in sharp, angular
>movements and displayed red, green and blue lights. The objects
>to the north appeared to be elliptical through 8-10 power lens.
>They then turned to full circles. The objects in the north
>remained in the sky for an hour or more. The object to the south
>was visible for two to three hours and beamed down a stream of
>light from time to time. "

>As for Halt's tape, nowhere, so far as I know, does it describe
>anything nearly as "sensational" as the sighting of a structured
>landed craft by Penniston and co the previous night. There are
>lights and beams, and lots of excitement, but no structured
>landed craft. In short this seems a much less interesting event
>than the sightings of the first night.

The meaning and significance of this totally eludes me.

>The most pertinent and reliable evidence we have in relation to
>the first night is, you will agree, the original statements of
>those involved. The facts above do not support your contentions
>that the Halt memo (which BTW also contains an erroneous date)
>is "by far the most important and credible evidence" or that it
>contains evidence about that night of a more "sensational"
>nature than the original accounts. It does not. And why would
>it, if (as Halt and his apologists now claim) his account was
>censored to remove sensational aspects of the reports, not to
>make them more sensational than they already were?

"Most pertinent and reliable?" No! The most pertinent and
reliable information we have is from Halt and Penniston (and
others) after overcoming their fear of ridicule and loss of
position, and coming forth to flesh out the story of what
happened. Just as a highly pertinent example, the first reports
from the Kennedy assassination were garbled and inaccurate in
most respects, but obviously for different reasons than in this
case. My point is that there is nothing sacred about original
information. I put far more trust in follow-up investigation,
character assessment, and other routine procedues of vetting
information.

>>Halt certainly didn't write his
>>memo or make the recording in order to get on TV years later.
>>Even if Penniston's later claim that he touched the object is a
>>lie, it doesn't affect the significance of the memo or the
>>recording.

>This paragraph risks confusing the two separate sightings on two
>different nights. Halt's tape has nothing to do with the
>Penniston, Burroughs, Cabansag event that is the topic of this
>thread. As I already pointed out, the part of Halt's memo that
>is relevant to that event is a summary of information already in
>the witness's statements.

Well, yes it does. They sought out the landing site and
documented it.

>>And the fact that the witnesses' written descriptions
>>are more vague than what's described in the memo does indicate
>>that they were toning down what they put in writing, regardless
>>of whether Penniston was jazzing things up in his later
>>statements.

>This is incomplete reasoning. If it were true that Halt's
>summary was more sensational than the content of the original
>reports, then one possible interpretation would be that the
>witnesses had decided to tone down their own accounts, just like
>Halt supposedly toned down his own (indeed the suggestion that
>has been made is that they all did this in concert for the same
>reasons). Another would be that Halt's second-hand summary was
>an exaggeration based on Halt's false impression of the original
>story. That would be more economical than the topsy-turvey idea
>that an inflated second-hand summary demonstrates that the
>original evidence must have been self-censored.

If you knew Charles Halt, you would know how ridiculous this

statement is. And the following comments.

>No matter. In any case, your hypothesis assumes Halt's summary
>_is_ more sensational, and is _not_ toned down like
>the originals. Why would this be? Surely he didn't just forget
>that they were supposed to be keeping mum? This is after all
>paral of the very same memo in which he has (ex hypothesi)
>carefully toned down his own account of the next night for the
>same motives.

>Fortunately this daft idea is not required to make sense,
>because the story in the original statements is in fact just the
>same story as the one summarised by Halt: The "positively
>identified mechanical device" moving erratically through the
>trees and observed as close as 50m, the drawing of a clearly
>artificial structured machine with a red light on top, the bank
>of blue lights below, the illuminated trees, the animal
>disturbance... it's all there.

>>I agree that Penniston's more sensational description doesn't
>>add much to the evidence embodied in the Halt memo, but it
>>doesn't detract from it either.

<snip>

>>I think what people say at the
>>time of an incident like this should be given far more weight
>>than any new alleged details or revisions they make years
>>later. (Unless they are astronauts like Buzz Aldrin, who are
>>allowed to totally contradict their initial UFO descriptions
>>years later without anyone being impolite enough to point it
>>out.)

This is absolute hogwash that you keep repeating. Constantly
repeating false premises does not make them true. There are not
revisions made many years later, there are more complete
revelation of facts and clarifications as the parties resolved
their fears and conflicts. And the following statement is more
of the same. It is absolutely inaccurate and irresponsible to
say that Halt or Penniston have "jazzed up their stories."

>We appear to be in agreement on this at least. But if it is
>really the general feeling among ufologists that it's not too
>important if witnesses jazz up their stories, even if it becomes
>necessary to gut original documents of their credibility in
>order to accommodate the jazz, then frankly I despair.

>Martin Shough

I suggest you try to understand human psychology and behavior
under stress a little better. That might help.

Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 19:28:25 -0400
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:02:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:18:24 -0000
>Subject: Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

>>Source: SeedMagazine.Com - Montreal, Quebec, Canada

>><http://tinyurl.com/yqhdpr>
>>December 12, 2007 by David Grinspoon

>>After decades of searching, scientists have found no trace of
>>extraterrestrial intelligence. Now, some of them hope to make contact
>>by broadcasting messages to the stars. Are we prepared for an answer?

>Who speaks for common sense? The only beings using radio signals
>detectable by SETI are going to be:

>a) primitives like us, who've recently discovered radio (in last
>century or so) and haven't yet progressed to a more efficient
>comms method, which is a very narrow 'window' and virtually
>rules out any statistical chance of detection,

>_or_

>b) advanced types actually looking for primitives - with
>unknown, unknowable motives.

It is interesting that SETI people are upset about Zaitsev and others sending out signals because that might lead to bad actions against us on the part of aliens out there. That would only be possible if the aliens could get here. If they can now, they could have a very long time ago. This suggests that searching for alien visitations makes far more sense than searching for signals. Signals could be coming from devices whose builders are long gone. The SETI community is not seeking ETI. It is seeking ET Signals. How dare aliens visit without sending them messages, therefore taking them off their self-installed pedestals!!

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:35:12 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:06:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:57 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>Lan and Gerald,

>>>You are two people on this List whose views and opinions I
>>>always benefit from. Anyone who knows me knows how skeptical I
>>>am of people who engage in sensationalism, embellishment, or any
>>>of their cousins. I personally size up witnesses at every
>>>opportunity.

>>>During the recent National Press Club press conference I had
>>>occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at
>>>meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very
>>>conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is highly
>>>professional about military matters. I heard his presentation
>>>which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel
>>>Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

>Dick

>I realise that you're not speaking to me but you will excuse
>this intervention. I acknowledge your long experience in
>speaking with witnesses and I have no reason to think you are
>not amongst the best judges of character. However you will also
>acknowledge that personal impressions cannot trump the evidence
>in the historical record, so you will understand that my own
>point of view is to note your opinion of the man's character but
>to continue to place emphasis on the consistency of the written
>and spoken evidence.

Okay, I had not read this when I responded at length to the
previous post, but you deserve a point by point response and I
will give it to you. But for openers, you have to look at all of
the "historical record", not just the first draft.

>Which causes me to agree with Gerald that the latter contains
>difficult and inconsistent issues that are not satisfactorily
>resolved. These are all, so far as I can tell, introduced by
>claims made years after the event. I would be first in the queue
>to hear explanations.

There you go again, to borrow an expression from Ronald Reagan.
Years after the event we often get a much clearer and more
accurate picture of what really happened. And here I speak as a
published historian.

>Since you have recently questioned Penniston at length in order
>to satisfy yourself that "no way is he embellishing or
>exaggerating" I'm confident that you will be able to tell the
>list how he explained to you the discrepant time and date on the
>notebook which he claims to have written by the light of the UFO

>in real time, but which Burroughs denies he ever wrote.

Something I have observed over and over in your argumentation is a tendency to make a series of assumptions (premises) and go from there as if the premises were all true. I did not question Penniston to satisfy myself of anything; I simply had an opportunity to talk with him and took advantage of it. From having talked with Col. Halt at great length I had no reason to doubt pennistons honesty and integrity.

Secondly, when I spoke to him I was not even aware of an alleged date discrepancy and am not sure how valid that allegation is. The dates of the Bentwaters events have always been a little confused, but that has never bothered me particularly. It would be good to clear up that question and maybe Nick Pope could offer something definitive about that.

I didn't know that Burroughs had denied that Penniston made notes. That seems to me to be a bizarre claim which I will take up with Penniston next time I am in touch with him. Definitely requires clarification, but I strongly suspect that Burroughs is wrong.

>Of course if Penniston _has_ embellished his story that does not >mean the original event was not significant. That something >unexplained happened on Dec 26 appears clear, to me, from the >original documents. But I seem to be alone. The rest of you >appear bent upon totally devaluing those documents by promoting >the story that they were faked, which is the only way of >accommodating new and more exciting claims made years >afterwards.

Where did I or anyone else say that the original documents were "faked?" And there you go again with "new and exciting claims made many years afterwards." You continue to falsely characterize the sequence and timing of events.

>The irony of this is devastating.

Huh?

>>Some people on this List seem unable to grasp the human factors >>aspects of close encounter UFO sightings, which generally scare >>the pants off of the astonished witnesses. In this country, at >>least, the ridicule factor is very powerful. So in the heat of >>the momemnt, fearing ridicule and/or loss of reputation, >>witnesses often (I repeat, often) are reluctant to come forth >>with the full details of their experiences. I know this as a >>fact, and know many highly placed witnesses who don't dare >> speak out.

>They weren't thinking straight, not reacting rationally in the >heat of the moment. Yet Chandler's testimony indicates that they >had the presence of mind to make up a lie on the spot about not >getting closer than 50m and report this over the radio to CSC in >real time so that it would lend credence to what Penniston was >planning to claim.

Well, I won't even attempt to respond to this sort of lawyerly spin doctoring, subjective argument.

>Or else Chandler's statement and Buran's statement were >fabricated too, so that this 50m detail and the time-line in >which it is embedded was all carefully constructed at leisure >after the fact - even though neither Chandler nor Buran was a >witness and had nothing directly to gain by it, yet definitely >had something to lose by putting their signatures to lies on >official reports, as you point out:

See above. Aristotle would be proud of you for your either - or reasoning amply loaded with false premises.

>>In the military this Ridicule Factor can be especially powerful. >>You do things by the book, and you are required to follow >>certain protocols, and you don't go around telling wild >>stories.

>Yes of course in the military you know to do things by the book, >follow regs and don't purvey fantasies. So it's natural, I >suppose, for security police who are sticklers for protocol to >conspire to fabricate official statements and sign off on an

>untrue wild story for fear of ridicule and to protect their
>reputations. In fact it comes naturally to Buran and Chandler to
>do this to protect someone else's reputations.

God, Martin, get real!

>>So if you are a senior security policeman and see a rather
>>unearthly metallic craft in the woods and touch it, you are in
>>a quandary.

>Are you in much less of a quandary if you only see it from 50m
>away? Perhaps so, because you could then claim that you couldn't
>honestly say if it was an unearthly machine or not. Yes, and you
>could then, if you were a bit slow, totally subvert the point of
>that strategem by claiming that you "positively identified" it
>as an unearthly machine in any case. All you would have achieved
>then is to make the same claim and expose yourself to all that
>"ridicule and loss of reputation" whilst having hog-tied
>yourself by watering down your own evidence for this "wild
>story" which according to you military men just don't go around
>telling. And what a shame when you had all those nice close-up
>photographs too.

Your reasoning is as convoluted as....a conspiracy theorist.

>>The behavior of both Penniston and Halt in initially
>>holding back the details about what they experienced is
>>completely understandable.

>If you say so.

I did say so and I will stand by what I said. it is based
collectively on many years direct field investigation and
interviewing of witnesses, personal knowledge of military
affairs, many years experience as a senior editor of
psychological and other human behavioral literature, oversight
of a national and international investigation network, and...
personal contact with two of the principal witnesses in this
case.

Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:44:30 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:07:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

>Source: SeedMagazine.Com - Montreal, Quebec, Canada

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

>December 12, 2007

>Who Speaks For Earth?
>by David Grinspoon

>After decades of searching, scientists have found no trace of
>extraterrestrial intelligence. Now, some of them hope to make
>contact by broadcasting messages to the stars. Are we prepared
>for an answer?

What a lot of hot air from the public version of SETI.

Let's hear from the real SETI, the one being conducted by
remote viewers! The one that almost certainly already has the
important answers!

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:10 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:09:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

><http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

>14 December 2007

>Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

>Dec 14, 2007 (LBO) Celebrated science fiction writer and space
>prophet Arthur C. Clarke yearns to see aliens and peace in his
>adopted home in Sri Lanka, a video statement released ahead of
>his 90th birthday said.

>Clarke is widely known for his 1945 proposal to put up
>geostationary communications satellites an orbiting relay
>station that moves at the same rate as the earth so that it
>appears to be stationary from the ground of which now there
>are more than 300 going around in 'Clarke' orbits.

>He also wrote futuristic fiction where humankind met advanced
>space faring civilizations from other worlds.

>Clarke who is celebrating his birthday on December 16 said his
>fondest wish was to see evidence of extra terrestrial (ET)
>life.

>"I have always believed that we are not alone in the universe,"
>Clarke said.

>"But we are still waiting for ETs to call us or give us some
>kind of a sign. We have no way of guessing when this might
>happen I hope sooner rather than later."

<snip>

God ol' Art Clarke, much younger version, commented on the Trent
photos when they were published in Britain. Sunday Dispatch,
July 2, 1950, Clarke wrote:

"There is nothing in the whole aeronautical field which gives a
clue about the pictured object. It makes one wonder if there are
extra-terrestrial visitors. We can neither prove nor disprove
such a theory until one lands. They may be revolutionary types
of aircraft or they may be extra-terrestrial. We shall
certainly achieve space flight in 50 years or so. Others may
have done so before us."

About 5 years later Clarke commented favorably on Ruppelt's
book, The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects.

About 29 years later the show, Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious
World, featured the then-famous New Zealand Sightings of
December 1978. Clarke had read some of my reports on those
sightings. Although skeptical, he did not throw them out.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Skylab 3

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:03 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:12:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>From: James Smith <lunartravel.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 10:53:44 -0500 (GMT-05:00)
>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 15:01:30 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Skylab 3

snip

>Highly elliptical orbits can have the object glow
>and pass out of the heat up zone and survive.

><http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1996/0151.html>

><http://www.satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1996/0153.html>

>However, without doing the calcs, the observations above imply
>if objects do pass out of dense part of the atmosphere during
>perigee, then they cool off rapidly.

>So I think this ends this possibility.

>>>Based on your updated SL3 web page, I want to re-emphasize the
>>>conflict of dates of the laser experiment photos. The mission
>>>report for Skylab 3...

>>><http://tinyurl.com/2jnrmg>

>>>shows on page 5-3 that the dates of the laser photos are Sept 19
>>>(good ones) and Sept 20 (blurred ones). This conflicts with the
>>>laser experiment report which states the images were from Sept
>>>4. This is pretty important since on Sept 4 we had some fairly
>>>long duration "close" passes. I think the Skylab transcripts
>>>could help pinpoint/ confirm the times/days.

>>>I am quite certain that the report is wrong in saying that the
>>>laser experiments occurred on the 54th and 55th days (Sept 19 >
>>>and 20). The guys who actually ran the laser (at Goddard) would
>>>know what days they operated the laser (Sept 4 and 5) which are
>>>days 39 and 40 of SL3.

>>>I am not so sure the Goddard report is right mainly because of
>>>the long amount of time between the blurred laser photos and
>>>the UFO photos. Given all the time they have to take pictures
>>>since there are alot of EREP passes between Sept 4 and
>>>Sept 20, it seems highly unlikely they would not film the Earth's
>>>surface. We need the transcript to be sure. How can we
>>>be definitive about the dates when there are conflicting officially
>>>reported values?

There was a long time between usages of this particular Nikon,
if the dates are correct (no use between Sept 4 and Sept 20).
However, there were four other Nikons available for use, some
with a 300 mm lens, so they could have taken pictures with other
cameras. The date of the red satellite observation is given in
the debriefing transcript as a week to ten days and in the

official report as 10 days. According to Oberg it was first mentioned about 4.5 hours after the sighting while they were still in orbit. He listed the day as Sept 20.

>>The report provided a little more information on the "red >>satellite" sighting in section 10.5 labelled "Visual >>Observations and Unusual Events." It says that the object >>changed to a more reddish hue during the last 20 seconds of >>visibility. This would make some sense if the object was red >>colored (reflecting red).

>>Before entering the shadow transition region (where the sunlight >>is reddened by the atmosphere) the object would be illuminated >>by "white" light (direct sunlight). But while going through the >>sunlight- reddened region, it would be illuminated by red light, >>bringing out the red even more, but also being less bright.

>>This would seem to argue for red reflection rather than red >>light emission.

>>However if the object were both reflecting sunlight like metal >>("white" reflection) and also emitting bright red light (not a >>"normal" satellite) then the resulting color would be a >>"diluted" red (red emission plus white light reflection) while >>above the shadow transition region. When the object went into >>the reddened sun region the net color would no longer be a >>"diluted" red but rather a "saturated" red (red emission plus >>red reflection).

>Regarding red satellite/orbiting objects, a search on the web >shows that the Lacrosse satellites 1-4 launched between 1989- >2000 into inclinations from 57 deg to 68 deg appear to be red- >orange due to being covered with Kapton thermal insulation. ><http://www.satobs.org/spysat.html>

>ROSAT is another example shown in this image.

><http://wave.xray.mpe.mpg.de/rosat/calendar/1993/nov>

><http://satobs.org/seesat/Aug-1995/0105.html>

>Visual satellite observers have reported some possible others >(unclear whether due to being close to eclipse exit/entry >though):

>Meteo 1-11r (72-22B, 05918)

><http://satobs.org/seesat/Apr-2001/0169.html>

Of course, the real question is whether or not any satellite in 1973 was red, and, of so, if it came anywhere near SL3 at the time of the sighting.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review

From: Terry Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 03:25:14 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:17:28 -0500
Subject: 'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review

Forwarding permission given by William Corliss.

Source: Science Frontiers.Com

<http://www.science-frontiers.com>

Science Frontiers Book Supplement No. 174,
Nov-Dec 2007, p. 1

The Tunguska Fireball: Solving One of the Great Mysteries Of The
20th Century - S. Verma, 285 pp., 2005, \$14.95

This hardcover import from the UK traces the history of this
phenomenon from its 1908 fiery debut over Siberia until today.
The Tunguska explosion has been compared to that of 1,000 A-
bombs, but even today no one is sure what happened: meteor,
comet, UFO, mini-black hole, or terrestrial eruption?

Verma describes all the prostrated trees, the earth-girding
pressure wave, and curious luminous atmospheric effects.
Just as interesting are the stories of the expeditions
hunting for the impact point and the search for the expected,
but strangely missing meteoric debris. There is also the
human factor: the scientists, the speculators, and the
charlatans.

The book's price, too, is inexplicable!

Science Frontiers is a bi-monthly collection of digests of
scientific anomalies in the current literature. Published by the
Sourcebook Project; P.O. Box 107; Glen Arm, MD 21057. Annual
subscription: \$8.00.

Terry W. Colvin
Ladphrao (Bangkok), Thailand
Pran Buri (Hua Hin), Thailand

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

When Saucers Came To Earth

From: **Maurizio Verga** <mauverga.nul>
Date: Thu, 08 Feb 2007 10:51:14 +0100
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:26:31 -0500
Subject: When Saucers Came To Earth

Dear Friends,

A few months ago I posted the announcement of the availability of my latest book, When Saucers Came To Earth, devoted to the Italian UFO landings up to 1954.

A great review rating - 9 out of 10 - was granted by the prestigious Fortean Times. Read it at:

<http://tinyurl.com/2r5d8m>

For the first time ever an English-language book is about the most exciting Italian UFO events, those coming from the 'golden age' of the flying saucers. You can find more than 100 landing cases carefully covered and with most of the known Italian and foreign sources, plus a comprehensive comment for each case, delivering behind-the-scene information, previously unknown details and, where possible, in-depth evaluation).

All the Italian classic cases are covered in-depth with an unprecedented amount of information. What was available in the international literature was a poor picture of each of them but totally misleading. For example, the super-classic Cennina case, the encounter of Mrs. Lotti on November 1st, 1954 with a couple of dwarfs next to a landed odd-looking object - is covered by 14 pages!

The book comes with about 150 illustrations - sketches, maps, illustrations, newspaper clippings - and covers of magazines of the time.

The book has been printed in just 100 copies, in two versions - one including a DVD with 5 videoclips.

Read more about the book at:

<http://www.ufo.it/saucers>

There are just a handful of copies left. If you are interested in getting your copy (already becoming a rare collection item!), please follow the directions at the above URL.

It is likely that a new book, in English, will be released in about a year. It will have a complete coverage of all the Italian UFO photo and video cases. It will be a sort of visual encyclopedia, offering several hundred alleged UFO pictures.

Greetings from Italy!

Maurizio Verga

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 12:52:33 +0000
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 09:28:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:57 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>Lan and Gerald,

>>>You are two people on this List whose views and opinions I
>>>always benefit from. Anyone who knows me knows how skeptical I
>>>am of people who engage in sensationalism, embellishment, or any
>>>of their cousins. I personally size up witnesses at every
>>>opportunity.

>>>During the recent National Press Club press conference I had
>>>occasion to talk at length with Jim Penniston, sat with him at
>>>meetings, and got to know him pretty well. He is a very
>>>conservative, thoughtful, dignified person who was and is
>>>highly
>>>professional about military matters. I heard his presentation
>>>which, up to that point, I had only second hand from Colonel
>>>Halt. No way is he embellishing or exaggerating anything.

>>Dick

>>I realise that you're not speaking to me but you will excuse
>>this intervention. I acknowledge your long experience in
>>speaking with witnesses and I have no reason to think you are
>>not amongst the best judges of character. However you will also
>>acknowledge that personal impressions cannot trump the evidence
>>in the historical record, so you will understand that my own
>>point of view is to note your opinion of the man's character but
>>to continue to place emphasis on the consistency of the written
>>and spoken evidence.

>>Which causes me to agree with Gerald that the latter contains
>>difficult and inconsistent issues that are not satisfactorily
>>resolved. These are all, so far as I can tell, introduced by
>>claims made years after the event. I would be first in the queue
>>to hear explanations.

>>Since you have recently questioned Penniston at length in order
>>to satisfy yourself that "no way is he embellishing or
>>exaggerating" I'm confident that you will be able to tell the
>>list how he explained to you the discrepant time and date on the
>>notebook which he claims to have written by the light of the UFO
>>in real time, but which Burroughs denies he ever wrote.

>>Of course if Penniston has embellished his story that does not
>>mean the original event was not significant. That something
>>unexplained happened on Dec 26 appears clear, to me, from the
>>original documents. But I seem to be alone. The rest of you
>>appear bent upon totally devaluing those documents by promoting
>>the story that they were faked, which is the only way of
>>accommodating new and more exciting claims made years afterwards.

>The irony of this is devastating.

<Snip>

Martin,

May I just extricate myself from inclusion in the group you describe as "the rest of you"? To coin a phrase, you are not alone. I am not bent on devaluing any of the documentary record for this case, and certainly not the earliest material (although it is worth remembering, in passing, that all of this came to light some time after the events occurred).

My view is that, when there are inconsistencies in the evidence in a case like this, discussion tends to revolve around a process of advocacy. You adopt an admirably forensic approach to the data and interpret it accordingly, Lan points out that other interpretations might be viable, Dick comes to the party with character witness evidence of his own that offers yet further avenues of interpretation. Taking an overview of this process, it seems to me that we move to a situation where opinions are going to be influenced more by the quality of advocacy and the credibility of the advocates than by the actual evidence itself. This is where I have considerable sympathy for your position, Martin - if the evidence falls into the background while a process of advocacy takes over, then I feel that we inevitably diminish the likelihood of getting to the truth of the situation.

That is exactly why I have suggested that resolution might be easier to find if other, hitherto comparatively neglected, aspects of the case are pursued. Woodbridge and Bentwaters had a highly sensitive nuclear dimension at the time (and for all Dick's character assessment on Penniston and Halt, I cannot believe that this did not colour or act as a constraint upon original accounts and witness statements), while the contemporaneous Cash/Landrum incident involved apparent radiation poisoning and a similar apparent 'vehicle'.

Evidence is all - but I feel we need some new evidence (perhaps I should say a new type of evidence) on Rendlesham if it is not to become another of those unproductive cases where the best brains in the field end up wasting their energy by quarrelling over inconsistencies in the inadequate or inconsistent evidence that we do have.

For my own part, I'm hoping to duck out of this one now (and if I added to the confusion by coming into it, then I apologise to all concerned) and try to establish contact with parties who have valuable knowledge of the Cash/Landrum incident. If any list members can offer contacts I'd be grateful.

Oh, and a final apology for the obstinate pursuit of my Cash/Landrum hobby horse on this thread - I know it's a pain, but I just can't shake it off...

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:03:45 -0500
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:03:45 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

Mike Woods and I discuss the 'New Videos Of Objects In Space'
on the next SDI - 452.

Santiago Yturria Garza touched on it here, in this post:

www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/subscribers/2007/dec/m15-008.shtml

Mike sent me the following link that adds more to this story:

<http://tinyurl.com/3a87gn>

There appears to be an on-going exchange of words between
Santiago, Jose Escamillia and John Lenard Walson, there...

ebk

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 16:44:57 -0000
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:25:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 19:28:25 -0400
>Subject: Re: Who Speaks For Earth?

<snip>

>The SETI community is not seeking ETI. It is seeking ET Signals.
>How dare aliens visit without sending them messages, therefore
>taking them off their self-installed pedestals!!

Right. Looked at statistically our own situation should be representative and 'mediocre' - not exceptional. So we can expect that life-forms a million years more primitive than ourselves exist somewhere, and also that there is life, in whatever form it may have achieved, a million years or more in advance of us.

Possible dangers could be expected from those relatively close to our own stage, biological beings who might regard us as competition - or as a resource of some kind. But such types are not likely to be able to travel long distances easily.

Whereas those a million (or a billion) years in advance will be unrecognizable, and have almost certainly visited us, or those like us, many times already.

As the professors Cohen and Stewart wrote - "considering how far out from our parochial organic history any aliens that we find will be, leads inexorably to the conclusion that we will find them incomprehensible: not only as minds, but also as structures". They added "we simply would not know they were here unless they wanted us to".

Pronouncements from SETI, and the Brooking Institution Report indicate that the self-elected establishment are probably not concerned with finding truth but with retaining control - even if that means enforcing ignorance.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:45:10 -0400
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:28:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:10 -0500
>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

>><http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

>>14 December 2007

>>Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

>>Dec 14, 2007 (LBO) Celebrated science fiction writer and space
>>prophet Arthur C. Clarke yearns to see aliens and peace in his
>>adopted home in Sri Lanka, a video statement released ahead of
>>his 90th birthday said.

>>Clarke is widely known for his 1945 proposal to put up
>>geostationary communications satellites an orbiting relay
>>station that moves at the same rate as the earth so that it
>>appears to be stationary from the ground of which now there
>>are more than 300 going around in 'Clarke' orbits.

>>He also wrote futuristic fiction where humankind met advanced
>>space faring civilizations from other worlds.

>>Clarke who is celebrating his birthday on December 16 said his
>>fondest wish was to see evidence of extra terrestrial (ET)
>>life.

>>"I have always believed that we are not alone in the universe,"
>>Clarke said.

>>"But we are still waiting for ETs to call us or give us some
>>kind of a sign. We have no way of guessing when this might
>>happen I hope sooner rather than later."

>><snip>

>Good ol' Art Clarke, much younger version, commented on the Trent
>photos when they were published in Britain. Sunday Dispatch,
>July 2, 1950, Clarke wrote:

>"There is nothing in the whole aeronautical field which gives a
>clue about the pictured object. It makes one wonder if there are
>extra-terrestrial visitors. We can neither prove nor disprove
>such a theory until one lands. They may be revolutionary types
>of aircraft or they may be extra-terrestrial. We shall
>certainly achieve space flight in 50 years or so. Others may
>have done so before us."

>About 5 years later Clarke commented favorably on Ruppelt's
>book, The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects.

>About 29 years later the show, Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious
>World, featured the then-famous New Zealand Sightings of
>December 1978. Clarke had read some of my reports on those
>sightings. Although skeptical, he did not throw them out.

Bruce,

What were your own feelings about the man's interest in the reality of the phenomenon when you were in contact with him?

Arthur C. Clarke is a conundrum. I have great respect for him, but this is one man who has had the resources for years to fund a real investigation into a subject which has so richly rewarded him. He has managed to sit on the fence scientifically while artistically reaping great rewards writing about extraterrestrial intelligence.

As is obvious above in your statement Clarke's time-line for space travel is off - over-estimated - by 43 years as is his statement "They may be revolutionary types of aircraft or they may be extra-terrestrial." We now know that the Trent photos were not of some revolutionary military aircraft. He did make an attempt in his own television program back in the early 1980s Arthur C. Clarke's "Mysterious World" and Arthur C. Clarke's "World of Strange Powers" to at least look at the possibility. In both of these programs he explored among other topics the UFO phenomenon.

Perhaps it was because he was so busy writing about extraterrestrial intelligence that he didn't have the time to investigate - he could have had science looking into this phenomenon through the weight of his influence plus via the application of his own wealth - the possibility of some interacting with our own; he had more than adequate resources to do so. I've always found it a bit cheeky that he made so much money off of ETI while denying any possible reality of its presence.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 15:55:25 -0500
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:31:32 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 15:17:17 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>>From: Michael Woods <mike.woods.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 14 Dec 2007 03:27:43 -0500
>>Subject: New Videos Of Objects In Space

><snip>

>>I hit the Rense website regularly. I know it's filled with Jew-
>>haters and those convinced anyone slightly to the right of Karl
>>Marx is a neo-con in a conspiracy to turn North America over to
>>immigrants (!) before the New World Order takes over. The
>>opinions on that site are so out-there I almost always have a
>>laugh when I hit that site. Yesterday, an article there wiped
>>the smile off my face. This is something all Listers should
>>check out. I'll be interested in everyone's opinion on what they
>>are, whose they are, if they're real or fake, etc.

>>Here's the link, let the brawl begin:

>><http://www.rense.com/general79/wdx1.htm>

><snip>

Hello Vincent, All,

You wrote:

>How about this link with Jose Escamilla's side of the story?

Thanks for posting the link. This whole affair is a perfect example of just about everything that is wrong with 'modern' ufology. If I may...

Jose Escamilla, in his posts, uses buzzwords like, contracts, producers, and marketing etc. in regard to this new footage. It appears that we have all walked into the middle of a feeding frenzy gone horribly wrong! These guys are going at each other so hard over the potential profits to be had from this footage that none of them are able to see how utterly petty and greedy they all appear in public. They don't even seem to care that they have effectively trashed any credibility they may have been able to create - had they concentrated on presenting the material, as opposed to the three of them scrambling around on the men's room floor fighting over a dropped quarter.

I must say that I have never been fond of anyone who uses 'ufology' as some kind of money-making scam or side-show. It hurts ufology. Period.

I sometimes pine for the time when people actually tried to avoid airing their dirty laundry in public. Maybe it is a good thing that crass exploiters of the UFO phenomenon, such as these 'Three Stooges', are exposed for the petty, greedy, money-grubbing drones that they are.

If the guy with the ten aliases who took the videos is legit, he'll present his methods along with a list of co-ordinates so that it can be independently verified by astronomers.

Otherwise, piss off. I have no time or patience for this kind of sophomoric infighting over 'potential' spoils by Escamilla et al.

Just one man's opinion.

John Velez

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: 'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 16:42:22 -0500
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:33:51 -0500
Subject: Re: 'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review

>From: Terry Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 03:25:14 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: 'The Tunguska Fireball' - A Review

<snip>

>The Tunguska Fireball: Solving One of the Great Mysteries Of The
>20th Century - S. Verma, 285 pp., 2005, \$14.95

>This hardcover import from the UK traces the history of this
>phenomenon from its 1908 fiery debut over Siberia until today.
>The Tunguska explosion has been compared to that of 1,000 A-
>bombs, but even today no one is sure what happened: meteor,
>comet, UFO, mini-black hole, or terrestrial eruption?

>
>Verma describes all the prostrated trees, the earth-girding
>pressure wave, and curious luminous atmospheric effects.
>Just as interesting are the stories of the expeditions
>hunting for the impact point and the search for the expected,
>but strangely missing meteoric debris. There is also the
>human factor: the scientists, the speculators, and the
>charlatans.

"Curious luminous atmospheric effects." "Strangely missing
meteoric debris."

I've heard that military air-(gaseous)fuel bombs, because they
can expand to a huge size before being ignited, can be almost as
devastating, if everything is 'right', as nukes. I wonder if
this was some sort of natural air-fuel bomb?

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfl Fleming5.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 21:25:45 -0600
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:37:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:25 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lfl Fleming5.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:02:08 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>><snip>

>>>Pardon my intrusion at this late stage in the exchange, but it
>>>has revived some thoughts about Rendlesham that have been
>>>puzzling me intermittently over the years.

>>>A fascinating discussion, this, on a fascinating case. Martin
>>>has been absolutely right to draw attention to these
>>>inconsistencies, because they are fundamentally problematic.
>>>Indeed, the entire case has been plagued by witnesses (whether
>>>confirmed, claimed or self-proclaimed) shifting their ground
>>>over time. Larry Warren is the most notorious example, but it
>>>applies to others too. I'm not really sure what conclusions
>>>Martin draws from this tendency (or whether he believes that it
>>>makes drawing any conclusions a fruitless quest - a justifiable
>>>response from somebody who places such emphasis on analysable
>>>specifics of hard evidence), but, for my own part, I think it
>>>perpetuates a concentration of debate and research in areas of
>>>the case that are likely to lead nowhere.

>My tentative conclusion (I would rather say my strong feeling at
>this stage) has been fairly clearly stated. It is that the
>original statements have the ring of truth. Some unexplained
>event was witnessed by three people, involving an apparently
>ordered arrangement of multiple blue, red and white lights that
>appeared to fly among the trees, and at least one of the three
>was convinced they were attached to a mechanical device seen as
>close as 50m distance.

They have the ring of truth, but to some people they might also
have the ring of being downplayed in comparison to how the
object was described in the Halt memo. This comment by Burroughs
sounds like he's spinning his story in a pretty absurd way:

"A bank of lights, differently colored lights that threw off an
image of like-a-craft. I never saw anything metallic or anything
hard."

So, he says he didn't see an object - sorta kinda. He only saw
some lights that threw off "an image of like-a-craft." That
sounds almost as absurd as the "coveralls" story from the
Socorro incident, although Ray Stanford according to Ray
Stanford, it appears to have been Hynek's spin and not Zamora's.
Are you really going to claim that you see nothing at all

strange about Burroughs' above statement?

>10 or 15 years during which Penniston's new version continues to
>be repeated uncritically. That doesn't mean it must be false, it
>is asking for it to be treated critically. Why is it that after
>10 or 15 years merely to raise a question about Penniston's
>changed story on this List caused the questioner to get
>instantly jumped on with the aggressive assertion that anyone
>who claims Penniston ever said anything inconsistent is either
>badly confused or a liar? Seeing such an attitude only makes one
>more inclined to be sympathetic to those who claim the
>Rendlesham affair has the momentum of major myth

>(I mention this here in so discourteous a fashion in order to
>respect the custom of "some on this list" which is to direct
>comments obliquely via third parties out of the corners of their
>mouths and evade direct address.)

>Below, you obliquely criticise ufologists for declining to
>confront Buzz Aldrin's inconsistent evolving story (rightly so,
>if that is the way of things), yet you appear to give the nod
>here to Gerald's suggestion that in the case of Penniston
>possibly "jazzing up" his story, well, it doesn't really matter.
>You justify this because...

>>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most important
>>and credible evidence and they're only slightly less
>>sensational than Penniston's later story.

>Excuse me, but the "most important and credible evidence" in
>respect of the Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag incident, in
>which Halt plays no part at all, is not a second-hand summary by
>Halt but the original first hand accounts by these men, and the
>original statements of two other men (Buran and Chandler) who
>monitored the event by way of Penniston's radio commentary at
>the time. If you focus on these you will be cleaving to your own
>principle (as stated below, and with which I generally agree)
>that "what people say at the time of an incident like this
>should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or
>revisions they make years later".

The description of a triangular, metallic object was made a few weeks later, not years later. Penniston's later description, apparently made first to an Omni reporter in 1994, was that the object was triangular and had symbols on it, that he touched it, and that it was warm to the touch. These details added years later did not greatly qualitatively change the description of the object in Halt's memo. If your characterization of all the early descriptions as of a mere "will o' the wisp" were true, then the description of a triangular object years later would have been a radical qualitative change that should arouse considerable suspicion. Unlike Buzz Aldrin, Penniston didn't contradict himself on the nature of the object he saw, only the distance from which he saw it. And 50 meters is not a terribly large distance for viewing a 3-meter wide object.

>The most pertinent and reliable evidence we have in relation to
>the first night is, you will agree, the original statements of
>those involved.

The very first statements were not necessarily the more reliable. The description in the Halt memo was made within a few weeks of the written statements. Since it clearly was not derived from those statements, Penniston must have told Halt what he saw at another time, perhaps before he wrote his statement. Even if the description relayed to Halt came later, the difference of a few weeks is trivial, and the circumstances under which a statement is made are as important as when it was made.

>As I already pointed out, the part of Halt's memo that
>is relevant to that event is a summary of information already in
>the witness's statements.

It was not a summary of those statements. The description of a triangular object was not in any of the statements, was it? That seems to be a rather important detail.

>We appear to be in agreement on this at least. But if it is
>really the general feeling among ufologists that it's not too
>important if witnesses jazz up their stories, even if it becomes

>necessary to gut original documents of their credibility in
>order to accommodate the jazz, then frankly I despair.

I didn't say that it wasn't important, and I also didn't say Penniston was, in fact, 'jazzing up' his statement. I'll go with Dick Hall's opinion of Penniston unless something considerably more serious than the 50-meter discrepancy has been established.

I mentioned that only as a hypothetical. But it does appear that another alleged witness, Larry Warren did "jazz up" a story years after the incident about an alien contact with US Air Force officials, a claim that no other witness even hinted at, and then wrote a book about it. That seems considerably more suspicious than the witnesses describing (to Halt) a triangular object immediately after the incident and Penniston then saying he touched the triangular object 14 years later. You, apparently, see no difference between Warren's credibility and Penniston's.

By the way: are you intending to arrive at the conclusion that what the witnesses saw was the Orford-Ness lighthouse? That's usually the purpose of these attacks on Penniston's credibility. That explanation has always seemed absolutely ludicrous to me. Even Burroughs' rather convoluted "image of like-a-craft" description doesn't support the "flying lighthouse" theory.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Don't Call The Aliens They Might Not Be Friendly

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:45:23 -0500
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 07:45:23 -0500
Subject: Don't Call The Aliens They Might Not Be Friendly

Source: The Sunday Times - London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/2j6d5w>

December 16, 2007

Don't Call The Aliens They Might Not Be Friendly
Tony Allen-Mills in New York

For decades it has been staple of science fiction somewhere out in the galaxy, highly developed alien race picks up radio signal from Earth, and decides to eat us for lunch.

In a world plagued by war, hunger and disease, possible attack by little green men may not rank high among most nations' concerns. Yet for small group of scientists who are harnessing increasingly powerful technologies in trans-galactic search for signs of extraterrestrial intelligence, the prospect of catastrophe has stirred an angry debate.

Two senior scientists have resigned from an elite international study group in protest over lack of public discussion about the possible consequences of attracting the attention of aliens by sending signals deep into space.

"We're talking about initiating communication with other civilisations, but we know nothing of their goals, capabilities or intent," warned John Billingham, former Nasa scientist who has quit an extraterrestrial study group set up by the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA).

The scientists involved are all acutely aware of the dangers of ridicule in their discussions of ET and his more sinister cousins. Yet recent advances in radio telescope technologies, and substantial flow of private funding into ET-related projects, has transformed the "search for extraterrestrial intelligence" (Seti).

In California last October, astronomers switched on the first elements of giant new array of radio telescopes that will vastly extend the sweep of signals into outer space. Known as the Allen Telescope Array, it was built with the help of \$25m (=A312.3m) donation from Paul Allen, the billionaire co-founder of Microsoft, and is joint project of the Radio Astronomy Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, and the Seti Institute, America's foremost centre of ET research.

"I like to call Seti the longest of long shots," Allen said when the telescopes were commissioned. "But if this array picks up a signal, that would be an amazing thing a civilisation-changing event."

Yet critics argue that listening for signals and actively seeking out alien life are very different pursuits. At the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, Alexander Zaitsev, chief scientist at the Institute of Radio Engineering and Electronics, has been using 70-metre-wide radio telescope in the Crimea to

beam signals to nearby star systems a practice known as "active Seti".

It is the steady shift from listening to transmitting that has divided the Seti community and raised awkward questions that no one has yet been able to answer. Who will speak for Earth if an alien civilisation replies? And are we really in danger of inviting Armageddon? Sir Bernard Lovell, the British founder of Jodrell Bank, once remarked that it was "dangerous assumption" that any alien life would turn out to be friendly.

If an alien fleet mobilises against us, Allen should be one of the first to know. "If they do find something, they're going to call me up and say we have signal," he said. "So far the phone hasn't rung."

Yet the question of whether we should go actively looking for ETs still needs to be debated, insists Michael Michaud, former US State Department official who has also resigned from the IAA study group. Michaud is alarmed by his colleagues' reluctance to halt transmissions pending consideration of the possible consequences.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 09:36:12 -0500
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 09:36:12 -0500
Subject: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
How advanced could they possibly be?

by Michio Kaku

The late Carl Sagan once asked this question, "What does it mean for a civilization to be a million years old? We have had radio telescopes and spaceships for a few decades; our technical civilization is a few hundred years old... an advanced civilization millions of years old is as much beyond us as we are beyond a bush baby or a macaque."

Although any conjecture about such advanced civilizations is a matter of sheer speculation, one can still use the laws of physics to place upper and lower limits on these civilizations. In particular, now that the laws of quantum field theory, general relativity, thermodynamics, etc. are fairly well-established, physics can impose broad physical bounds which constrain the parameters of these civilizations.

This question is no longer a matter of idle speculation. Soon, humanity may face an existential shock as the current list of a dozen Jupiter-sized extra-solar planets swells to hundreds of earth-sized planets, almost identical twins of our celestial homeland. This may usher in a new era in our relationship with the universe: we will never see the night sky in the same way ever again, realizing that scientists may eventually compile an encyclopedia identifying the precise co-ordinates of perhaps hundreds of earth-like planets.

Today, every few weeks brings news of a new Jupiter-sized extra-solar planet being discovered, the latest being about 15 light years away orbiting around the star Gliese 876. The most spectacular of these findings was photographed by the Hubble Space Telescope, which captured breathtaking photos of a planet 450 light years away being sling-shot into space by a double-star system.

But the best is yet to come. Early in the next decade, scientists will launch a new kind of telescope, the interferometry space telescope, which uses the interference of light beams to enhance the resolving power of telescopes.

For example, the Space Interferometry Mission (SIM), to be launched early in the next decade, consists of multiple telescopes placed along a 30 foot structure. With an unprecedented resolution approaching the physical limits of optics, the SIM is so sensitive that it almost defies belief: orbiting the earth, it can detect the motion of a lantern being waved by an astronaut on Mars!

The SIM, in turn, will pave the way for the Terrestrial Planet

Finder, to be launched late in the next decade, which should identify even more earth-like planets. It will scan the brightest 1,000 stars within 50 light years of the earth and will focus on the 50 to 100 brightest planetary systems.

All this, in turn, will stimulate an active effort to determine if any of them harbor life, perhaps some with civilizations more advanced than ours.

Although it is impossible to predict the precise features of such advanced civilizations, their broad outlines can be analyzed using the laws of physics. No matter how many millions of years separate us from them, they still must obey the iron laws of physics, which are now advanced enough to explain everything from sub-atomic particles to the large-scale structure of the universe, through a staggering 43 orders of magnitude.

Physics of Type I, II, and III Civilizations

Specifically, we can rank civilizations by their energy consumption, using the following principles:

- 1) The laws of thermodynamics. Even an advanced civilization is bound by the laws of thermodynamics, especially the Second Law, and can hence be ranked by the energy at their disposal.
- 2) The laws of stable matter. Baryonic matter (e.g. based on protons and neutrons) tends to clump into three large groupings: planets, stars and galaxies. (This is a well-defined by product of stellar and galactic evolution, thermonuclear fusion, etc.) Thus, their energy will also be based on three distinct types, and this places upper limits on their rate of energy consumption.
- 3) The laws of planetary evolution. Any advanced civilization must grow in energy consumption faster than the frequency of life-threatening catastrophes (e.g. meteor impacts, ice ages, supernovas, etc.). If they grow any slower, they are doomed to extinction. This places mathematical lower limits on the rate of growth of these civilizations.

In a seminal paper published in 1964 in the Journal of Soviet Astronomy, Russian astrophysicist Nicolai Kardashev theorized that advanced civilizations must therefore be grouped according to three types: Type I, II, and III, which have mastered planetary, stellar and galactic forms of energy, respectively. He calculated that the energy consumption of these three types of civilization would be separated by a factor of many billions. But how long will it take to reach Type II and III status?

Shorter than most realize.

Berkeley astronomer Don Goldsmith reminds us that the earth receives about one billionth of the suns energy, and that humans utilize about one millionth of that. So we consume about one million billionth of the suns total energy. At present, our entire planetary energy production is about 10 billion billion ergs per second. But our energy growth is rising exponentially, and hence we can calculate how long it will take to rise to Type II or III status.

Goldsmith says, "Look how far we have come in energy uses once we figured out how to manipulate energy, how to get fossil fuels really going, and how to create electrical power from hydropower, and so forth; we've come up in energy uses in a remarkable amount in just a couple of centuries compared to billions of years our planet has been here... and this same sort of thing may apply to other civilizations."

Physicist Freeman Dyson of the Institute for Advanced Study estimates that, within 200 years or so, we should attain Type I status. In fact, growing at a modest rate of 1% per year, Kardashev estimated that it would take only 3,200 years to reach Type II status, and 5,800 years to reach Type III status. Living in a Type I, II, or III civilization

For example, a Type I civilization is a truly planetary one, which has mastered most forms of planetary energy. Their energy output may be on the order of thousands to millions of times our

current planetary output. Mark Twain once said, "Everyone complains about the weather, but no one does anything about it." This may change with a Type I civilization, which has enough energy to modify the weather. They also have enough energy to alter the course of earthquakes, volcanoes, and build cities on their oceans.

Currently, our energy output qualifies us for Type 0 status. We derive our energy not from harnessing global forces, but by burning dead plants (e.g. oil and coal). But already, we can see the seeds of a Type I civilization. We see the beginning of a planetary language (English), a planetary communication system (the Internet), a planetary economy (the forging of the European Union), and even the beginnings of a planetary culture (via mass media, TV, rock music, and Hollywood films).

By definition, an advanced civilization must grow faster than the frequency of life-threatening catastrophes. Since large meteor and comet impacts take place once every few thousand years, a Type I civilization must master space travel to deflect space debris within that time frame, which should not be much of a problem. Ice ages may take place on a time scale of tens of thousands of years, so a Type I civilization must learn to modify the weather within that time frame.

Artificial and internal catastrophes must also be negotiated. But the problem of global pollution is only a mortal threat for a Type 0 civilization; a Type I civilization has lived for several millennia as a planetary civilization, necessarily achieving ecological planetary balance. Internal problems like wars do pose a serious recurring threat, but they have thousands of years in which to solve racial, national, and sectarian conflicts.

Eventually, after several thousand years, a Type I civilization will exhaust the power of a planet, and will derive their energy by consuming the entire output of their suns energy, or roughly a billion trillion trillion ergs per second.

With their energy output comparable to that of a small star, they should be visible from space. Dyson has proposed that a Type II civilization may even build a gigantic sphere around their star to more efficiently utilize its total energy output. Even if they try to conceal their existence, they must, by the Second Law of Thermodynamics, emit waste heat. From outer space, their planet may glow like a Christmas tree ornament. Dyson has even proposed looking specifically for infrared emissions (rather than radio and TV) to identify these Type II civilizations.

Perhaps the only serious threat to a Type II civilization would be a nearby supernova explosion, whose sudden eruption could scorch their planet in a withering blast of X-rays, killing all life forms. Thus, perhaps the most interesting civilization is a Type III civilization, for it is truly immortal. They have exhausted the power of a single star, and have reached for other star systems. No natural catastrophe known to science is capable of destroying a Type III civilization.

Faced with a neighboring supernova, it would have several alternatives, such as altering the evolution of dying red giant star which is about to explode, or leaving this particular star system and terraforming a nearby planetary system.

However, there are roadblocks to an emerging Type III civilization. Eventually, it bumps up against another iron law of physics, the theory of relativity. Dyson estimates that this may delay the transition to a Type III civilization by perhaps millions of years.

But even with the light barrier, there are a number of ways of expanding at near-light velocities. For example, the ultimate measure of a rockets capability is measured by something called "specific impulse" (defined as the product of the thrust and the duration, measured in units of seconds). Chemical rockets can attain specific impulses of several hundred to several thousand seconds. Ion engines can attain specific impulses of tens of thousands of seconds. But to attain near-light speed velocity, one has to achieve specific impulse of about 30 million seconds, which is far beyond our current capability, but not that of a Type III civilization. A variety of propulsion systems would be

available for sub-light speed probes (such as ram-jet fusion engines, photonic engines, etc.) How to Explore the Galaxy

Because distances between stars are so vast, and the number of unsuitable, lifeless solar systems so large, a Type III civilization would be faced with the next question: what is the mathematically most efficient way of exploring the hundreds of billions of stars in the galaxy?

In science fiction, the search for inhabitable worlds has been immortalized on TV by heroic captains boldly commanding a lone star ship, or as the murderous Borg, a Type III civilization which absorbs lower Type II civilization (such as the Federation). However, the most mathematically efficient method to explore space is far less glamorous: to send fleets of "Von Neumann probes" throughout the galaxy (named after John Von Neumann, who established the mathematical laws of self-replicating systems).

A Von Neumann probe is a robot designed to reach distant star systems and create factories which will reproduce copies themselves by the thousands. A dead moon rather than a planet makes the ideal destination for Von Neumann probes, since they can easily land and take off from these moons, and also because these moons have no erosion. These probes would live off the land, using naturally occurring deposits of iron, nickel, etc. to create the raw ingredients to build a robot factory. They would create thousands of copies of themselves, which would then scatter and search for other star systems.

Similar to a virus colonizing a body many times its size, eventually there would be a sphere of trillions of Von Neumann probes expanding in all directions, increasing at a fraction of the speed of light. In this fashion, even a galaxy 100,000 light years across may be completely analyzed within, say, a half million years.

If a Von Neumann probe only finds evidence of primitive life (such as an unstable, savage Type 0 civilization) they might simply lie dormant on the moon, silently waiting for the Type 0 civilization to evolve into a stable Type I civilization. After waiting quietly for several millennia, they may be activated when the emerging Type I civilization is advanced enough to set up a lunar colony. Physicist Paul Davies of the University of Adelaide has even raised the possibility of a Von Neumann probe resting on our own moon, left over from a previous visitation in our system aeons ago.

(If this sounds a bit familiar, that's because it was the basis of the film, 2001. Originally, Stanley Kubrick began the film with a series of scientists explaining how probes like these would be the most efficient method of exploring outer space. Unfortunately, at the last minute, Kubrick cut the opening segment from his film, and these monoliths became almost mystical entities)

New Developments

Since Kardashev gave the original ranking of civilizations, there have been many scientific developments which refine and extend his original analysis, such as recent developments in nanotechnology, biotechnology, quantum physics, etc.

For example, nanotechnology may facilitate the development of Von Neumann probes. As physicist Richard Feynman observed in his seminal essay, "There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom," there is nothing in the laws of physics which prevents building armies of molecular-sized machines. At present, scientists have already built atomic-sized curiosities, such as an atomic abacus with Buckyballs and an atomic guitar with strings about 100 atoms across.

Paul Davies speculates that a space-faring civilization could use nanotechnology to build miniature probes to explore the galaxy, perhaps no bigger than your palm. Davies says, "The tiny probes I'm talking about will be so inconspicuous that it's no surprise that we haven't come across one. It's not the sort of thing that you're going to trip over in your back yard. So if that is the way technology develops, namely, smaller, faster, cheaper and if other civilizations have gone this route, then we

could be surrounded by surveillance devices."

Furthermore, the development of biotechnology has opened entirely new possibilities. These probes may act as life-forms, reproducing their genetic information, mutating and evolving at each stage of reproduction to enhance their capabilities, and may have artificial intelligence to accelerate their search.

Also, information theory modifies the original Kardashev analysis. The current SETI project only scans a few frequencies of radio and TV emissions sent by a Type 0 civilization, but perhaps not an advanced civilization. Because of the enormous static found in deep space, broadcasting on a single frequency presents a serious source of error. Instead of putting all your eggs in one basket, a more efficient system is to break up the message and smear it out over all frequencies (e.g. via Fourier like transform) and then reassemble the signal only at the other end. In this way, even if certain frequencies are disrupted by static, enough of the message will survive to accurately reassemble the message via error correction routines. However, any Type 0 civilization listening in on the message on one frequency band would only hear nonsense. In other words, our galaxy could be teeming with messages from various Type II and III civilizations, but our Type 0 radio telescopes would only hear gibberish.

Lastly, there is also the possibility that a Type II or Type III civilization might be able to reach the fabled Planck energy with their machines (10^{19} billion electron volts). This energy is a quadrillion times larger than our most powerful atom smasher. This energy, as fantastic as it may seem, is (by definition) within the range of a Type II or III civilization.

The Planck energy only occurs at the center of black holes and the instant of the Big Bang. But with recent advances in quantum gravity and superstring theory, there is renewed interest among physicists about energies so vast that quantum effects rip apart the fabric of space and time. Although it is by no means certain that quantum physics allows for stable wormholes, this raises the remote possibility that a sufficiently advanced civilizations may be able to move via holes in space, like Alice's Looking Glass. And if these civilizations can successfully navigate through stable wormholes, then attaining a specific impulse of a million seconds is no longer a problem. They merely take a short-cut through the galaxy. This would greatly cut down the transition between a Type II and Type III civilization.

Second, the ability to tear holes in space and time may come in handy one day. Astronomers, analyzing light from distant supernovas, have concluded recently that the universe may be accelerating, rather than slowing down. If this is true, there may be an anti-gravity force (perhaps Einstein's cosmological constant) which is counteracting the gravitational attraction of distant galaxies. But this also means that the universe might expand forever in a Big Chill, until temperatures approach near-absolute zero. Several papers have recently laid out what such a dismal universe may look like. It will be a pitiful sight: any civilization which survives will be desperately huddled next to the dying embers of fading neutron stars and black holes. All intelligent life must die when the universe dies.

Contemplating the death of the sun, the philosopher Bertrand Russel once wrote perhaps the most depressing paragraph in the English language: "...All the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and the whole temple of Mans achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins..."

Today, we realize that sufficiently powerful rockets may spare us from the death of our sun 5 billion years from now, when the oceans will boil and the mountains will melt. But how do we escape the death of the universe itself?

Astronomer John Barrows of the University of Sussex writes, "Suppose that we extend the classification upwards. Members of these hypothetical civilizations of Type IV, V, VI,... and so on, would be able to manipulate the structures in the universe on larger and larger scales, encompassing groups of galaxies,

clusters, and superclusters of galaxies." Civilizations beyond Type III may have enough energy to escape our dying universe via holes in space.

Lastly, physicist Alan Guth of MIT, one of the originators of the inflationary universe theory, has even computed the energy necessary to create a baby universe in the laboratory (the temperature is 1,000 trillion degrees, which is within the range of these hypothetical civilizations).

Of course, until someone actually makes contact with an advanced civilization, all of this amounts to speculation tempered with the laws of physics, no more than a useful guide in our search for extra-terrestrial intelligence. But one day, many of us will gaze at the encyclopedia containing the coordinates of perhaps hundreds of earth-like planets in our sector of the galaxy. Then we will wonder, as Sagan did, what a civilization a millions years ahead of ours will look like...

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 14:27:38 -0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:02:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:35:12 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>Secondly, when I spoke to him I was not even aware of an alleged
>date discrepancy and am not sure how valid that allegation is.
>The dates of the Bentwaters events have always been a little
>confused, but that has never bothered me particularly. It would
>be good to clear up that question and maybe Nick Pope could
>offer something definitive about that.

<snip>

It's fairly clear that the first incident took place in the early hours of December 26 (Halt's memo erroneously gives the date as December 27). In their witness statements, Burroughs, Cabansag, Buran and Chandler state that the incident took place in the early hours of December 26 (Penniston's statement doesn't give the date) and this ties in with the civil police logs, available (as .pdf documents) on the Suffolk Constabulary website:

<http://tinyurl.com/2nvt3l>

The date of the incident in which Charles Halt was involved is less clear, but it seems to be the night of December 27/28. To further complicate matters, there are indications that there were other incidents on other nights.

This issue (and other ones currently being discussed, such as the question of what went into the witness statements and what was left out) are discussed at length in Georgina Bruni's book on the case, You Can't Tell The People.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 15:25:38 -0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:03:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>Contemplating the death of the sun, the philosopher Bertrand
>Russel once wrote perhaps the most depressing paragraph in the
>English language: "...All the labors of the ages, all the
>devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of
>human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of
>the solar system, and the whole temple of Mans achievement must
>inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in
>ruins..."

Ha! Our achievement so far amounts to not much more than putting
one stone upon another stone and then knocking them down. After
that we lie about what we've done and call it 'history'.

Look at it another way: If, in the next billion years or so, we
can't figure out how to completely escape from the Solar System,
with or without the Earth, then we don't deserve to survive.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 12:46:33 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:06:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:45:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>>Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

>>><http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

>>>14 December 2007

>>>Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

<snip>

>>About 5 years later Clarke commented favorably on Ruppelt's
>>book, The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects.

>>About 29 years later the show, Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious
>>World, featured the then-famous New Zealand Sightings of
>>December 1978. Clarke had read some of my reports on those
>>sightings. Although skeptical, he did not throw them out.

>What were your own feelings about the man's interest in the
>reality of the phenomenon when you were in contact with him?

I was never in direct contact with Clarke. However, at the time of the filming of his "Mysterious World," back in '79 - not 1879, but 1979... my how time flies - the New Zealand sightings were still 'hot'. The TV crew came to my house and filmed me analyzing the NZ film of Dec 31, 1978, and also got copies of the numerous articles about the sightings that I had written. (Although there were numerous articles written about the sightings by news reporters and investigators, my articles were the only ones based on personal interviews with all the participants, radar data, and film analysis.) Clarke took the time to review some of the research stuff I gave to the film crew. I had a copy of the book that was written based on the series (shown in 1980) but lost it years ago in a house move. I see by Googling on "Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious World" that copies are available from Amazon as low as \$0.01 (plus shipping for \$4.00).

>Arthur C. Clarke is a conundrum. I have great respect for him,
>but this is one man who has had the resources for years to fund
>a real investigation into a subject which has so richly rewarded
>him. He has managed to sit on the fence scientifically while
>artistically reaping great rewards writing about
>extraterrestrial intelligence.

>As is obvious above in you statement Clarke's time-line for
>space travel is off - over-estimated - by 43 years as is his
>statement "They may be revolutionary types of aircraft or they
>may be extra-terrestrial." We now know that the Trent photos

>were not of some revolutionary military aircraft. He did make an
>attempt in his own television program back in the early 1980s
>Arthur C. Clarke's "Mysterious World" and Arthur C. Clarke's
>"World of Strange Powers" to at least look at the possibility.
>n both of these programs he explored among other topics the UFO
>phenomenon.

>Perhaps it was was because he was so busy writing about
>extraterrestrial intelligence that he didn't have the time to
>investigate - he could have had science looking into this
>phenomenon through the weight of his influence plus via the
>application of his own wealth - the possibility of same
>interacting with our own; he had more than adequate resources to
>do so. I've always found it a bit cheeky that he made so much
>money off of ETI while denying any possible reality of its
>presence.

I think the bottom line is he wasn't completely convinced by the
UFO evidence and was worried about rejection by the scientific
community if he took a positive stand.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:46:04 -0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:16:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:35:12 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:57 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2007 05:39:31 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

Dick

Sorry to be tardy. Now the Snooker's finished I can find time to reply properly.

>Okay, I had not read this when I responded at length to the >previous post, but you deserve a point by point response and I >will give it to you. But for openers, you have to look at all >of the "historical record", not just the first draft.

I beg your pardon, but this is precisely what I have been urging that we all should do, whereas your preference is to focus on your favourable character assessment of Penniston and your faith in the story he tells today. Looking at the whole historical record means a cross-referencing of the many documents and statements by Penniston and by all the others made over the course of many years - not nit-picking at contradictions for the sake of it, but asking what the most sensible explanation is where inconsistencies arise. And they do.

>>Which causes me to agree with Gerald that the latter contains >>difficult and inconsistent issues that are not satisfactorily >>resolved. These are all, so far as I can tell, introduced by >>claims made years after the event. I would be first in the >>queue to hear explanations.

>There you go again, to borrow an expression from Ronald Reagan. >Years after the event we often get a much clearer and more >accurate picture of what really happened. And here I speak as a >published historian.

It's really quite hard to believe that you have just offered that as an argument. I am speechless.

>>Since you have recently questioned Penniston at length in order >>to satisfy yourself that "no way is he embellishing or >>exaggerating" I'm confident that you will be able to tell the >>list how he explained to you the discrepant time and date on >>the notebook which he claims to have written by the light of the >>UFO in real time, but which Burroughs denies he ever wrote.

>Something I have observed over and over in your argumentation

>is a tendency to make a series of assumptions (premises) and go
>from there as if the premises were all true. I did not question
>Penniston to satisfy myself of anything; I simply had an
>opportunity to talk with him and took advantage of it. From
>having talked with Col. Halt at great length I had no reason to
>doubt pennistons honesty and integrity.

Oh dear. As Listers who are alert to a tone of mild irony will have detected, I was having just a little fun with you. I did not really expect you to have used your time with Penniston to pursue the outstanding problems of his story. Your earlier responses were sufficient to suggest that you didn't know what they were and had little enthusiasm to find out. I'd have been pleasantly surprised if you'd come back with a cogent answer to my question. Instead the dismally predictable response is an indignant admission that, no, of course you didn't need to question Penniston in order to satisfy yourself that he could not possibly be exaggerating or embellishing anything, his soul being an open book to a man of your outstanding perspicacity.

>Secondly, when I spoke to him I was not even aware of an
>alleged date discrepancy and am not sure how valid that
>allegation is.

>The dates of the Bentwaters events have always been a little
>confused, but that has never bothered me particularly. It would
>be good to clear up that question and maybe Nick Pope could
>offer something definitive about that.

You can see Penniston showing his notebook to camera in this documentary

<http://www.scifi.com/rendlesham/>

or a still shot of the relevant page here

<http://www.ianridpath.com/ufo/rendlesham2b.htm>

Consider that the date on this notebook - Dec 27 - was the date previously believed to be the correct date on the basis of Halt's inaccurate memo.

Why was it inaccurate? According to Halt,

"I tried to go back and recover the police blotter and the security blotter think I mentioned to you earlier to reaffirm the dates. Keep in mind, I wrote the memo several weeks later. And it was not a really important memo. The date was not critical."

<http://www.rendlesham-incident.co.uk/charles-halt-memo.php>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/2cye97>

All this must be old news to you. I've been looking at this case now for about a week and it's plain that everyone accepts the correct date was Dec 26. This is the date given on all four of the original witness statements that contain one. It is the date on the Suffolk police incident log, the original of which you can view here

<http://tinyurl.com/2nvt31>

It is the known date of the Cosmos booster re-entry and a major fireball both widely visible over the south of the UK which evidently gave rise to the remark in the police log that reports had been made of lights in the sky over southern England during the night. These interlocking facts leave negligible room for doubt that Halt's memo date was wrong.

Did Penniston write the same wrong Dec 27 date by chance during the incident on Dec 26, even though the witness statements show that his associates at the time knew it was Dec 26? Or did he really write this entry after the fact, when the true date recorded in these statements and in the police log was still not known, using the widely accepted but erroneous Halt date? The balance of probability is shifted further in favour of the latter by Burroughs' statement in an email to Ian Ridpath that "Penniston was not keeping a notebook" during the incident.

<http://www.ianridpath.com/ufo/rendlesham2b.htm>

Another indicator is that when Penniston reads an extract from his notepad on the Sci-Fi Channel documentary he says

"... triangular in shape. The top portion is producing mainly white light, which encompasses most of the upper section of the craft. A small amount of white light peers out the bottom. At the left side centre is a bluish light, and on the other side, red."

Burroughs' drawing can certainly be construed as a triangular object, as can the general arrangement of lights he described. But this statement and drawing were buried in CAUS files unknown until James Easton published them many years after the event. Penniston's original drawing of the strange "mechanical device" showed a drum-shaped or rectangular object with a red light on top, a blue band around it and blue light beaming from the bottom. The word "triangular" first appears publicly in Halt's memo.

>I didn't know that Burroughs had denied that Penniston made >notes. That seems to me to be a bizarre claim which I will take >up with Penniston next time I am in touch with him.

Wouldn't it be appropriate to take it up with Burroughs first? And why is this new information "bizarre"? Haven't you just lectured us that "Years after the event we often get a much clearer and more accurate picture of what really happened. And here I speak as a published historian"?

>Definitely
>requires clarification, but I strongly suspect that Burroughs >is wrong.

Ah, I see, Burroughs' account is bizarre because it disagrees with Penniston and therefore is probably wrong, and so the proper thing to do is to defer to Penniston for an explanation.

>>Of course if Penniston has embellished his story that does not >>mean the original event was not significant. That something >>unexplained happened on Dec 26 appears clear, to me, from the >>original documents. But I seem to be alone. The rest of you >>appear bent upon totally devaluing those documents by promoting >>the story that they were faked, which is the only way of >>accommodating new and more exciting claims made years >>afterwards.

>Where did I or anyone else say that the original documents were >"faked?" And there you go again with "new and exciting claims >made many years afterwards." You continue to falsely >characterize the sequence and timing of events.

Once more, and slowly:

Many years after the event and many years after the date of all the original documents Penniston has produced a version of events that conflicts with those documents, along with a new document (his notebook) to support it. If this new story of spending 45 minutes photographing and taking notes at zero meters distance from a stationary object soon after 0020 on Dec 27 is true, then the original documents collectively recording a brief minimum approach to within 50 meters of an elusive object between 0300 and 0354 on Dec 26 are untrue.

Are you still having difficulty with this?

Now there purports to be a reasonable explanation of this, or rather there is a buffet of justifications offered including shock and disorientation as well as a conscious decision by Penniston and Burroughs in particular to suppress a sensational sighting of a wierd machine that would have laid them open to ridicule or censure. All of this led, as claimed on this List and elsewhere, to omission of "details".

Clearly this explanation requires not just omission of details but commission of substantive untruths - altered time, altered date, invented 50-meter minimum approach distance, embedded in convincing narratives not only by Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag but also by non-involved security police (Chandler and

Buran) who were only monitoring Penniston's radio reports from remote locations. It has also been claimed that this was done in a manner designed to throw people off the scent and cast suspicion on the Orford lighthouse.

But the suggested motivation is inconsistent with the fact that Penniston explicitly did report "positive identification" of a weird machine, a metallic craft also described by Halt at the time in an official memo in terms which do not differ substantively from the original reports and which have been characterised on this List as "sensational". In respect of motivation the explanation doesn't add up.

As I've said elsewhere, there is the problem that Burroughs is on record as defending the authenticity of his own, Penniston's and Cabansag's original statements against some sceptics who, he complains, try to "twist" their stories to appear to implicate the lighthouse. Evidently he does not think that his statement was fudged to implicate the lighthouse, and like the others it records the date and start time as 25-26 Dec, 0300.

And it doesn't add up that Burroughs is recently on film confirming his original 1980 statement to the effect that as soon as they approached the object they all "hit the ground" and it "went up into the trees". Burroughs describes, again, how it stayed up there and they pursued it fruitlessly through the forest. No 45 minute photographic inspection. And no Penniston notebook either, as mentioned.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E2CJY2VyCfo>

It can be claimed that Penniston's 45 minute close encounter with the photos and the symbols happened later, perhaps when he was separated somewhat from Burroughs and Cabansag on the way back to the vehicle. That might explain why Burroughs does not verify the more elaborate story told by Penniston. The Halt "landing site" near the E edge of the forest has been assumed to be the site of the near approach described in the original statements, but as I cited elsewhere

"...when Halt led Penniston and Bryant Gumbel (presenter) to the location of the landing site, Penniston said that the landing site he had found was in the opposite direction." (Sci-Fi Channel, "UFO Invasion at Rendlesham")

Penniston puts his site 1/2 mile to the W of this near the road leading from the Bentwaters back gate. So maybe this fits the original statements that after the 50-meter approach and pursuit of UFO#1 Burroughs and Cabansag returned via the road whilst Penniston returned alone through the trees? Maybe he had a closer encounter on his own during this walk back?

But this doesn't work out. According to the original statements it was during this walk back that Burroughs and Penniston, though separated, were both able to see a brief light streak by to their left through the trees, which would be off to the north. They weren't separated by much. According to Cabansag they all made contact again and walked through the area where they first saw the lights. Penniston's original statement agrees, and he recently said:

"_We_ thought it had left, but then both Airman Burroughs and I saw the same array of colored lights maybe a half mile away. So we pursued it, trying to follow its course as best we could on foot. We only got about 300 yards into the woods before we turned around" [my emphases]

They then went and found what they thought was the landing site with three imprints and all three men made their way back to the base.

<http://www.rendlesham-incident.co.uk/25-26-december.php>

Penniston's original statement says that the walk took 45 minutes. There doesn't appear to be much room anywhere in this narrative for Penniston to have had his 45 minute private encounter, and there is more timing evidence that seems to rule it out.

The start time of the whole affair is recorded as 0300, and at 0354 they were instructed by Buran to turn back to base from the

end point of their walk in the field beyond the E edge of the woods. The walk back to the position of Penniston's claimed landing site near the road to the Bentwaters back gate would have been substantial. The statements say they were a good 2 miles from here, but this could easily be a gross exaggeration in the circumstances. Say it was a mile, then at a reasonable 2 or 3 mph it must have been at least 0415 or so by the time Pennisto got there, even ignoring the events mentioned above. So 45 mins from then takes us to 0500.

But the Suffolk police were called by A1C Arnold from Bentwaters at 0411 and officers responded "immediately" according to their incident log. They must have arrived in the area east of the back gate within minutes, looking around but seeing nothing of note but the lighthouse, all whilst Penniston should have been in mid-sighting not 100 yards from the road, bathed in brilliant light, taking his photos and jotting his notes.

In any case, Penniston himself has plainly said that Burroughs was with him at the time and repeatedly uses the plural pronoun "we":

"The nearer we got to that thing the more uneasy I felt [my emphasis]"

[ibid.]

"when we got to the wood line off the east gate we discovered a craft of unknown origin. It was triangular in shape, on the ground - touched it, walked around it, photographed it. We did a full investigation of it on the ground for 45 minutes."

http://www.youtube.com:80/watch?v=KY5exRzIa_U&feature=related

And, for emphasis, the text of a 2002 interview with Penniston describing events during his touching, photographing and note-taking encounter:

[Quote]

You are all standing there and do what next?

Well, I turned to my partner there and said, 'How are you going to explain this?' And that was pretty much -- we were trying to absorb what we had just seen. It was most unusual.

Who was with you?

The patrolman who was with me was John Burroughs. He has worked the law enforcement side. In fact, he had worked directly for Bud Stefans, but he was one of the guys who went out there with me.

So, is he the only one with you?

Well, immediately next to me at 10 feet, yes. We, of course, we had another one back about 100 meters and there were others back at a logging road. Of course, there were several people at the East Gate. And all of this was observed from Bentwaters, too.

[End Quote]

<http://www.hyper.net/ufo/vs/m18-020.html>

Do you begin to see why reconciling the original narrative with Penniston's new story requires much more than just omitting a few details? It requires major re-jigging of the time line embedded in all of the original documents, making them (ex hypothesi) false.

>>you

>>appear bent upon totally devaluing those documents by promoting
>>the story that they were faked, which is the only way of
>>accommodating new and more exciting claims made years
>>afterwards.

>>The irony of this is devastating

>Huh?

I should have added "To those capable of appreciating the

irony". I'm reminded of the saying that "It is one of nature's kindly dispensations that most of the questions which it is beyond a man's power to answer never occur to him."

>>>Some people on this List seem unable to grasp the human factors >>>aspects of close encounter UFO sightings, which generally scare >>>the pants off of the astonished witnesses. In this country, at >>>least, the ridicule factor is very powerful. So in the heat of >>>the moment, fearing ridicule and/or loss of reputation, >>>witnesses often (I repeat, often) are reluctant to come forth >>>with the full details of their experiences. I know this as a >>>fact, and know many highly placed witnesses who don't dare >>> speak out.

>>They weren't thinking straight, not reacting rationally in the >>heat of the moment. Yet Chandler's testimony indicates that they >>had the presence of mind to make up a lie on the spot about not >>getting closer than 50m and report this over the radio to CSC in >>real time so that it would lend credence to what Penniston was >>planning to claim.

>Well, I won't even attempt to respond to this sort of lawyerly >spin doctoring, subjective argument.

Of course not. I don't believe you even understand it. Typically you prefer to take a sideswipe at the supposed form of the argument or the habits of the arguer on your way out of the room. The fact is noted. You believe that to lay out the reported facts from the recorded testimony and test inferences drawn therefrom against other reported facts is "subjective" and worthy of nothing but derision. But you think it is objective to chat cursorily with a witness and form impressions in admitted ignorance of the issues. I need add nothing to that.

>>Or else Chandler's statement and Buran's statement were >>fabricated too, so that this 50m detail and the time-line in >>which it is embedded was all carefully constructed at leisure >>after the fact - even though neither Chandler nor Buran was a >>witness and had nothing directly to gain by it, yet definitely >>had something to lose by putting their signatures to lies on >>official reports, as you point out:

>See above. Aristotle would be proud of you for your either - or >reasoning amply loaded with false premises.

Dick, in many instances you present a model of rationality, but I have reluctantly come to believe that there are times when you are incapable of following a simple chain of inference or of really understanding the purpose of the use of "what if?" reasoning in testing out the consequences of ideas. This is one of those times when you are constitutionally incapable, it seems to me, of the objectivity needed to try out thoughts that don't emotionally appeal to you, and your literal-minded response to the attempts of others to do so is typically churlish, baffled and angry.

>>>In the military this Ridicule Factor can be especially powerful. >>>You do things by the book, and you are required to follow >>>certain protocols, and you don't go around telling wild >>>stories.

>>Yes of course in the military you know to do things by the book, >>follow regs and don't purvey fantasies. So it's natural, I >>suppose, for security police who are sticklers for protocol to >>conspire to fabricate official statements and sign off on an >>untrue wild story for fear of ridicule and to protect their >>reputations. In fact it comes naturally to Buran and Chandler >>to do this to protect someone else's reputations.

>God, Martin, get real!

Is that exhalation of wind supposed to signify something?

>>>So if you are a senior security policeman and see a rather >>>unearthly metallic craft in the woods and touch it, you are in >>>a quandary.

>>Are you in much less of a quandary if you only see it from 50m >>away? Perhaps so, because you could then claim that you couldn't >>honestly say if it was an unearthly machine or not. Yes, and you >>could then, if you were a bit slow, totally subvert the point of

>>that strategem by claiming that you "positively identified" it
>>as an unearthly machine in any case. All you would have achieved
>>then is to make the same claim and expose yourself to all that
>>"ridicule and loss of reputation" whilst having hog-tied
>>yourself by watering down your own evidence for this "wild
>>story" which according to you military men just don't go around
>>telling. And what a shame when you had all those nice close-up
>>photographs too.

>Your reasoning is as convoluted as....a conspiracy theorist.

I'm afraid to say that my reasoning is sound and rather
childishly simple. You must decide what that says about your
difficulty with it.

>>>The behavior of both Penniston and Halt in initially
>>>holding back the details about what they experienced is
>>>completely understandable.

>>If you say so.

>I did say so and I will stand by what I said. it is based
>collectively on many years direct field investigation and
>interviewing of witnesses, personal knowledge of military
>affairs, many years experience as a senior editor of
>psychological and other human behavioral literature, oversight
>of a national and international investigation network, and...
>personal contact with two of the principal witnesses in this
>case.

Not that you wish to be pompous and stand on your dignity or
anything. :-)

Martin

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:47:05 -0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:21:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 18:01:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:25 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2007 13:31:56 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>>>I think it's been 10 or 15 years
>>>since Penniston first claimed he'd touched the object and seen
>>>writing on it.

>Right on!

<snip>

>>>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most
>>>important and credible evidence and they're only slightly
>>>less sensational than Penniston's later story.

>>Excuse me, but the "most important and credible evidence" in
>>respect of the Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag incident, in
>>which Halt plays no part at all, is not a second-hand summary by
>>Halt but the original first hand accounts by these men, and the
>>original statements of two other men (Buran and Chandler) who
>>monitored the event by way of Penniston's radio commentary at
>>the time. If you focus on these you will be cleaving to your
>>own principle (as stated below, and with which I generally agree)
>>that "what people say at the time of an incident like this
>>should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or
>>revisions they make years later".

>This is one of your repeated false premises, that revisions made
>many years later are involved. Then you become very rigid after
>accepting - in your own mind - that your false premise is Gospel
>truth.

I am sure everybody reading this will be baffled by the
suggestion that claims which, you agree ("right on!"), were made
13-18 years after the original event, and which contradict
explicit statements in the original account, were not "revisions
made years later". Please explain - without importing theory-
dependent assumptions - what other type of revision or retro-
vision you think this is.

>>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most
>>important and credible evidence and they're only slightly
>>less sensational than Penniston's later story.

><snip>

>>As for Halt's tape, nowhere, so far as I know, does it describe
>>anything nearly as "sensational" as the sighting of a
>>structured
>>landed craft by Penniston and co the previous night. There are
>>lights and beams, and lots of excitement, but no structured
>>landed craft. In short this seems a much less interesting event
>>than the sightings of the first night.

>The meaning and significance of this totally eludes me.

That's because you haven't properly understood the points to which I was replying and you have snipped out the paragraph that made it clear. To repeat: Lan claimed that the Halt memo and the Halt tape are the "most important and credible evidence" and, specifically, contain more "sensational" detail about the Penniston, Burroughs, Cabansag (PBC) event than did the original witness statements. Not so. Para 1 of his memo is only a digest of some of the info already in those statements, and the tape along with his para.3 is irrelevant to them. Further, in case it was being suggested that Halt's own sighting account and tape are of more intrinsic interest than PBC in any case, I wished to argue that this is not so.

>>The most pertinent and reliable evidence we have in relation to
>>the first night is, you will agree, the original statements of
>>those involved. The facts above do not support your contentions
>>that the Halt memo (which BTW also contains an erroneous date)
>>is "by far the most important and credible evidence" or that it
>>contains evidence about that night of a more "sensational"
>>nature than the original accounts. It does not. And why would
>>it, if (as Halt and his apologists now claim) his account was
>>censored to remove sensational aspects of the reports, not to
>>make them more sensational than they already were?

>"Most pertinent and reliable?" No! The most pertinent and
>reliable information we have is from Halt and Penniston (and
>others) after overcoming their fear of ridicule and loss of
>position, and coming forth to flesh out the story of what
>happened.

Firstly, you are stating a personal trust in Penniston's claim that the more explicit story which he produced 13-18 years after the event is the truth. That's all. As I said elsewhere, your judgment of character may have value but it is secondary to questions of the internal consistency of that story and its consistency with the historical record. It doesn't pass those tests too well.

Secondly, Halt's recent claims about an event at which he was not present can be no more "pertinent and reliable" in respect of the PBC event than was his original memo. He may now claim to have received additional information from P, but the pertinence and reliability of such info is subject to the serious qualification mentioned in the last paragraph. You argue that Halt's statement of confidence in Penniston is evidence that his story must be wholly truthful, a character reference which you must surely concede would have more force if Halt and Penniston were not, as you put it, giving more or less a "joint presentation".

Thirdly, by adducing the recent testimony of those "others" in support of Penniston and Halt you are sipping from a poisoned chalice, inasmuch as Burroughs' position does not sit very comfortably with theirs. I already mentioned three (3) points of friction that have been raised and invited comments. Your response is to snip them and ignore them. Listeners may think that this tells its own story.

>Just as a highly pertinent example, the first reports
>from the Kennedy assassination were garbled and inaccurate in
>most respects, but obviously for different reasons than in this
>case.

Actually the impertinence of this example for your case is quite striking. Your claim (not very clearly expressed by you or co-claimants, but I have tried to make its implications explicit for the purposes of debate and my framing of it stands unchallenged) is that PBC, and Buran and Chandler, conspired to make deliberate false statements, not merely omitting a minor detail but actively inserting false information, whilst subtly

preserving the illusion of independent true statements. I on the other hand see these five statements as convincing precisely because they are "garbled and inaccurate" to some degree. It seems a simpler interpretation to me that they are really ingenuous, than that their ingenuousness is cunningly contrived. There would have to be good evidence for your interpretation, and the mere claim by Penniston that it is so is not good evidence, for all that you think he seems like a stand-up guy, because it creates more and worse inconsistencies. Explanations are supposed to simplify.

>My point is that there is nothing sacred about original
>information. I put far more trust in follow-up investigation,
>character assessment, and other routine procedures of vetting
>information.

This is follow-up investigation. Logical investigation. I agree that my contribution is little and late. But I'm coming fresh to this case whereas you and others have the benefit of long experience and wise rumination. It's frustrating, if not entirely unexpected, to see how little rigorous thinking has been done because of reliance on trust and belief.

>>>Halt certainly didn't write his
>>>memo or make the recording in order to get on TV years later.
>>>Even if Penniston's later claim that he touched the object is
>>>a lie, it doesn't affect the significance of the memo or the
>>>recording.

>>This paragraph risks confusing the two separate sightings on
>>two different nights. Halt's tape has nothing to do with the
>>Penniston, Burroughs, Cabansag event that is the topic of this
>>thread. As I already pointed out, the part of Halt's memo that
>>is relevant to that event is a summary of information already
>>in the witness's statements.

>Well, yes it does. They sought out the landing site and
>documented it.

OK I wasn't planning to raise all this because I wanted to get some clarity on the other issues, but that was probably over-hopeful, and so now that you bring it up.

As you surely know, where Halt and his men were located during the events described in para 2 of the memo and on the tape is nowhere near the place where Penniston claims he spent 45 minutes photographing the landed UFO seen by him, Burroughs and Cabansag on Dec 26. Halt was near the east edge of the forest. Penniston's claimed landing site was about 1/2 mile away to the west.

http://roswellproof.homestead.com/files/REND_map2.gif

It seems that Halt was not alone in being confused about this.

'... new information on this subject was revealed in Sci-Fi Channel's "UFO Invasion at Rendlesham". Halt led Penniston and Bryant Gumbel (presenter) to the location of the landing site, Penniston said that the landing site he had found was in the opposite direction (both were involved on different nights) because of this it seems that Halt had indeed found a new landing site.'

<http://www.rendlesham-incident.co.uk/27-28-december.php>

So, no, it appears that Halt did not seek out the landing site and document it. The contents of Halt's para.2 are irrelevant to the touching-distance encounter claimed by Penniston (although they might still be relevant to the Dec 26 sightings reported by everybody else).

[As an aside there are some questions you could answer about the Halt site as well: The chipped and/or "burned"-appearing wounds in the tree bark are reported to have been identified by forestry workers as man-made marks used to identify trees ready for felling. I have not seen this refuted. Please will you take this opportunity to do so. (I have only seen these marks in photos, probably like yourself, but I have seen forestry marking much like them - not hereabouts, as they usually use red paint for the same purpose, but in England)

I have not read any serious treatment of the radiation readings that does not conclude the original MoD statement of levels 10 times above average expectation was at best compromised by misunderstandings about the type of instrument and the type of readings. The reported levels turned out, I believe, to be peak meter readings (not average readings, therefore not representative of the expectation value which is the mean of variation), and moreover were taken at the bottom end of the scale on an inappropriate instrument calibrated to measure much larger radiation levels (and therefore were probably not too accurate). The MoD science consultant who made the original assessment of a "significant" radiation level on the basis of incomplete information has himself stated that if these facts had been known to him he would not have regarded the readings as significant. Again, please take this opportunity to explain why this is wrong.

I think it remains possibly interesting that according to the Halt memo and tape there seemed to be a difference between the readings on the sides of the trees facing the "landing site" and on the sides facing away, and it is claimed that the areas of the ground marks gave higher readings. But I also take account of the fact that they did not appear to be experienced in using the meter, and the whole affair seems to have been a bit shambolic with people stumbling around in dark and difficult circumstances. Consequently none of this was exactly forensically done and none of it was properly documented. So all we have is a few ambiguous remarks on tape, and no real independent evidence that this clearing in the forest - which was happened upon by accident during a rather random search - was ever the site of any UFO event in the first place]

>>>And the fact that the witnesses' written descriptions
>>>are more vague than what's described in the memo does indicate
>>>that they were toning down what they put in writing, regardless
>>>of whether Penniston was jazzing things up in his later
>>>statements.

>>This is incomplete reasoning. If it were true that Halt's
>>summary was more sensational than the content of the original
>>reports, then one possible interpretation would be that the
>>witnesses had decided to tone down their own accounts, just like
>>Halt supposedly toned down his own (indeed the suggestion that
>>has been made is that they all did this in concert for the same
>>reasons). Another would be that Halt's second-hand summary was
>>an exaggeration based on Halt's false impression of the original
>>story. That would be more economical than the topsy-turvey idea
>>that an inflated second-hand summary demonstrates that the
>>original evidence must have been self-censored.

>If you knew Charles Halt, you would know how ridiculous this
>statement is.

Dick, please use the decent brain that I feel sure you were blessed with. What I'm doing here is illustrating that Lan's argument does not force upon us the unique conclusion claimed for it, not asserting that Halt exaggerated PBC's account in his memo. How you can have read this far and imagined that I think this is frankly astonishing, since the whole thrust of the argument here is my objection to Lan's claim that the memo summary is in any way more sensational than the witnesses' own statements.

>And the following comments.

Are... what?

>>No matter. In any case, your hypothesis assumes Halt's summary
>>is more sensational, and is not toned down like
>>the originals. Why would this be? Surely he didn't just forget
>>that they were supposed to be keeping mum? This is after all
>>part of the very same memo in which he has (ex hypothesi)
>>carefully toned down his own account of the next night for the
>>same motives.

>>Fortunately this daft idea is not required to make sense,
>>because the story in the original statements is in fact just
>>the same story as the one summarised by Halt: The "positively
>>identified mechanical device" moving erratically through the
>>trees and observed as close as 50m, the drawing of a clearly
>>artificial structured machine with a red light on top, the bank

>>of blue lights below, the illuminated trees, the animal
>>disturbance... it's all there.

. . . these comments are what? "Ridiculous" again? Why? Do you then assert that Halt's memo summary is more sensational than the reports it summarises? In what way? Be specific. It shouldn't take a moment.

>>>I agree that Penniston's more sensational description doesn't
>>>add much to the evidence embodied in the Halt memo, but it
>>>doesn't detract from it either.

><snip>

>>>I think what people say at the
>>>time of an incident like this should be given far more weight
>>>than any new alleged details or revisions they make years
>>>later. (Unless they are astronauts like Buzz Aldrin, who are
>>>allowed to totally contradict their initial UFO descriptions
>>>years later without anyone being impolite enough to point it
>>>out.)

>This is absolute hogwash that you keep repeating. Constantly
>repeating false premises does not make them true.

Whereas constantly denying them makes them false? But you might wish to beg Lan's pardon, since this was his comment, not mine. I do, however, agree with him.

>There are not revisions made many years later

Yes, in point of fact there are. You have agreed as much in your first words, above ("right on!"). In point of interpretation of that fact we have this:

>there are more complete
>revelation of facts and clarifications as the parties resolved
>their fears and conflicts.

Well that is the unproven claim that you accept and push here quite forcibly. But it is not the only possible interpretation. And I'm not convinced that it's the favoured one, because of the inconsistencies involved in the evidence latterly offered. That is the nub, but I can see that we are never going to get to it.

>And the following statement is more
>of the same. It is absolutely inaccurate and irresponsible to
>say that Halt or Penniston have "jazzed up their stories."

It is inaccurate and irresponsible to berate me for a phrase which, again, was not mine but Lan's, and is used in a more general context. You need to pay attention to detail.

>>We appear to be in agreement on this at least. But if it is
>>really the general feeling among ufologists that it's not too
>>important if witnesses jazz up their stories, even if it becomes
>>necessary to gut original documents of their credibility in
>>order to accommodate the jazz, then frankly I despair.

>I suggest you try to understand human psychology and behavior
>under stress a little better. That might help.

Thought for the day: Psycho-logical insight needs to have some logic in it.

Martin

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:53:47 -0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:24:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 21:25:45 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 16:33:25 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>My tentative conclusion (I would rather say my strong feeling
>>at this stage) has been fairly clearly stated. It is that the
>>original statements have the ring of truth. Some unexplained
>>event was witnessed by three people, involving an apparently
>>ordered arrangement of multiple blue, red and white lights that
>>appeared to fly among the trees, and at least one of the three
>>was convinced they were attached to a mechanical device seen as
>>close as 50m distance.

>They have the ring of truth, but to some people they might also
>have the ring of being downplayed in comparison to how the
>object was described in the Halt memo. This comment by Burroughs
>sounds like he's spinning his story in a pretty absurd way:

>"A bank of lights, differently colored lights that threw off an
>image of like-a-craft. I never saw anything metallic or
>anything hard."

>So, he says he didn't see an object - sorta kinda. He only saw
>some lights that threw off "an image of like-a-craft." That
>sounds almost as absurd as the "coveralls" story from the
>Socorro incident, although Ray Stanford according to Ray
>Stanford, it appears to have been Hynek's spin and not Zamora's.
>Are you really going to claim that you see nothing at all
>strange about Burroughs' above statement?

First I want to alert you to the fact (evident from scanning
ahead and seeing where you are going with this) that you are
continuing to misunderstand me in precisely the fashion I set
out, over-carefully I had thought, to correct. Apparently I was
not obvious enough, which is my fault I'm sure.

Second, referring to your question "Do I think Burrough's
statement odd?", you need to provide the context and reference
for this phrase, and one's judgment of its oddity needs to be
made in relation to some clearly expressed expectation of what
you think he ought to have said. If you think he ought to have
said without qualification that he definitely saw a metallic
craft then perhaps you think it is odd. I don't know for sure
why I should expect that. One interpretation of it is that he
thinks that the questioner/reader/public in general expects him
to say that. He appears to be saying he saw a structured
triangular pattern of lights which, he is ready to concede,
certainly gave the appearance ("image") that they were attached
to a craft; but he is not prepared to go beyond that and say
that he saw the body of a craft itself. This is quite consistent
with his original statement and his drawing and without sharing
your own personal expectations I cannot see anything to object
to.

>>>Halt's memo and his tape recording are by far the most
>>>important and credible evidence and they're only slightly
>>>less sensational than Penniston's later story.

>>Excuse me, but the "most important and credible evidence" in
>>respect of the Penniston, Burroughs and Cabansag incident, in
>>which Halt plays no part at all, is not a second-hand summary by
>>Halt but the original first hand accounts by these men, and the
>>original statements of two other men (Buran and Chandler) who
>>monitored the event by way of Penniston's radio commentary at
>>the time. If you focus on these you will be cleaving to your
>>own principle (as stated below, and with which I generally agree)
>>that "what people say at the time of an incident like this
>>should be given far more weight than any new alleged details or
>>revisions they make years later".

>The description of a triangular, metallic object was made a few
>weeks later, not years later.

I didn't say that it was made years later, neither is it at all
relevant to my point that it was not.

>Penniston's later description,
>apparently made first to an Omni reporter in 1994, was that the
>object was triangular and had symbols on it, that he touched it,
>and that it was warm to the touch. These details added years
>later did not greatly qualitatively change the description of
>the object in Halt's memo. If your characterization of all the
>early descriptions as of a mere "will o' the wisp" were true,

Did you really just put the words "descriptions of a mere will
o'the wisp" into my mouth for the second time? I'm rapidly
realising the futility of talking about this since you persist
in failing even to even read accurately. In fact this more than
a failure, it is a perverse and wilfull misrepresentation
peddled a second time after I explicitly and with precise
quotation as evidence proved to you that this was neither what I
said nor what any rational reader could have conceived that I
meant.

>then the description of a triangular object years later would
>have been a radical qualitative change that should arouse
>considerable suspicion. Unlike Buzz Aldrin, Penniston didn't
>contradict himself on the nature of the object he saw, only the
>distance from which he saw it.

In point of fact he did. His original drawing in 1980 was of a
rectangular or rather drum-shaped object; in the mid-nineties he
began to draw a very different triangular type of object.

>And 50 meters is not a terribly
>large distance for viewing a 3-meter wide object.

Dear heaven, give me strength! Yes, his original account is a
perfectly explicit report of an object seen close enough to be
"positively identified" as an unfamiliar "mechanical device". I
wonder how many times I have attempted to make this precise
point using how many different forms of words? I can't be
bothered to even think about it.

>>The most pertinent and reliable evidence we have in relation to
>>the first night is, you will agree, the original statements of
>>those involved.

>The very first statements were not necessarily the more
>reliable. The description in the Halt memo was made within a
>few weeks of the written statements. Since it clearly was not
>derived from those statements, Penniston must have told Halt
>what he saw at another time, perhaps before he wrote his
>statement. Even if the description relayed to Halt came later,
>the difference of a few weeks is trivial, and the circumstances
>under which a statement is made are as important as when it was
>made.

Again let's not reverse blindly over and over points already
made until they are flattened beyond all recognition. First,
recall that your previous argument was that the Halt description
was much more "sensational", and this is the important bit, not
just that there might be some minor differences of nuance and
detail - this in order to support the claim that Penniston must

have given a version to Halt back in 1980 which was tantamount to his later description of studying onyx symbols on the object from zero feet range and taking notes and photographs for 45 minutes.

Now I justified in detail the statement that the all significant features of Halt's para.1 are in the originals. I'll try once more.

". . . The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest."

Check.

"The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape"

Penniston described positively identifying it from only 50m as a "mechanical device" (what else would that convey - plywood?) and Burroughs' drawing shows a triangular or pyramidal arrangement of lights. Check.

[Important note: You may want to object and say, "Ah, but Penniston's original drawing doesn't really show a triangular object, does it? It shows a drum-shaped object and the only thing you could say is triangular about it is the fan of blue lights raying out below." If so you may also want to consider how hard to push this because you endanger your parallel contention that Penniston "didn't contradict himself on the nature of the object he saw, only the distance from which he saw it."]

"... approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high."

No check. This size detail, as I've already clearly conceded, is the only one which is not traceable to something mentioned in the written statements. But that doesn't mean that it is a significant addition. Is it impossible for Penniston or Burroughs to have mentioned an impression of size without having at the same time described studying onyx symbols on the object from zero feet range and taking notes and photographs for 45 minutes? Of course not. In fact it isn't even necessary that this estimate was made from direct observation of the object, since we know that they went back to what they believed to be the landing site and observed impressions in the ground that were about this distance apart. But howsoever one or both of them provided an estimate of size, it in no way implies anything more "sensational" than that they thought they saw something about this big.

"... It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath."

Check.

"The object was hovering or on legs. As the patrolmen approached the object it maneuvered through the trees and disappeared."

Check. [Note: this very closely reproduces the story in the original statements, but very explicitly contradicts Penniston's later claim that they approached it on the ground and studied it for 45 minutes]

"At this time the animals on a nearby farm went into a frenzy."

Check. [Although there were apparently no animals on any nearby farm. The animals were deer in the forest.]

Now tell me explicitly and precisely what else is in the Halt memo which is not in the original statements?

>>As I already pointed out, the part of Halt's memo that >>is relevant to that event is a summary of information already >>in the witness's statements.

>It was not a summary of those statements. The description of a >triangular object was not in any of the statements, was it? >That seems to be a rather important detail.

See above.

>>We appear to be in agreement on this at least. But if it is
>>really the general feeling among ufologists that it's not too
>>important if witnesses jazz up their stories, even if it becomes
>>necessary to gut original documents of their credibility in
>>order to accommodate the jazz, then frankly I despair.

>I didn't say that it wasn't important, and I also didn't say
>Penniston was, in fact, 'jazzing up' his statement. I'll go with
>Dick Hall's opinion of Penniston unless something considerably
>more serious than the 50-meter discrepancy has been
>established.

If a "50-meter discrepancy" is all you've taken away from this
exchange then it has been an utter waste of time for you, and
I'm sorry.

>I mentioned that only as a hypothetical. But it does appear that
>another alleged witness, Larry Warren did "jazz up" a story
>years after the incident about an alien contact with US Air
>Force officials, a claim that no other witness even hinted at,
>and then wrote a book about it. That seems considerably more
>suspicious than the witnesses describing (to Halt) a triangular
>object immediately after the incident and Penniston then saying
>he touched the triangular object 14 years later. You,
>apparently, see no difference between Warren's credibility and
>Penniston's.

I might see a great many things concerning Larry Warren if and
when I concern myself with him. Up to now it has proved such a
struggle to achieve a scintilla of clarity in the matter of
Penniston and co that I doubt the wisdom of going there.
However, in case I should wish to, I'd appreciate it if you put
no more words in my mouth concerning him.

>By the way: are you intending to arrive at the conclusion that
>what the witnesses saw was the Orford-Ness lighthouse? That's
>usually the purpose of these attacks on Penniston's
>credibility.

This is simply gratuitously insulting and very stupid. I have no
pre-meditated "intentions" and (unlike you, it would appear from
this) side with no faction. I have no interest or investment in
"these attacks" except insofar as anyone may develop information
of interest to me in trying to work out what to believe.

>That explanation has always seemed absolutely ludicrous to me.
>Even Burroughs' rather convoluted "image of like-a-craft"
>description doesn't support the "flying lighthouse" theory.

None of the several things I can think of to say in reply to
that seem worth the cost of being even further misunderstood. All
I will suggest is that you check the transcript of that
strangely gallumphing phrase from Burroughs that you clearly
delight in repeating. Are you sure he didn't in fact say "an
image of . . . like a craft", as in:

"A bank of lights, differently colored lights that threw off an
image of [something] _like_ a craft. [But] I never saw anything
metallic or anything hard."

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:54:26 +0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:26:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

>Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
>How advanced could they possibly be?

>by Michio Kaku

>The late Carl Sagan once asked this question, "What does it mean
>for a civilization to be a million years old?"

<snip>

A more pertinent question for Carl Sagan to have asked, and for the likes of Michio Kaku and Nicolai Kardashev to consider, would be 'How old is our civilisation?'

Nowhere in their ruminations do these guys appear to acknowledge the distinction between a species and a civilisation. There is an imponderably gigantic gap between the continuity of a life-form and the continuity of a social system that creates, accumulates, preserves, develops and then widely and freely disseminates useful scientific knowledge. As a species we are still in the process of creating the first civilisation with those characteristics, and we only have a couple of hundred years track record on the attempt. During this latest attempt we've distinguished ourselves by developing the means to totally destroy our species, without simultaneously achieving the sophistication to safeguard ourselves from that power. Whether we like the idea or not, we remain here more by luck than judgment.

If our own example is anything to go by, the biggest challenge isn't in harnessing ever greater forms of energy in order to achieve galactic and then intergalactic exploration, but in creating a civilisation of sufficient wisdom and stability to be able to achieve technical progress without destroying itself. If this is properly factored into the calculations that purport to predict the likelihood of extraterrestrial intelligence, then we may well end up with the view that the universe contains an infinity of species and just a few dozen civilisations.

Come to think of it, an even more pertinent question for Carl Sagan to have asked, and for the likes of Michio Kaku and Nicolai Kardashev to consider, would be 'When will we have a civilisation?'

If idle speculation along these lines is to have any value at all, I would speculate that we would be better served by pondering the sociology of extraterrestrial physics than we are by pondering the physics of extraterrestrial civilisations... --

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 13:51:23 -0600
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:27:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

I need to correct what I wrote about Burroughs. His odd description of what he saw as an "image of like-a-craft" was made in the 1990; it was not in his original statement in 1980. I was looking for a transcribed version of his original handwritten statement, which is hard to read, and found this link:

<http://www.ufoevidence.org/Cases/CaseSubarticle.asp?ID=280>

Given the 1990 time frame, the awkwardness of this description is probably because Burroughs was having difficulty putting what he saw into words rather than indicating a reluctance to fully describe what he saw. That's what I get for skimming too fast over a bunch of online material in too little time between holiday-related goings on.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Inexplicata's UFOs In Latin America 2007

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 15:03:39 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:29:02 -0500
Subject: Inexplicata's UFOs In Latin America 2007

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
December 17, 2007

INEXPLICATA - UFOs in Latin America 2007

Our annual review of the best UFO images from Latin America

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XOHImKhns-A>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 16:58:46 -0400
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:38:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:45:10 -0400
>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:10 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>>Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

>>><http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

>>>14 December 2007

>>>Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

>>>Dec 14, 2007 (LBO) Celebrated science fiction writer and space prophet
>>>Arthur C. Clarke yearns to see aliens and peace in his adopted home in
>>>Sri Lanka, a video statement released ahead of his 90th birthday said.

<snip>

>>Good ol' Art Clarke, much younger version, commented on the Trent
>>photos when they were published in Britain. Sunday Dispatch, July 2,
>>1950, Clarke wrote:

>>"There is nothing in the whole aeronautical field which gives a clue
>>about the pictured object. It makes one wonder if there are
>>extra-terrestrial visitors. We can neither prove nor disprove such a
>>theory until one lands. They may be revolutionary types of aircraft or
>>they may be extra-terrestrial. We shall certainly achieve space flight
>>in 50 years or so. Others may have done so before us."

>>About 5 years later Clarke commented favorably on Ruppelt's book, The
>>Report On Unidentified Flying Objects.

>>About 29 years later the show, Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious World,
>>featured the then-famous New Zealand Sightings of December 1978. Clarke
>>had read some of my reports on those sightings. Although skeptical, he
>>did not throw them out.

>Bruce,

>What were your own feelings about the man's interest in the
>reality of the phenomenon when you were in contact with him?

>Arthur C. Clarke is a conundrum. I have great respect for him,
>but this is one man who has had the resources for years to fund
>a real investigation into a subject which has so richly rewarded
>him. He has managed to sit on the fence scientifically while
>artistically reaping great rewards writing about
>extraterrestrial intelligence.

>As is obvious above in you statement Clarke's time-line for
>space travel is off - over-estimated - by 43 years as is his
>statement "They may be revolutionary types of aircraft or they

>may be extra-terrestrial." We now know that the Trent photos
>were not of some revolutionary military aircraft. He did make an
>attempt in his own television program back in the early 1980s
>Arthur C. Clarke's "Mysterious World" and Arthur C. Clarke's
>"World of Strange Powers" to at least look at the possibility.
>In both of these programs he explored among other topics the UFO
>phenomenon.

>Perhaps it was because he was so busy writing about
>extraterrestrial intelligence that he didn't have the time to
>investigate - he could have had science looking into this
>phenomenon through the weight of his influence plus via the
>application of his own wealth - the possibility of same
>interacting with our own; he had more than adequate resources to
>do so. I've always found it a bit cheeky that he made so much
>money off of ETI while denying any possible reality of its
>presence.

In my 1977 MUFON paper Science Fiction, Science And UFOs, I
presented details of the very un-scientific views expressed by 3
noted Science Fiction writers: Dr. Isaac Asimov, Ben Bova, and
Arthur C. Clarke.

Clarke had done a full page article Whatever Happened to UFOs?
in the Saturday Evening Post, Summer of 1971. He said, "The
public is no longer worried about them - no longer news. The
hysterical credulity of the late 40's has been replaced, except
in the minds of the few surviving cultists - by a realization
that the heavens are full of extraordinary sights (astronomical,
meteorological and electrical)..."

He says "What killed the visitors from space concept was the
International Geophysical Year 1958 - they never discovered a
single flying saucer".

Of course, no basis is given for this extraordinary
proclamation.

One might note that the Trinidade photographs were taken from an
IGY ship. He stresses the Ballistic Missile Warning radar
systems and their ability to detect single bolts and nuts.

As if they have not detected "Uncorrelated Targets" - their
fancy words.

Since when did he, as an English science fiction writer, have a
need-to-know for such data which is, by definition, born
classified?

In his 1968 book The Promise Of Space, he said, "After twenty
years of the wretched things, I am bored to death with UFOs. Any
letters on the subject will not be forwarded by my publishers.
If forwarded, they will not be read. And if read, they will not
be answered."

Perhaps this 'don't bother me with the facts, my mind is made up'
attitude is responsible for his ignorance. But why write the
article for the Post three years later???

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

A Mexican Schoolteacher's Alien Encounter

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 16:08:41 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:43:02 -0500
Subject: A Mexican Schoolteacher's Alien Encounter

Source: Debate - a Sinaloa, Mexico newspaper
Date: 12.05.07

Mexico: A Schoolteacher's Alien Encounter

MOCORITO - (Maria Elizalde) - The time was nearly 05:00 when an unexpected visitor appeared before her. She felt neither fear nor uncertainty. She only recalls having felt an odd sense of peace upon seeing that "body" of gelatinous material "the color of honey".

No questions were asked at first. But she later inquired: "What do you seek here with your presence?"

This is the contact experience of Violeta Ortiz Castro last Sunday (December 2nd) when an extraterrestrial entity appeared in her bedroom. Not only that - she was also able to capture it on video and photos on her cellphone.

That morning, Violeta arrived home after 04:00 hours, returning from a family celebration. Upon returning, she was about to put on her pajamas, as usual, turning on some music while she fell asleep and also lit a cigarette.

She sat on the floor to smoke, on the left hand side of the bed, listening to Vicki Carr's "Me Recordar=Els", when the strange image appeared less than a meter away from her. Is it real? She wondered.

Stunned by the visit, she later asked it: "What do you seek here with your presence?"

The world of the extraterrestrial had interested her from before, so she did not hesitate to think that she was facing a being from another planet. The creature, stating approximately 80 cm tall, looked at her fixedly while she asked questions that received no answer.

"I'm not afraid of you, because God is with me," she told it. As it refused to answer, she told it she would take pictures of it.

The time was 04:57 when her cellphone captured the first video. The screen shows a honey-colored image and large eyes. According to the young woman's description -- she is a preschool teacher - the creature's feet resembled those of a chicken, and instead of hands, it had something resembling the spines of a fish skeleton. While she never touched it, she said that the creature's skin looked gelatinous, and that the only reaction she observed from her "visitor" were head movements from side to the other.

Violeta managed to take three videos and five photographs, the last at 5:07 hours, which shows the image fading, as though the entity was being transported away. She was deeply impressed by this experience, but states feeling no fear at any time.

"It inspired much peace and tranquility. After it was gone, I felt paralyzed. I didn't get up, didn't scream, or made any noise whatsoever."

40 minutes later, she managed to get up and went to her older sisters room to tell her what had happened. Her sister was frightened and did not allow her to return to her bedroom. They tried to get some sleep.

The experience was discussed the next day with the rest of the family, and the cellphone images gave everyone "goosebumps"

She found it unbelievable that the entity could have gotten into her home while they were all asleep. Violeta remarks that the alien was perhaps trying to send a message through her, and she would like to see it again. "I would have liked to touch it or hug it, because I felt tenderness toward it. I take this as a good sign. We're different beings and maybe it was trying to tell us something."

That very same night, shortly before 22:00 hours, Jesus Antonio Gutierrez claims that he saw a UFO when he was in the backyard of a home located on Donato Guerra street.

Upon returning home, the first thing he told his wife was: "Honey, for the first time in my life I've seen a UFO." He explained that it was an object that flew around moving slowly, making shapes similar to the letter "V". When he saw the light, it increased threefold in size. "I felt that they saw me."

There are other eyewitnesses to the sighting, and all of them agree that there were aliens in Mocorito that night:

22:00 hours, Saturday 12.01: A neighbor saw a UFO near Donato Guerra street.

23:00 hours, Saturday 12.01: Other neighbors saw a strange light they ascribed to the UFO.

05:00 hours, Sunday 12.02: An alien appears inside a home in the town's historic central district.

(Source: "Debate" Newspaper, Afternoon Edition, Guamuchil, Sonora, Mexico)

Ana Luisa Cid managed to interview reporter Maria Elizalde, who covered the story of the schoolteacher's alien encounter. "Given the lack of images of the alleged alien, I thought it prudent to interview the reporter and learn more specifics about this case," she says. "Ms. Maria Elizalde kindly accepted my call and these are her statements."

Ana: Are you aware of Professor Violeta Ortiz's videos and photos?

Maria: Yes, I'm aware of the photos and the videos. The teachers room can be seen in the half light and there is the silhouette of a short creature with a large head and dark eyes. Neither hands nor feet can be seen. Violeta can be heard singing on the video. She used a Motorola V5 cellphone.

Ana: Does the alleged being move or does it remain static?

Maria: Yes, it moves. It has a slight side-to-side movement.

Ana: Forgive me, but this question is obvious. Couldn't it be a trick?

Maria: No, I don't think it's a trick. I know Violeta because she's an in-law of mine. Furthermore, other people reported seeing UFOs since Saturday.

Ana: Why isn't there a photo of the strange entity in your newspaper article?

Maria: I had one and intended to publish it, but Violeta didn't want me to. She believes that if we publish the material, someone may take it and doctor it. However, she has shown her videos to many people. About 50 people visited her home during the first two days and she showed them her material. She also did the same at work. Since Mocorito is a small town, the news spread quickly.

Ana: Had the teacher taken photos of this nature before?

Maria: Well, she's very interested in extraterrestrial concerns, but she had never taken photos like these. She has other very interesting photos, such as a face that can be seen in the bottom of a photo. She took that when she was alone. There was no one else at home, and she's picked up other things with her cellphone. In fact, strange phenomena occur in her neighborhood. That site formerly held a graveyard and then a hospital. Mocorito is a place with a lot of history.

[picture @ <http://www.analuisacid.com/mocorito.htm>]

Translation (c) 2007. S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Ana Luisa Cid and Maria Elizalde

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 16:48:39 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:44:08 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 15:55:25 -0500
>Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

<snip>

>If the guy with the ten aliases who took the videos is legit,
>he'll present his methods along with a list of co-ordinates so
>that it can be independently verified by astronomers.

Has anyone else with a good astronomical telescope
posted a photo of the International Space Station which
we could compare with the photos in question?

Here's one example:

<http://tinyurl.com/ytb65p>

Or, full link:

<http://www.spaceweather.com/swpod2007/07oct07/Chris-Todd1.jpg>

What I'm thinking is, if "Chris Todd" can snap a photo without
the so-called advanced methods that looks clear enough to ID it
as at least something artificial, and if there are many
undocumented stations and/or vehicles up there, then it should
have by now been relatively easy for others to also spot these
undocumented items.

The sky's a huge place, of course, and if most amateur
astronomers weren't aware of the possibility of undocumented
non-junk items up there, that may be why we haven't heard of
this before.

I would hope, even if none of the undocumented items are UFO-
related, that this Rense posting will encourage others with
modest telescopes to try to duplicate the work.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell 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) > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

UFO Believers Pursue Case

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:48:12 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 09:48:12 -0500
Subject: UFO Believers Pursue Case

Source: The Detroit Free Press - Michigan, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2lb3mz>

December 18, 2007

UFO Believers Pursue Case
Judge has told NASA to find the files

By Sean D. Hamill
Chicago Tribune

KECKSBURG, Pa. -- The U.S. government says nothing of note happened in this small town in the hills of southwestern Pennsylvania on Dec. 9, 1965. A meteor may have passed by, but no alien ship or Russian space probe fell to Earth.

Still, Bill Bulebush, 82, says he knows what he saw, heard and smelled, despite the doubts of the government and others in Kecksburg.

"I looked up and saw it flying overhead and it was sizzling," said Bulebush, a retired truck driver.

"I got to it 15 to 20 minutes after it landed. I saw it 10 to 15 feet away from behind a big tree -- because I was worried it might blow up -- and it smelled like sulfur or rotten eggs and was shaped like a huge acorn, about the size of a VW."

Other people said that dozens of Army soldiers and three members of the Air Force showed up, and later that night a flatbed military truck took the object away.

Despite such accounts, the government has been "trying to make it out like we're a bunch of liars," Bulebush said.

But now he and his fellow believers may have their best chance to prove their case. A recent settlement in a 4-year-long Freedom of Information Act court battle requires NASA to comb for documents about the incident and report back periodically to the judge overseeing the case.

The lawsuit was filed in December 2003 in the District of Columbia by Leslie Kean, a freelance journalist, with financial support from the SciFi Channel.

SciFi had asked Kean in 2002 to find a solid UFO report, one with credible witnesses and possible physical evidence, to serve as a test case.

Kean pressed the case after she filed a Freedom of Information Act request in 2003 and NASA said it couldn't find any documents related to Kecksburg.

But Kean knew the space agency had documents. Stan Gordon, a UFO and Bigfoot researcher with whom Kean was working, had

information he got in response to a request he sent NASA in the 1990s.

The case boiled over on March 20 for federal Judge Emmet Sullivan, who had tried to move NASA along for more than 3 years.

According to a transcript of the hearing that day, Sullivan angrily referred to NASA's search efforts as a "ball of yarn" that never fully answers the request, adding: "I can sense the plaintiff's frustration because I'm frustrated."

A settlement, reached Oct. 17, specifies how NASA will make a new search for records. Both sides will be required to report back to Sullivan periodically, starting this week.

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

UFOs Do Exist Government Spokesman Says

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 10:39:36 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 10:39:36 -0500
Subject: UFOs Do Exist Government Spokesman Says

Source: News.Com.Au - Sydney New South Wales, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/362zb5>

December 18, 2007

UFOs Do Exist, Government Spokesman Says

From correspondents in Tokyo

Yes, UFOs do exist, Japan's top government spokesman said today.

The comment by Nobutaka Machimura drew laughter from reporters at his regular briefing on government policy.

Earlier the Cabinet issued a statement saying it was unaware of cases where an unidentified flying object had been discovered, responding to an opposition lawmaker who demanded an investigation "given incessant reports of UFO sightings".

"The Government can only offer a stereotyped response," Machimura, the chief Cabinet secretary, said.

"Personally, I definitely believe they exist," he said, apparently tongue in cheek.

"I shouldn't talk any more. But I would welcome such questions every day."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

An NGO Solution For UFO Study

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 10:49:35 -0500
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 10:49:35 -0500
Subject: An NGO Solution For UFO Study

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void - Sarasota Herald Tribune,
Florida, USA

<http://www.heraldtribune.com/apps/pbcs.dll/section?CATEGORY=BLOG32>

Monday, December 17, 2007, 9:49 am

An NGO Solution For UFO Study
By Billy Cox

Maybe the way to nudge the U.S. back into the official business of investigating UFOs is to let someone other than the U.S. government handle it.

This trial balloon comes from Ted Roe, executive director of the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena. Founded in 2000 by a clique of scientists and aviation experts troubled by UFOs' potential and demonstrable impact on flight safety, NARCAP has published some impressive analyses to that end, most recently of the Chicago O'Hare case in 2006, at www.narcap.org.

Unlike the more rational aviation climates in places like France, England, Peru, Paraguay and Chile, where filing UFO reports isn't a one-way ticket to the rubber room (probably because their governments make no secret of their ongoing studies), American pilots are less inclined to go on record with what they've seen. By necessity, NARCAP has established a track record of preserving pilot confidentiality, but unlike Uncle Sam, it publishes the results of its inquiries.

"Both NARCAP and the FAA's Aviation Safety Reporting System are ready to engage" the filing and analysis of American UFO encounters, Roe says via e-mail from his home in Hawaii.

"Ideally," he continues, "the smart move in the U.S. is to set up a transparent NGO that can work in the public domain to take on and attempt resolution of, say, the top 10 percent of any cases reported in any year . . . Of course, such a group would not be able to comment credibly on the ETH (extraterrestrial hypothesis) or anything else without some very strong documentation which has eluded most efforts to date, regardless of the country."

At what point might such a study run into the U.S. military channels?

"We worked with the Committee on Gov. Reform in assisting their interrogations of the USAF regarding incursions into (defense airspace), and that entire matter went under the heading of National Security very quickly because along with the record of incursions comes the profile of vulnerability," Roe writes. "So yes, there is an issue with transparency and credibility when overlapped with security issues. It's a problem I would love to have the opportunity to resolve."

Or, more to the point: "I think Gov. would suffer a credibility issue if they tried to build a group out of thin air. Much better to empower a credible effort that is already in the public domain."

Anybody got any better ideas?

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

More On Japanese 'UFOs Exist' Story

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:07:24 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:07:24 -0500
Subject: More On Japanese 'UFOs Exist' Story

Source: BBC News - London UK

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/7150156.stm>

Tuesday, 18 December 2007

UFOs Exist, Says Japan Official
By Chris Hogg
BBC News, Tokyo

Japan's chief government spokesman has announced that unidentified flying objects (UFOs) exist.

Earlier, in response to a question from an opposition lawmaker, the Japanese government issued a statement saying it could not confirm any cases of UFOs.

But Chief Cabinet Secretary Nobutaka Machimura later told reporters he believed they were "definitely" real.

It is the sort of question politicians dread but, under Japanese rules, are unable to ignore.

A member of the opposition asked the government what its policy was to deal with UFOs.

He said work should begin urgently to try to confirm whether or not they exist because of what he called "incessant" reports of sightings.

The Japanese civil service swung into action.

In a statement it said that should a flying saucer be spotted in the country's airspace, a fighter would be scrambled to attempt visual confirmation.

But it emphasised that the government was not aware of cases where a UFO from space had been discovered.

Most alerts turned out to be birds or other objects.

'Not confirmed'

The document revealed that Japan has not yet planned what to do should aliens arrive here.

Sundogs, refracted images of the sun (Picture: Erik Axdahl) Many UFO sightings can be easily explained

The government's chief spokesman Nobutaka Machimura drew laughter from reporters when he admitted that this was a "stereotypical" response from the bureaucrats.

Perhaps with his tongue a little in his cheek he insisted that he believed UFOs did "definitely" exist.

Questioned about the existence of alien spaceships, Japan's Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda thought about it and then answered carefully.

He said he had "not yet confirmed" whether they existed.

The conspiracy theorists will note that the answer was not a "no".

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 10:40:09 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:10:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 16:58:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>In his 1968 book The Promise Of Space, he said, "After twenty
>years of the wretched things, I am bored to death with UFOs. Any
>letters on the subject will not be forwarded by my publishers.
>If forwarded, they will not be read. And if read, they will not
>be answered."

>Perhaps this 'don't bother me with the facts, my mind is made up'
>attitude is responsible for his ignorance. But why write the
>article for the Post three years later???

I would venture a guess that Clarke has been the recipient of an
awful lot of mail - regarding all sorts of subjects - from
strangers over the years.

I'm more inclined to believe that he was simply fed-up with
receiving an overwhelming amount of correspondence on the
subject that was either hopelessly incomplete and thus next to
useless, or simply deranged.

I would not take this to mean that his 'mind is made up'.

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Spy Planes To Recharge By Clinging To Power Lines

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:13:34 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:13:34 -0500
Subject: Spy Planes To Recharge By Clinging To Power Lines

Source: NewScientist.com News Service

<http://tinyurl.com/2poh9x>

18 December 2007

Spy Planes To Recharge By Clinging To Power Lines
by Paul Marks

The next time you see something flapping in the breeze on an overhead power line, squint a little harder. It may not be a plastic bag or the remnants of a party balloon, but a tiny spy plane stealing power from the line to recharge its batteries.

The idea comes from the US Air Force Research Lab (AFRL) in Dayton, Ohio, US, which wants to operate extended surveillance missions using remote-controlled planes with a wingspan of about a metre, but has been struggling to find a way to refuel to extend the plane's limited flight duration.

So the AFRL is developing an electric motor-powered micro air vehicle (MAV) that can "harvest" energy when needed by attaching itself to a power line. It could even temporarily change its shape to look more like innocuous piece of trash hanging from the cable.

Hanging about

AFRL's initial aim is to work out how to make a MAV flying at 74 kilometres per hour latch onto a power line without destroying itself or the line.

In addition, so as not to arouse suspicion, AFRL says the spy plane will need to collapse its wings and hang limply on the cable like a piece of wind-blown detritus. Much of the "morphing" technology to perform this has already been developed by DARPA, the Pentagon's research division. Technologies developed in that program include carbon composite "sliding skins", which allow fuselages to change shape, and telescopic wings that allow lift to be boosted in seconds by boosting a wing's surface area.

Challenges abound, though. Zac Richardson, a power-line engineer with National Grid in the UK, warns that if the MAV contacts an 11-kilovolt local power line, it could short circuit two conductors, causing an automatic disconnection of the very power the plane seeks.

And, on a 400 kilovolt inter-city power line, it risks discharging sparks. "It will hang there fizzing and banging and giving its position away anyway," says Richardson.

"Even kites falling across power lines cause breakdowns," adds Ian Fells, an expert in electricity transmission based in Newcastle, UK. "It's an utterly bizarre idea to try to land a plane on one."

Regardless of the challenges faced, AFRL plans test flights in 2008.

[Thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Ending The UFO 'Giggle Factor' Once And For All

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 12:30:31 EST
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:17:57 -0500
Subject: Ending The UFO 'Giggle Factor' Once And For All

I've just read the post regarding Japan's top government official publicly stating that UFOs exist. The story states he drew laughter from the Press when making the statement.

The Press? I thought they were supposed to be objective. Here a top government official makes such an astounding announcement and they giggle? Now why would that be? It's because there's an underlying 'group idiotic-think' amongst the world's Press regarding UFOs and that sure helps the shadow industrialists who want to make sure anyone who brings the issue up is subject to ridicule.

Ridicule has and continues to be the #1 weapon against researchers, witnesses, experiencers, whistle blowers. We humans have some twisted innate desire to survive amongst groups of other humans and fear of ridicule is grounded in that desire.

The old saying that sticks and stones can break our bones but words will never hurt us just doesn't hold water here. It's like that old joke by the late comedian Nipsey Russell where he would state that beauty may be only skin deep but ugly cuts straight to the bone.

Seems like fear of ridicule cuts even deeper.

So what do we do?

Tell the stories and reports of abduction and encounters that leave no room for giggles, laughs, chortles, nor guffaws. The past month I've gotten several more stories about the dark-side of abduction and just one or two of these stories are enough to chill the blood to the core. We often read or hear too much of the happy camper type of abductions and sightings as if someone is trying to push an agenda that all aliens are benevolent because some of us make the insane assumption that the ability to use advanced technology equates to advanced morality.

Ever hear of the Nazis? At the time they had some of if not the best technology on the planet and the first thing they did was used it to obliterate and subjugate portions of humankind.

We need to tell the hard-edged stories and stop perpetrating the myth of the nifty, neato, aliens like Spielberg does. Life isn't a movie. Life is hard, often brutal and rewards neither fear nor chronic hesitation.

I'm sure the horror stories will kill the interview factor as soon as we all start knuckling down and telling the real deal and they'll knock it off regarding anal probes and such.

I'm sure folks like the late Ms. Betty Hill would appreciate it.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 11:58:51 -0800
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:20:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:54:26 +0000
>Subject: Re: Kaku - The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations

>>Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

>>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>>The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
>>How advanced could they possibly be?

>>by Michio Kaku

>>The late Carl Sagan once asked this question, "What does it
>>mean for a civilization to be a million years old?"

><snip>

>A more pertinent question for Carl Sagan to have asked, and
>for the likes of Michio Kaku and Nicolai Kardashev to consider,

>Nowhere in their ruminations do these guys appear to acknowledge
>the distinction between a species and a civilisation. There is
>an imponderably gigantic gap between the continuity of a life-
>form and the continuity of a social system that creates,
>accumulates, preserves, develops and then widely and freely
>disseminates useful scientific knowledge. As a species we are
>still in the process of creating the first civilisation with
>those characteristics, and we only have a couple of hundred
>years track record on the attempt. During this latest attempt
>we've distinguished ourselves by developing the means to totally
>destroy our species, without simultaneously achieving the
>sophistication to safeguard ourselves from that power. Whether
>we like the idea or not, we remain here more by luck than
>judgment.

>If our own example is anything to go by, the biggest challenge
>isn't in harnessing ever greater forms of energy in order to
>achieve galactic and then intergalactic exploration, but in
>creating a civilisation of sufficient wisdom and stability to
>be able to achieve technical progress without destroying itself.
>If this is properly factored into the calculations that purport
>to predict the likelihood of extraterrestrial intelligence, then
>we may well end up with the view that the universe contains an
>infinity of species and just a few dozen civilisations.

>Come to think of it, an even more pertinent question for Carl
>Sagan to have asked, and for the likes of Michio Kaku and
>Nicolai Kardashev to consider, would be 'When will we have a
>civilisation?'

>If idle speculation along these lines is to have any value at
>all, I would speculate that we would be better served by
>pondering the sociology of extraterrestrial physics than we
>are by pondering the physics of extraterrestrial civilisations...

The longevity of technological civilizations has always been
realized to be the major limiting variable in the Drake equation

to the number of such civilizations. Longevity short = few or no concurrent civilizations in the galaxy; longevity long = many civilizations.

Not factored into the Drake equation, however, is the probability of interstellar travel and colonization. Even if average longevity is low, if only a few ancient civilizations were stable and achieved such instellar colonization, then the galaxy could be quite full of such derivitive civilizations, even if most civilizations end up destroying themselves.

Kaku, et al, are tackling the latter question, namely the probability of achieving interstellar travel and colonization. The chief argument against it are the levels of energy required. Kaku argues that even at low levels of energy growth, such as our own 3% per year, we will achieve what he calls "Type I" civilization status in only 200 years, namely able to harness the energy resources of an entire planet. This would be sufficient to achieve interstellar travel by brute force propulsion methods (nothing exotic like wormhole travel). [At only 1% growth, we would go to Type II status (harnessing energy of an entire star) in only about 3000 years.]

Here's one way to achieve Type I status using nothing particularly exotic, only a little beyond our present technology. Create von Neumann, self-reproducing, artificially intelligent machines for extraplanetary mining. Create self-reproducing solar cell factories on rocky bodies like the Moon or Mercury and beam the energy to Earth or elsewhere with microwaves or lasers. The "elsewhere" could be to power interstellar probes.

Plaster the Moon with solar cells and even at only 10% overall efficiency we could generate a thousand times more energy than we do now here on Earth. Similarly on Mercury, with over twice the surface area and ten times the solar intensity, the energy would be at least 10,000 times greater, about equivalent to what we could achieve by covering the Earth with solar cells. That's Type I status - using the energy of an entire planet.

Point is if we can conceivably do it, so could some ETs, and the main argument against interstellar travel and the ETH collapses. As you and others mention, the main problem is surviving to do it.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

PRG Media Notice - December 18

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <PRG.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:07:07 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:30:39 -0500
Subject: PRG Media Notice - December 18

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

PRG Media Notice - December 18, 2007

Washington, DC - PRG Executive Director, Stephen Bassett, will appear in studio on the Fox syndicated Morning Show with Mike and Juliet on Wednesday, December 19 between 9 and 10 am in most markets.

See:

<http://www.mandjshow.com>

for stations, show times and streaming feed.

The discussion will be related to recent developments in Japan regarding comments by high government officials about the UFO/ET phenomenon.

See:

www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/updates/subscribers/2007/dec/m19-001.shtml

Paradigm Research Group
4938 Hampden Lane, #161, Bethesda, MD 20814
PRG.nul 202-215-8344
www.paradigmresearchgroup.org

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 12:14:44 -0800
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:34:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 12:46:33 -0500
>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 13:45:10 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2007 23:38:10 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens & Peace For Sri Lanka

>>>>Source: Lanka Business OnLine - Colombo, Sri Lanka

>>>><http://tinyurl.com/2xnjna>

>>>>14 December 2007

>>>>Space Prophet Yearns For Aliens And Peace For Sri Lanka

><snip>

>>>About 5 years later Clarke commented favorably on Ruppelt's
>>>book, The Report On Unidentified Flying Objects.

>>>About 29 years later the show, Arthur C Clarke's Mysterious
>>>World, featured the then-famous New Zealand Sightings of
>>>December 1978. Clarke had read some of my reports on those
>>>sightings. Although skeptical, he did not throw them out.

>>What were your own feelings about the man's interest in the
>>reality of the phenomenon when you were in contact with him?

>>Arthur C.Clarke is a conundrum. I have great respect for him,
>>but this is one man who has had the resources for years to
>>fund a real investigation into a subject which has so richly
>>rewarded him. He has managed to sit on the fence scientifically
>>while artistically reaping great rewards writing about
>>extraterrestrial intelligence.

<snip>

>>Perhaps it was because he was so busy writing about
>>extraterrestrial intelligence that he didn't have the time to
>>investigate - he could have had science looking into this
>>phenomenon through the weight of his influence plus via the
>>application of his own wealth - the possibility of same
>>interacting with our own; he had more than adequate resources
>>to do so. I've always found it a bit cheeky that he made so much
>>money off of ETI while denying any possible reality of its
>>presence.

>I think the bottom line is he wasn't completely convinced by the
>UFO evidence and was worried about rejection by the scientific
>community if he took a positive stand.

Here's a news article in my collection that bears on Clarke's early views.

Source: New York Times, June 22, 1952, book review of Clarke's just-published "The Exploration Of Space," by rocket expert Willy Ley.

...Even the possibility of trips to other solar systems is given some attention. Nobody, Mr. Clarke notes, will come out and say that he considers it a future possibility, but "if anyone attempts to prove the total impossibility of interstellar flight there is a great show of indignation and calculations are promptly produced refuting the critics."

In connection with this idea, Mr. Clarke carefully enters the flying saucer controversy. If even interstellar travel seems ultimately possible why has none of the other intelligent races, presumed to exist, ever visited earth? His answer is that this may have happened before recorded history, although "anyone who is willing to spend a lifetime browsing through old newspapers could collect an impressive amount of 'evidence' for extraterrestrial visitors *** since it is, in the nature of things, never possible to prove that such apparitions did not come from outer space, the most reasonable attitude toward them would seem to be one of open-minded skepticism."

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Larry Hatch News

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:56:49 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 07:56:49 -0500
Subject: Larry Hatch News

As you may recall, UFO UpDates reported that Larry Hatch suffered a stroke. Since then many readers have asked for updates on his condition.

Thanks to Mary Castner for the latest on Larry...

ebk

From: Mary Castner <m.castner.nul>
To: Project-1947.nul
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 12:08:37 -0600
Subject: Update On Larry Hatch

List Members,

As of now Larry is permanently in a nursing home. His choice as he didn't want to try and live at home with help. Maybe that will change in the future - I can't say.

If anyone wants to send him a Christmas card, letter or brief note or just keep in touch this is his mailing address.

I am told he now has glasses and is doing cross word puzzles in addition to much TV.

Can't say he will respond to anyone. So if you hope to hear from him I would enclose a stamped, self addressed envelop with a couple of sheets of paper so he gets the idea:)

Lawrence Hatch
Room 202B
Mission Skilled Nursing Facility
410 North Winchester Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95050-6325

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Who's Your Favorite Alien?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:30:05 EST
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:00:57 -0500
Subject: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

<http://www.jamesarness.com/biogphy.htm>

I was feeling nostalgic for the good TV shows and remembered Gunsmoke starring James Arness. I remembered years of watching that show with my Dad and Granddad and the lessons the program emphasized.

The longest running dramatic series in TV history too!

Then I remembered not only did actor James Arness play the most famous lawman in TV history, but he also played the coolest and scariest alien in movie history for my money, namely the Thing from Howard Hawkes classic The Thing From Another World. Gotta be the best alien movie ever. Sure, I'm about to get lambasted with Klaatu's and Spocks - Spock rules by the way - but The Thing was a no-nonsense alien with one agenda: survive!

No pretense, no benevolent messages and nebulous agendas, just: survive!

Not only was The Thing a great movie all around and co-starred an endless stream of talent, Mr. Arness also starred in another sci-fi great Them!, about the giant ants. Seems like whatever he touched turned to gold and became classics. That's what it's all about, what you make lives on.

So we've had our share of aliens on TV and film and Arness' Thing is mine, who's yours and why?

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:13:28 -0500
Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
>How advanced could they possibly be?

>by Michio Kaku

<snip>

I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving detailed arguments untouched. He also censored my mention of opinion polls showing high levels of support for the reality of UFOs amongst the best educated (and the least amongst the poorly educated), and also a decent level of support for the ETH shown in 1970s polls of technical readers of Optical Spectra and Industrial Research/Development journals. And he censored a lot of historical material I documented showing clear discussion of the ETH even back in 1947 during the big U.S. flying saucer wave. Just one example, as noted in Ted Bloecher's review of the newspaper articles, is that a Pentagon spokesman on July 8, 1947, felt it necessary to specifically deny that they were explained by "space ships". The article had previously tried to claim that there was no discussion along these lines.

Here's my point. Wikipedia has an absolutely huge readership, orders of magnitude higher than UpDates - sorry Errol 8-) - or our individual websites. Part of process of getting this to be a subject of proper public debate is getting our side out there to be widely read...

Whether we like it or not, there is a propaganda war going on. The debunkers try to control the debate through continuous ridicule and also censorship of favorable material then claim there is "no evidence". So, if we want to get the other side of this debate out there - which doesn't mean slanting articles only one way in our favor, but presenting both sides to the debate in a balanced way, then we have to confront these bozos on the major battlegrounds.

Unfortunately Wikipedia's ground rules enable idiots to distort controversial articles their way and censor opposing views. One can protest this, but it is very hard for one person to stop it. They just keep doing it, and also play tag team. I just don't have the time or energy to constantly fight with them

One way to counter this is to gang up on them. One person fighting them is treated as a kook or ignored, but they will have a hard time repeatedly censoring material if a large group of us insist on it being in there. Again, the point isn't to create articles slanted only our way, but to create well-researched and cited encyclopedia articles for the mass public that give a balanced presentation.

So I encourage people here to become Wikipedia editors. The level of knowledge here on UFOs is much, much higher than the usual poorly informed, overly-opinionated, pseudoskeptic college science student types who tend to haunt Wikipedia, thinking they already know it all. Most people edit using screen names, so you don't have to expose who you are. You are not supposed to cite original research, but there is nothing to stopping others from citing your own research. Jerry Clark's UFO histories, e.g., are often cited in UFO-related articles. So Jerry can't cite his own books, but I sure can. And Jerry could cite Bruce Maccabee's work, or Richard Hall's, or other original source material, and vice versa, etc., etc.

David Rudiak

Perhaps those who participate in the 're-editing' of Wikipedia entries could post those 're-edits' here to enable copying and reinserting by others?

ebk

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Sandia National Laboratories On Tunguska

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:23:21 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:23:21 -0500
Subject: Sandia National Laboratories On Tunguska

Source: Popular Mechanics - New York, USA

http://www.popularmechanics.com/blogs/science_news/4237449.html

December 18, 2007

Real-Life 3D X-Files Reveal Asteroid Levelled Siberian Region
by
Erik Sofge

It's no Roswell, but dedicated Ufologists have spent decades debating the true nature of the Tunguska event, a June 30, 1908, explosion that cleared an 800-sq.-mi. swath of Siberian forest. After all, there are discrepancies: Though many scientists believe the destruction came from an asteroid detonating in the atmosphere, extraterrestrial fragments have yet to be recovered. A team of Italian scientists believes that a hunk of asteroid may be in a nearby lake, buried deep within a submerged impact crater. But until further investigation can be conducted, this event remains a hot topic for the X-Files set. Was it a UFO crash? An alien weapons test?

Now, Sandia National Laboratories has released its own explanation for the event. Using supercomputers to create a 3D simulation of the explosion, the Department of Energy-funded nuke lab determined that Tunguska was, indeed, the result of a relatively small asteroid. When the object detonated in midair, Sandia's report says, the force of the blast appears to have been contained by the Earth's atmosphere, funneling downward as a column of superheated gas. In fact, the atmosphere might have been the trigger for the explosion, as increasing resistance compressed the asteroid until it detonated.

If this analysis is accurate - and it's hard to argue with Sandia's ability to model earth-shattering explosions - it might explain the lack of asteroid fragments, since the object could have been smaller than previously suspected. It would also mean the total destructive force was somewhere between three and five megatons, as opposed to the 10 to 20 megatons originally theorized. None of this is good news.

Although Sandia's report, which was presented at the American Geophysical Union meeting in San Francisco last week, doesn't specify the likely size of the Tunguska asteroid, it demonstrates the threat of relatively small cosmic objects. And hard as it is to spot the massive rocks hurtling in Earth's general direction, such as the 1150-ft. asteroid Apophis, which Popular Mechanics reported on last year, smaller asteroids are more numerous, and even more difficult to track.

Of course, imaginative Tunguska enthusiasts might interpret Sandia's results in a more sinister light, since a precise jet of compressed flame is an excellent description of an alien-built weapon. For a more reasonable dose of the apocalyptic, check out simulation videos here:

<http://www.sandia.gov/news/resources/releases/2007/asteroid.html>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 22:52:33 +0000
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:29:17 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 16:48:39 -0500
>Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2007 15:55:25 -0500
>>Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

><snip>

>>If the guy with the ten aliases who took the videos is legit,
>>he'll present his methods along with a list of co-ordinates so
>>that it can be independently verified by astronomers.

>Has anyone else with a good astronomical telescope
>posted a photo of the International Space Station which
>we could compare with the photos in question?

>Here's one example:

><http://tinyurl.com/ytb65p>

>Or, full link:

><http://www.spaceweather.com/swpod2007/07oct07/Chris-Todd1.jpg>

>What I'm thinking is, if "Chris Todd" can snap a photo without
>the so-called advanced methods that looks clear enough to ID it
>as at least something artificial, and if there are many
>undocumented stations and/or vehicles up there, then it should
>have by now been relatively easy for others to also spot these
>undocumented items.

>The sky's a huge place, of course, and if most amateur
>astronomers weren't aware of the possibility of undocumented
>non-junk items up there, that may be why we haven't heard of
>this before.

Amateur astronomers know there are tons of space junk, some of
it undocumented. Where would you want to hear about this
fact?

I hear about it from other amateur astronomers. The only people
who haven't heard about it are people not interested in
astronomy. Such as the general public.

>I would hope, even if none of the undocumented items are UFO-
>related, that this Rense posting will encourage others with
>modest telescopes to try to duplicate the work.

Eleanor:

More to the point, why is any caring whether the 'new videos'
are analyzed?

Have you seen the one showing "the aliens moving around inside

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

their craft"? If not, take a look and then wonder to yourself if the poster of the videos is serious or not.

I'll vote for not serious.

KK

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was:

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:46:17 -0600
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:23:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was:

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

>>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>>The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
>>How advanced could they possibly be?

>>by Michio Kaku

><snip>

>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving detailed
>arguments against untouched. He also censored my mention of
>opinion polls showing high levels of support for the reality of
>UFOs amongst the best educated (and the least amongst the poorly
>educated), and also a decent level of support for the ETH shown
>in 1970s polls of technical readers of Optical Spectra and
>Industrial Research/Development journals. And he censored a lot
>of historical material I documented showing clear discussion of
>the ETH even back in 1947 during the big U.S. flying saucer
>wave. Just one example, as noted in Ted Bloecher's review of
>the newspaper articles, is that a Pentagon spokesman on July 8,
>1947, felt it necessary to specifically deny that they were
>explained by "space ships". The article had previously tried to
>claim that there was no discussion along these lines.

<snip>

Right on - this is exactly what I mean... this is the sorry
'state-of-the-art' activity of the ufological opposition... UFOs
are real by default! The opposition self-implodes and
invalidates itself.

Consider, it's not the quality evidence of same keeping Ufology
alive, as I read recently here at UpDates, it is the incompetent
denial of that evidence by the opponents of ufology giving
rise to it!

Scurvy bastards! CSI - Cretins Supporting Insentience.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog - <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>
U F O M a g a z i n e - www.ufomag.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

From: Carol Buckallew <clbuckallew.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 12:04:30 -0600
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:26:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:30:05 EST
>Subject: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

><http://www.jamesarness.com/biogphy.htm>

>I was feeling nostalgic for the good TV shows and remembered
>Gunsmoke starring James Arness. I remembered years of watching
>that show with my Dad and Granddad and the lessons the program
>emphasized.

>The longest running dramatic series in TV history too!

>Then I remembered not only did actor James Arness play the most
>famous lawman in TV history, but he also played the coolest and
>scariest alien in movie history for my money, namely the Thing
>from Howard Hawkes classic The Thing From Another World. Gotta
>be the best alien movie ever. Sure, I'm about to get lambasted
>with Klaatu's and Spocks - Spock rules by the way - but The
>Thing was a no-nonsense alien with one agenda: survive!

>No pretense, no benevolent messages and nebulous agendas, just:
>survive!

>Not only was The Thing a great movie all around and co-starred
>an endless stream of talent, Mr. Arness also starred in another
>sci-fi great Them!, about the giant ants. Seems like whatever
>he touched turned to gold and became classics. That's what it's
>all about, what you make lives on.

>So we've had our share of aliens on TV and film and Arness'
>Thing is mine, who's yours and why?

Greg

James Arness is still alive at over 100 years young, unless I
missed his demise in the last couple years. I watched him
celebrate his birth day on TV not to long ago.

Carol

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 13:45:02 -0600
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:29:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:53:47 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>Did you really just put the words "descriptions of a mere will
>o'the wisp" into my mouth for the second time? I'm rapidly
>realising the futility of talking about this since you persist
>in failing even to even read accurately. In fact this more than
>a failure, it is a perverse and wilfull misrepresentation
>peddled a second time after I explicitly and with precise
>quotation as evidence proved to you that this was neither what I
>said nor what any rational reader could have conceived that I
>meant.

Your original statement was:

>They saw some wierd display of
>blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-
>whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At
>that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were
>attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is
>with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they got
>right up close and actually touched this thing.

A weird display of lights that behaves like a will o' the wisp
is, as far as I can tell, the description of something very
similar to, and something that just might be, a will_o'_the_
wisp. You are the one who put those words into your own mouth.
Don't blame me for it.

The Halt memo makes it clear that from the very beginning,
someone in Penniston's group was describing something that
cannot be explained away as "some wierd display of blue and red
lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the- whisp fashion,"
to use your exact words so as to avoid any future complaints
and false accusations.

That's all I've got time for. There's really no point in
debatings someone who's too fond of his own argument to concede
that rational people just might find it less than completely
convincing.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

From: Michael Woods <mike.woods.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 17:39:10 -0500
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:37:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:30:05 EST
>Subject: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

><http://www.jamesarness.com/biogphy.htm>

>I was feeling nostalgic for the good TV shows and remembered
>Gunsmoke starring James Arness. I remembered years of watching
>that show with my Dad and Granddad and the lessons the program
>emphasized.

<snip>

>So we've had our share of aliens on TV and film and Arness'
>Thing is mine, who's yours and why?

Well Greg,

Ray Walston was always My Favorite Martian, although I think I
could transcend the Alien-Human dichotomy if I spent extended
time in isolation with Seven-of-Nine from the Star Trek
universe.

I like the Alien alien for her dental hygiene, while the aliens
in Starship Troop looked like fun.

Damn, a fully charged ray-gun, so many aliens and so little
time.

Mike Woods

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

UFO Observers/Abductees Linked To Medical

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 18:12:09 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:41:14 -0500
Subject: UFO Observers/Abductees Linked To Medical

True or False: Can UFO Observers or Alien Abductees Be Linked
With Medical Exceptions Or Non-Medical Test Scores?

I realize each of us is unique, just like everyone else. But seriously, I've hesitated to ask these long enough. I'm looking for more, reliably replicable research evidence. Specifically:

Has anyone found any absolute associations between groups of high frequency direct observers of UFO's or alien abductees, and patients with "natural immunities", rare blood types, changes in blood types, family histories of medical concerns, or other medical exceptions?

Has anyone found associations between these groups and certain non-medical test scores?

If you wish to contact me off-list, please do so. I will honor requests for anonymity. But I will need to verify any evidence offered.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Fawcett Releases New UFO Book For 2007

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:48:07 -0500
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:48:07 -0500
Subject: Fawcett Releases New UFO Book For 2007

Source: The Lincolnton Tribue - North Carolina, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/ywpgqc>

2007/12/19

Local Writer Releases New UFO Book For 2007
By Jason Saine

LINCOLNTON =96 George Fawcett, a local author and a veteran UFO investigator and researcher for 67 years has released a revised and enlarged version of his book, UFO Repetitions - A Challenge to Scientific Investigations.

Fawcett has investigated over 1,200 UFO sighting reports and has read over 700 books and 1,000 magazine articles on the subject since 1944. He has had published over 100 UFO investigative and research articles he has written in Flying Saucers Magazine, Search, Fate, Saga, Argosy, True, Flying Saucer Review, National Enquirer, UFO Magazine, UFO Universe Magazine, MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings. In 1975 Fawcett authored the highly illustrated book, Quarter Century of UFOs in Florida, North Carolina and Tennessee.

His illustrated UFO lectures have been well received by almost 600 different colleges and universities, service clubs, military and scientific organizations, technical and special interest groups in United States and overseas.

Fawcett has been a guest on dozens of radio and TV shows and also featured in many books and magazine and newspaper interviews. Dozens of Fawcett's articles were listed in the 1969 Library of Congress book UFOs and Related Subjects: An Annotated Bibliography, published under contract with the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. George was a consultant to the movie, UFOs - Target Earth produced by Centrum Films in Atlanta, Georgia in 1974.

Fawcett served as the founder and chief advisor to the New England UFO Study Group (1957), the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Two-State UFO Study Group (1965), the Florida UFO Study Group (1968), the Tar Heel UFO Study Group (1973) and the Mutual UFO Network of North Carolina, Inc. (1989).

Fawcett is the owner of a large 'Sauceriana Collection' consisting of over 15,000 items. From 1976 to 1984 George helped organize seven consecutive UFO symposiums for the state unit of the worldwide MUFON, Inc. and co-hosted by the Tar Heel UFO Study Group in Winston Salem, North Carolina.

=46rom 1979 to 1982 George taught a 30 hour (3 credit hours) accredited collegiate UFO course titled, "UFOs: A New Frontier of Science" at the Lincoln County Campus of Gaston College.

If you would like to purchase a copy of the book you may contact Fawcett at 704-735-5725 or via email at:

[fawcett28092.nul](#)

The book cost is \$10.00 plus \$2.00 for postage and handling for each copy.

The books can be autographed if requested.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

On Lacking The Guts To Squeeze The Trigger

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:52:43 -0500
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:52:43 -0500
Subject: On Lacking The Guts To Squeeze The Trigger

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void - Sarasota Herald Tribune,
Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

Wednesday, December 19, 2007

On Lacking The Guts To Squeeze The Trigger
By Billy Cox

Last week, CNSNews.com uncorked a whinefest about Judicial Watch's frustrations over its inability to obtain selected Clinton White House records in a timely fashion. Its petulant headline read: "Clinton Library Has Responded to UFO Inquiries - Little Else."

Essentially, Judicial Watch - the right-wing legal firm that represented the likes of Gennifer Flowers and Paula Jones in their sex-scandal suits against Bill Clinton - wants the National Archives and Records Administration to chuck its first-come, first-served document-review policy so it can butt in line ahead of everyone else and chase its own Hillary theories in time for the election.

You can understand why Judicial Watch would be PO'd about UFOs. When you're mining data for decade-old slush funds, \$1,000 coifs and the identities of Vince Foster's assassins, taking a number behind UFO queries is definitely slummin'.

But what about this thing called "Cybercast News Service"?

According to its own Web site, CNS was formed in 1998 by the conservative Media Research Center as a "response" to the "liberal bias in many news outlets - bias by commission and bias by omission - that results in a frequent double-standard in editorial decisions on what constitutes 'news.' "

Fair enough. But it also bills itself as "a news source for individuals, news organizations and broadcasters who put a higher premium on balance than spin and seek news that's ignored or underreported as a result of media bias by omission."

News that's ignored or underreported? CNS - surely you jest. Otherwise, De Void wouldn't have to reiterate the befuddlement it directed last week at the GOP: Why aren't you using this UFO material from the National Archives against Senator Clinton?

Are you deaf? Are you blind to the obvious? This stuff will blow her out of the water. As first lady, she actually met with a jillionaire who wanted her husband to unlock the government files on flying saucers! UFOs aren't even real! This is outrageous; this is witchcraft! This is manna from heaven! It goes to character; it goes to judgment! And here they are, the Clintons, stroking a rich old geezer's delusions for more campaign money? What WON'T these people do? And if the Clintons

weren't being cynical =97 isn't that infinitely worse?

Wait a minute. You guys at CNS aren't really dumb enough not to get it. You're saving the UFO card for the general election - right?

[Thanks to Stuart Miller of <http://uforeview.net/> for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Minister Troubled Over Legal Issues If UFO Arrives

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:58:29 -0500
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 07:58:29 -0500
Subject: Minister Troubled Over Legal Issues If UFO Arrives

Source: Japan News Review - Stockholm, Sweden

<http://tinyurl.com/3y1lp6>

Thursday, December 20, 2007

Defense Minister Troubled Over Legal Issues If UFO Arrives

Defense Minister Shigeru Ishiba said Thursday that he was troubled over potential legal issues if a UFO arrives in Japan, requiring action by the Self-Defense Forces, Japanese media reports.

The subject was triggered by a question from oppositional lawmaker Ryuji Yamane, who argued the government should attempt to confirm what UFOs are because of "frequent observations" of them in Japan.

"There are no grounds for us to deny that there are unidentified flying objects (UFOs) and some life-form that controls them," Ishiba said at a news conference. "Various possibilities should be considered."

Ishiba noted that in the classical Godzilla movies, Japan deployed its military against the monster. "Few discussions have been made on what the legal grounds were for that," the minister said, drawing laughter from reporters, according to an AFP report.

Ishiba said it would be difficult to determine on what legal grounds the Self-Defense Forces could be mobilized if a UFO violating Japanese airspace is not hostile.

"Would that be mobilization for an act of defense? That would not be the case if they say, 'Everyone on the Earth, let us be friends,'" Ishiba said. "Or what can we do when we can't figure out what they're saying?" Ishiba was quoted as saying by Kyodo News.

The minister added that he was strictly speaking his own views and that the ministry was not actually working out ways to deal with UFOs.

The government officially took the position Tuesday that the existence of UFOs are unconfirmed. Chief Cabinet Secretary Nobutaka Machimura drew headlines around the world when he after the conference stated he was a firm believer in UFOs, citing Peru's Nazca Lines as evidence.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 08:03:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 13:45:02 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:53:47 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

I've been watching this thread with bewilderment. I expected Martin to get a hard time, but what I have seen surpasses any previous lack of understanding that I have seen all year. I kept out of this because I don't have the time to engage in-depth at the moment, but I simply can't stand by and observe what is going on without comment.

Martin's points are well argued and absolutely clear to me, his logic is infallible. He is looking objectively at the evidence, something which I don't believe I have seen anyone else doing including esteemed historian and psychological journal editor Richard Hall, who has gone down immensely in my esteem.

Martin, at this point I don't know why you bother - you will never alter the 'tenets of the faith' based on what I have witnessed on this thread, you would have a better chance of converting Osama Bin Laden to Catholicism!

Merry Christmas to all,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was:

From: **Bill Chalker** <bill_c.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 23:53:23 +1100
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 08:06:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was:

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving detailed
>arguments against untouched. He also censored my mention of
>opinion polls showing high levels of support for the reality of
>UFOs amongst the best educated (and the least amongst the poorly
>educated), and also a decent level of support for the ETH shown
>in 1970s polls of technical readers of Optical Spectra and
>Industrial Research/Development journals. And he censored a lot
>of historical material I documented showing clear discussion of
>the ETH even back in 1947 during the big U.S. flying saucer
>wave. Just one example, as noted in Ted Bloecher's review of
>the newspaper articles, is that a Pentagon spokesman on July 8,
>1947, felt it necessary to specifically deny that they were
>explained by "space ships". The article had previously tried to

While Wikipedia might be a good starting point for preliminary information it should always be fact checked elsewhere.

Myself and others have had a sort of 'UFO history war' about the Wikipedia entry on "Australian Ufology". It is a skewed, unbalanced and troubled article that reflects the biases and agendas of the anonymous edits.

My entry on my new UFO history keys blog and the links there tell the sorry story.

While there has been some limited success with correcting some of the problems it seems a waste of time trying to play the Wikipedia 'edit game'. Read my article, Australian UFO History Wars, which can be accessed via my blog:

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

Good luck with trying to sort your Wikipedia problems out.

Regards,

Bill Chalker

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 09:13:17 -0500
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 08:02:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 15:30:05 EST
>Subject: Who's Your Favorite Alien?

><http://www.jamesarness.com/biogphy.htm>

>I was feeling nostalgic for the good TV shows and remembered
>Gunsmoke starring James Arness. I remembered years of watching
>that show with my Dad and Granddad and the lessons the program
>emphasized.

>The longest running dramatic series in TV history too!

>Then I remembered not only did actor James Arness play the most
>famous lawman in TV history, but he also played the coolest and
>scariest alien in movie history for my money, namely the Thing
>from Howard Hawkes classic The Thing From Another World. Gotta
>be the best alien movie ever. Sure, I'm about to get lambasted
>with Klaatu's and Spocks - Spock rules by the way - but The
>Thing was a no-nonsense alien with one agenda: survive!

>No pretense, no benevolent messages and nebulous agendas, just:
>survive!

Seems to me the first Alien movie was also all about survival
when confronted by 'the alien', and this applies to both the
hungry alien as to the frightened human, since the human was,
presumably, alien to 'the alien'.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 10:58:38 -0500
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 08:05:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: Bill Chalker <bill.c.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 23:53:23 +1100
>Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>>favor of the ETH.

<snip>

>Myself and others have had a sort of 'UFO history war' about the
>Wikipedia entry on "Australian Ufology". It is a skewed,
>unbalanced and troubled article that reflects the biases and
>agendas of the anonymous edits.

Myth: Wikipedia is entirely written by a vast community of
independent contributors.

Reality: Wikipedia is controlled by a small group of insiders,
who work hard to guarantee that craziness stays out of the text.

It pretty much has to be that way, if Wikipedia is going to have
any credibility. But a recent interview with Wikipedia's head
guy was quite revealing. He seems to think that most of the
contributors shouldn't get much respect.

In this case, I can imagine that - like many people in
established positions - the Wikipedia insiders think UFOs are
nonsense, and gravitate to the skeptical position. But that
makes David's and Bill's work even more courageous and
necessary. I'd say keep it up, just bombard Wikipedia, and
maybe, just maybe, the people in charge will change their view.

Thanks for your good work, guys. And happy holidays to everyone!

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Lord Hill-Norton Rendlesham Papers

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 16:28:36 -0000
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 08:10:03 -0500
Subject: Lord Hill-Norton Rendlesham Papers

Given the current discussion on this List about the Rendlesham Forest incident, the following documents (.pdf files) from the MoD's website may be of relevance and interest:

<http://tinyurl.com/3xcfeh>

The documents include correspondence between Lord Hill-Norton (a former Chief of the Defence Staff) and Defence Ministers, together with internal MoD papers relating to the handling of this correspondence.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 13:23:47 -0600
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 08:55:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:13:28 -0500
>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>Source: Michio Kaku's Website - New York, New York, USA

>>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>>The Physics Of Extraterrestrial Civilizations
>>How advanced could they possibly be?

>>by Michio Kaku

><snip>

>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving detailed
>arguments against untouched.

><snip>

I'm actually rather surprised to hear that. As much as I disagree with 'movement' skepticism, I always assumed they were still part of the reality-based community, as one Bush advisor derisively called people who valued facts. But deleting information unfavorable to their positions rather than just arguing against it is more like the radical conservatives who believe in the Biblical account of creation. And these 'skeptics' presume to call themselves defenders of reason. I doubt that even the farthest-out 'pro-UFO' people would dream of doing that.

>So I encourage people here to become Wikipedia editors. The
>level of knowledge here on UFOs is much, much higher than the
>usual poorly informed, overly-opinionated, pseudoskeptic college
>science student types who tend to haunt Wikipedia, thinking they
>already know it all.

That sounds like it's worth a try. The main Wiki entry on UFOs appears to present the subject of UFOs in a balanced manor, although I've only skimmed over it:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UFO>

Maybe it hasn't yet occurred to the so-called skeptics to 'correct' it yet.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 14:23:48 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:08:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 23:53:23 +1100
>Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>>favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leavin! g detailed
>>arguments against untouched. He also censored my mention of
>>opinion polls showing high levels of support for the reality of
>>UFOs amongst the best educated (and the least amongst the poorly
>>educated), and also a decent level of support for the ETH shown
>>in 1970s polls of technical readers of Optical Spectra and
>>Industrial Research/Development journals. And he censored a lot
>>of historical material I documented showing clear discussion of
>>the ETH even back in 1947 during the big U.S. flying saucer
>>wave. Just one example, as noted in Ted Bloecher's review of
>>the newspaper articles, is that a Pentagon spokesman on July 8,
>>1947, felt it necessary to specifically deny that they were
>>explained by "space ships". The article had previously tried to

>While Wikipedia might be a good starting point for preliminary
>information it ! should always be fact checked elsewhere.

>Myself and others have had a sort of 'UFO history war' about the
>Wikipedia entry on "Australian Ufology". It is a skewed,
>unbalanced and troubled article that reflects the biases and
>agendas of the anonymous edits.

>My entry on my new UFO history keys blog and the links there
>tell the sorry story.

>While there has been some limited success with correcting some
>of the problems it seems a waste of time trying to play the
>Wikipedia 'edit game'. Read my article, Australian UFO History
>Wars, which can be accessed via my blog:

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

>Good luck with trying to sort your Wikipedia problems out.

Hello David, Bill and Listers,

You might be interested in the following link regarding the KNOL
project from Google that wants to dethrone Wikipedia:

http://www.teachersnews.net/artikel/sek_i/englisch/004660.php

It seems that Knol will feature articles signed b! y 'experts',
not anonymous authors like Wikipedia. You guys might want to get
into this.

More on this if you follow the NEWS links from Google:

<http://tinyurl.com/394t6a>

Btw, the NEWS link from Google provides a search engine on news outlets.

<http://news.google.ca/nwshp?hl=en&tab=wn>

As I key this, a search on the word UFO actually provides 695 hits - 413 effective.

Happy holidays,

Vincent Boudreau

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: Robert Morningstar <robert_morningstar.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 11:41:30 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:10:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 23:53:23 +1100
>Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments in
>favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving detailed
>arguments against untouched. He also censored my mention of
>opinion polls showing high levels of support for the reality of
>UFOs amongst the best educated (and the least amongst the poorly
>educated), and also a decent level of support for the ETH shown
>in 1970s polls of technical readers of Optical Spectra and
>Industrial Research/Development journals. And he censored a lot
>of historical material I documented showing clear discussion of
>the ETH even back in 1947 during the big U.S. flying saucer
>wave. Just one example, as noted in Ted Bloecher's review of
>the newspaper articles, is that a Pentagon spokesman on July 8,
>1947, felt it necessary to specifically deny that they were
>explained by "space ships". The article had previously tried to

>>While Wikipedia might be a good starting point for
>>preliminary
>>information it should always be fact checked elsewhere.

>>Myself and others have had a sort of 'UFO history war' about
>>the Wikipedia entry on "Australian Ufology". It is a skewed,
>>unbalanced and troubled article that reflects the biases and
>>agendas of the anonymous edits.

>>My entry on my new UFO history keys blog and the links there
>>tell the sorry story.

>>While there has been some limited success with correcting
>>some of the problems it seems a waste of time trying to play
>>the Wikipedia 'edit game'. Read my article, Australian UFO
>>History Wars, which can be accessed via my blog:

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

>>Good luck with trying to sort your Wikipedia problems out.

Hello, David & Bill...

Perhaps, one possible solution may be to induce Wikipedia to
have a different format for "opinion issues" such as credence or
skepticism on as yet unresolved scientific mysteries (like UFOs)
or interpretations of historical events. A Pro/Con, or Point<-
>Counterpoint format would categorize the posts easily clearly.
The poster would have to make a choice to target his/her

audience.

Of course, this would only be a partial solution as malicious elements, i.e. those who are not satisfied simply with the right to express expression but feel the need, impulse or compulsion to quash the opinions of others, may still delete pertinent material from UFO Positive sites.

In such cases, a Wiki oversight committee may be necessary to counter such sabotage efforts by checking the content of the pro-site to insure good maintainance and to replace instantly the material that has been targeted for deletion by forces antagonistic to free expression of UFO related credence or opinion.

You have to realize that we are engaged in "Mind Wars" with forces that seek to control the contents and thereby the beliefs of the populace by curtailing free speech, creating confusion, controversy and distraction to obfuscate information about an alternate reality, which they fear.

This is a sometimes dangerous condition because frightened people sometimes do frightening things.

Regards,

Robert M*

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 16:27:22 -0500
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:11:50 -0500
Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

>From: Kathy Kasten <catraja.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 22:52:33 +0000
>Subject: Re: New Videos Of Objects In Space

<snip>

>Amateur astronomers know there are tons of space junk, some of
>it undocumented. Where would you want to hear about this
>fact?

I know that too. I'm not clear on why you are asking "where" I
would want to hear. I already know that, and I'm not seeking to
hear that there is space junk up there.

>I hear about it from other amateur astronomers. The only people
>who haven't heard about it are people not interested in
>astronomy. Such as the general public.

<snip>

>More to the point, why is any caring whether the 'new videos'
>are analyzed?

>Have you seen the one showing "the aliens moving around inside
>their craft"? If not, take a look and then wonder to yourself if
>the poster of the videos is serious or not.

No, I only saw the blurry images of what were touted as
artificial orbiting objects.

What I was suggesting is that if amateur astronomers can take
close ups of artificial orbiting objects with affordable
telescopes, maybe there are some serious space platforms up
there, maybe undocumented. I'd be interested in seeing clear
photos of such items.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 00:30:58 +0000
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:13:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>I've been watching this thread with bewilderment. I expected
>Martin to get a hard time, but what I have seen surpasses any
>previous lack of understanding that I have seen all year. I kept
>out of this because I don't have the time to engage in-depth at
>the moment, but I simply can't stand by and observe what is
>going on without comment.

>Martin's points are well argued and absolutely clear to me, his
>logic is infallible. He is looking objectively at the
>evidence, something which I don't believe I have seen anyone
>else doing including esteemed historian and psychological
>journal editor Richard Hall, who has gone down immensely in my
>esteem.

>Martin, at this point I don't know why you bother - you will
>never alter the 'tenets of the faith' based on what I have
>witnessed on this thread, you would have a better chance of
>converting Osama Bin Laden to Catholicism!

Joe, here's another way to look at what has happened to date on
this particular thread:

1. Martin raised some legitimate concerns about inconsistencies over time in Penniston's Rendlesham story.
2. There was a lively discussion around the possible reasons for these inconsistencies, with particular reference as to whether they discredit Penniston's original testimony, subsequent testimony, both, or neither.
3. A subtle shift then occurred as the focus drifted away from discussion of the primary evidence towards a dispute as to the quality of advocacy of the respective protagonists' interpretation of that evidence.
4. To varying degrees, the protagonists have lost patience with each other's conduct of that secondary dispute and are now at loggerheads.
5. Despite this, the central question remains as to why Penniston's story should have changed, and what is the significance of this change.
6. Of the central protagonists, Dick is the only one who has put forward an unambiguous view as to why Penniston's story should have changed, and has actually offered some evidence (albeit of a 'character witness' status) for his view.
7. The central protagonists are now so annoyed with each other (and very possibly themselves for becoming so annoyed) that the

thread is probably at, or close to, its useful end.

My own view? As somebody who has been following the Rendlesham case intermittently for twenty years, and who has been perplexed by its myriad inconsistencies, I'm saddened that what might have been an illuminating and informative discussion should have degenerated into a series of disagreements with personal overtones.

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming5.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 19:13:29 -0600
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:14:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>Martin, at this point I don't know why you bother - you will
>never alter the 'tenets of the faith' based on what I have
>witnessed on this thread, you would have a better chance of
>converting Osama Bin Laden to Catholicism!

I've seen plenty of scurrilous ad hominem attacks on the List
over the years, but comparing anyone to the most murderous
vilest religious fanatic in the world is really scraping the
bottom of the barrel.

I don't know if you're directing this slur at Dick Hall, at me,
or at both of us. But whoever it is you owe an apology, Mr.
McGonagle.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Alien Worlds Magazine

From: **Stuart Miller** <stuart.4.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 10:20:41 +0000
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 11:18:15 -0500
Subject: Alien Worlds Magazine

The Internet based magazine UFO Review, which has been in hiatus for the last few months, has metamorphosised into a glossy newsstand print magazine called "Alien Worlds".

The first issue will appear on UK retail sale on February 8th 2008 and will be available via a wide array of outlets. Among a number of other European countries also taking the magazine are Ireland, Greece, Poland, Sweden, Israel, Norway and Austria. The selling-in process is ongoing at this moment and it is probable that others will be added to the roster before publication.

Negotiations are also underway for North American distribution but no details are on hand as yet. As the picture becomes clearer, further information will be posted on our web site.

Initially, the magazine will be published bimonthly. It will also be available worldwide via subscription.

Alien Worlds will take a much broader approach to the subject of extraterrestrial life and will encompass astrobiology and SETI as well as the phenomenon of UFOs/UAPs and the origins and development of life here on planet Earth.

In preparation for the launch, a new web site has been created to support the magazine which is located at:

<http://alienworldsmag.com>

It is still being developed but there you will find the identical news service that was previously located at UFO Review as well as a blog, a forum, background information on the magazine, and general articles of interest.

Starting us off, we have a guest article kindly written especially for us by Stan Friedman entitled Flying Saucers And Science - An Overview. In it, Stan explains and describes the background and circumstances that has led to him writing his new book, "my magnum opus", which will be published in June of 2008. The article can be found on the front page of the web site at:

<http://www.alienworldsmag.com>

Barring unforeseen events, it is evident that any imminent progress in the search for extraterrestrial life is going to come first from space flight and astronomy. Alien Worlds will be taking a keen interest in those areas.

But Ufology cannot be ignored. Unlike the other specialities, it is much more people orientated and while there is a diversity of ideas and opinions in the other disciplines, they generally converge towards a central point. Not so with UFOlogy which is rich in disparity and utterly lacking in convergence. This provides an array of fascinating avenues to explore.

My goal has been to get the level and feel of the magazine to a point where I would buy it if I saw it sitting on a rack, and I don't buy magazines. I am very proud of the result. It represents a more progressive and current approach to the question of extraterrestrial life and brings together under one

title a combination of subjects with, broadly speaking, a common goal. There is nothing else like it out there

For those who share this wider perspective, you will find those principles reflected in Alien Worlds.

You are very welcome to join us.

Stuart Miller
Alien Worlds magazine
<http://www.alienworldsmag.com>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Joe (ntl:) McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 16:55:11 +0000
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 07:56:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 00:30:58 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

Hello Gerald, thanks for the response, most of which I agree with
but;

<snip>

>6. Of the central protagonists, Dick is the only one who has put
>forward an unambiguous view as to why Penniston's story should
>have changed, and has actually offered some evidence (albeit of
>a 'character witness' status) for his view.

I thought that Dick's response was untypically subjective, and
misleading.

Dick ought to be more aware than most of the concept of 'myth',
and how myths develop. The case in point is an excellent
example, and I would like to go into more detail, but can't
spare the time. Suffice to say that changed or 'refined'
testimony over time is a significant factor, as any historian or
psychologist ought to realise.

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 17:37:25 -0000
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 07:59:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 13:45:02 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:53:47 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>Did you really just put the words "descriptions of a mere will
>>o'the wisp" into my mouth for the second time? I'm rapidly
>>realising the futility of talking about this since you persist
>>in failing even to even read accurately. In fact this more than
>>a failure, it is a perverse and wilfull misrepresentation
>>peddled a second time after I explicitly and with precise
>>quotation as evidence proved to you that this was neither what
>>I said nor what any rational reader could have conceived that I
>>meant.

>Your original statement was:

>>They saw some wierd display of
>>blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-
>>whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At
>>that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were
>>attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is
>>with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they
>>got right up close and actually touched this thing.

>A weird display of lights that behaves like a will o' the wisp
>is, as far as I can tell, the description of something very
>similar to, and something that just might be, a will_o'_the_
>wisp. You are the one who put those words into your own
>mouth.

>Don't blame me for it.

Well the entire force of that paragarph turns on the phrase "as
far as I can tell", which frankly is not far. You misinterpreted
me innocently once, but after having refused to listen to my
explanation of what I meant you have now persisted in
deliberately misrepresenting me twice. Your credibility
balance is now in negative figures.

>The Halt memo makes it clear that from the very beginning,
>someone in Penniston's group was describing something that
>cannot be explained away as "some wierd display of blue and red
>lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the- whisp fashion,"
>to use your exact words so as to avoid any future complaints
>and false accusations.

This is absolutely stunning! How the hell can a wierd mobile
display of blue and red lights which at least one witness was
certain were attached to an unknown mechanical device be an
explaining-away of anything? You must set the bar for anomalous
experience far higher than I do. I could fill a very long post

with quotes proving how hard I've tried to insist that "someone in Penniston's group" was describing what he was convinced was a mechanical device, in terms plainly echoed in Halt's memo. But you just won't have it. You won't be happy until I do claim that all they saw was a whisp of gas.

You assert that I "said the witnesses' statements were will-o-the-wispy", which I certainly didn't, and you add, "which they were". But no, they weren't! Penniston and Burroughs were clear in describing and drawing what they thought was a structured arrangement of brilliant white, red and blue lights. They initially judged that the lights were near the edge of the forest, and when they went after them they seemed to get close, at which point one witness at least was positive that they were attached to a mechanical device, which then rushed away deeper into the forest. As Penniston described this, "it moved in a zig-zagging manner back through the woods". They followed it to where they thought it exited the far side of the forest into the field. But when they climbed into the field after it, the thing vanished.

All this was described by Sgt Chandler in these terms: "Each time Penniston gave me the indication that he was about to reach the area where the lights were, he would give an extended estimated location...", terms which are (to my mind) instantly reminiscent of the type of leading-on or teasing behaviour which is traditionally ascribed to phenomena we call will-o-the-wisp, will-with-a-wisp, ingis fatuus etc. This fugitivity is what is conveyed by the "will o' the wisp" simile as used by poets and in common speech for centuries. That is the sense in which I intended it originally and intend it now. I also described Penniston's drawing as resembling a "drum". I suppose I should be thankful that I'm not being accused of "explaining away" that as a giant percussion instrument.

You are at liberty not to like the metaphor but you are not at liberty to misrepresent your own interpretation as mine, and then use this bogus issue as an ignis fatuus of your own, designed to "mislead the amaz'd night wanderer" (Milton) away from the numerous real issues you don't want to confront.

I'm tired of finding different ways to repeat myself, but in case others are being misled by your persistent claims I will quote just this one paragraph from an earlier post:

'The descriptions of a bank of blue lights topped by a red light; Burroughs' drawing showing this arrangement of lights on a triangular shape; Penniston's confirmation of having "positively identified" it from 50 meters as a "mechanical device" - these all add up to a sighting of something aptly characterised as a structured object not a vague glow.'

>That's all I've got time for. There's really no point in
>debating someone who's too fond of his own argument to concede
>that rational people just might find it less than completely
>convincing.

And that's your only response to a whole list of interrelated issues that have been raised? Lob in one final smoke-bomb of misrepresentation and run away? This is not how rational people deal with things. Rational people will understand that the point of proposing arguments is to have them discussed rationally and exposed to conscientious counter-arguments. But you haven't got time. Cheerio then.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 13:05:47 -0500
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 08:00:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

[non-subscriber submission]

Unfortunately, Wikipedia's strangely casual attitude towards its own credibility extends well beyond the controversial subject of UFOs.

An example of the utter worthlessness of another entry is that for "Air Racing History", a subject that is known sufficiently well by the undersigned to warrant his election to the presidency of the Society of Air Racing Historians. I checked the entry on this topic a year or so ago and was shocked to read a few paragraphs which were riddled with errors. I promptly corrected the many mistakes, as requested by the website's policy, appending my credentials. I checked back a couple of weeks later and found my entry replaced by another one which was substantially wrong, though not quite as bad as the first.

To refer anyone to this section of the website would therefore be unthinkable, and I have no reason to believe that many other entries are any more factual. Wikipedia, rather than being an example of democracy in action, illustrates nothing better than anarchy.

Don Berliner
The Fund for UFO Research, Inc.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 10:28:02 -0800
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 08:18:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 13:23:47 -0600
>Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2007 13:00:21 -0800
>>Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 08:13:28 -0500
>>Subject: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI [was: Kaku...]

>>I've been recently trying to edit a very slanted article on the
>>ETH over on Wikipedia which failed to present such arguments
>>in favor of the ETH. When I tried to insert some of Kaku's
>>arguments and others by Bernard Haisch, one of the CSICOP
>>debunkers came in and deleted them all - while leaving
>>detailed arguments against untouched.

><snip>

>I'm actually rather surprised to hear that. As much as I
>disagree with 'movement' skepticism, I always assumed they were
>still part of the reality-based community, as one Bush advisor
>derisively called people who valued facts. But deleting
>information unfavorable to their positions rather than just
>arguing against it is more like the radical conservatives who
>believe in the Biblical account of creation. And these
>'skeptics' presume to call themselves defenders of reason. I
>doubt that even the farthest-out 'pro-UFO' people would dream
>of doing that.

>>So I encourage people here to become Wikipedia editors. The
>>level of knowledge here on UFOs is much, much higher than the
>>usual poorly informed, overly-opinionated, pseudoskeptic college
>>science student types who tend to haunt Wikipedia, thinking
>>they already know it all.

>That sounds like it's worth a try. The main Wiki entry on UFOs
>appears to present the subject of UFOs in a balanced manor,
>although I've only skimmed over it:

><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UFO>

>Maybe it hasn't yet occurred to the so-called skeptics to
>'correct' it yet.

The main article had problems too for many months. Another one
of these censoring morons came through and started deleting
everything. The "rationale" was usually, "Those citations are
from a UFO conspiratorialist's website or some UFO fanatic's
book, therefore the material is all invalid." Then--POOF--the
material gets deleted. Fortunately on this article, it got so
decimated and it was so obvious what was going on, that the
article finally got restored.

The self-image and mindset of these CSICOPIAN censors seems to
be, "I'm brilliant, I've got a science degree or will get one,
"science" and therefore I know all that is true, I know UFOs are
all a bunch of nonsense, and it is my sacred duty to carry
science and truth to the unwashed, uneducated, gullible masses.

They shall not hear otherwise."

The reality is the CSICOPian censors are arrogant, egocentric mental cases who can only feel secure if their world view goes unchallenged. They are totally intolerant of other points of view, no matter how well documented. The irony is that "science", which they always profess to be defending, is exactly the opposite of this (at least ideally).

Recently deceased author Robert Anton Wilson noticed the striking similarity between the CSICOPIAN mindset and that of religious fanatics and wrote a book about it, "The New Inquisition." His description in an interview was, "I coined the term irrational rationalism because those people claim to be rationalists, but they're governed by such a heavy body of taboos. They're so fearful, and so hostile, and so narrow, and frightened, and uptight and dogmatic... I wrote this book because I got tired satirizing fundamentalist Christianity... I decided to satirize fundamentalist materialism for a change, because the two are equally comical... The materialist fundamentalists are funnier than the Christian fundamentalists, because they think they're rational! ...They're never skeptical about anything except the things they have a prejudice against. None of them ever says anything skeptical about the AMA, or about anything in establishment science or any entrenched dogma. They're only skeptical about new ideas that frighten them. They're actually dogmatically committed to what they were taught when they were in college..."

I think Wilson nailed it right on the head!

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 23:48:11 -0500
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 12:33:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 19:13:29 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>Martin, at this point I don't know why you bother - you will
>>never alter the 'tenets of the faith' based on what I have
>>witnessed on this thread, you would have a better chance of
>>converting Osama Bin Laden to Catholicism!

>I've seen plenty of scurrilous ad hominem attacks on the List
>over the years, but comparing anyone to the most murderous
>vilest religious fanatic in the world is really scraping the
>bottom of the barrel.

>I don't know if you're directing this slur at Dick Hall, at me,
>or at both of us. But whoever it is you owe an apology, Mr.
>McGonagle.

Joe didn't compare either of you to Bin Laden. Read it again. He
could just as easily have said, "convince Winnie the Pooh to
swear off honey."

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

At Least NORAD Is Tracking Santa Claus

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 12:38:10 -0500
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 12:38:10 -0500
Subject: At Least NORAD Is Tracking Santa Claus

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void - Sarasota Herald Tribune,
Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/34yy9v>

Friday, Dec. 21, 2007

At Least NORAD Is Tracking Santa Claus

By Billy Cox

billy.cox.nul

In light of this week=92s government-level UFO banter in Tokyo, it=92s kinda fitting that the 100th Monkey Effect was conceived in Japan.

You remember that one, right? Scientists studying simian behavior on Koshima Island in the 1950s supposedly noticed how an 18-month old female monkey started rinsing off sweet potatoes in a stream before eating them.

She teaches a few adults to emulate her; more join in. Next thing you know, the numbers indulging this new activity reach a critical mass of, say, 100, and =97 bingo =97 the entire population is washing its sweet potatoes.

But it doesn=92t stop there. Suddenly, without coming into physical contact with each other, monkey colonies on remote islands begin adopting the same behaviors. Depending on what you read, it=92s either the observational basis for a paradigm shift or a bunch of hokum from New Age fact-fudgers.

Either way, De Void couldn=92t help thinking about the 100th Monkey Effect when Reuters covered a Japanese exchange on UFOs on Tuesday.

Setting the stage was last month=92s milestone press conference in Washington, D.C. That=92s when pilots and retired military officials from nations whose governments sponsor UFO research (France, England, Chile and Peru, among others) called on the U.S. to join them in their official studies.

So, the other day, Japanese lawmaker Ryuji Yamane, of the opposition Democratic Party, challenged his government in kind.

"This is an issue that the nation is interested in. It is a defense issue, and a confirmation operation needs to take place," Yamane said. "But the government does not even try to collect information necessary for confirmation."

That prompted a headline-making statement from Chief Cabinet Secretary Nobutaka Machimura. "I definitely believe they exist," he said to laughter from the peanut gallery. Which obliged Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda to weigh in as well, saying "I have yet to confirm" that UFOs exist.

On Thursday, Japanese Defense Minister Shigeru Ishiba retorted, "There are no grounds for us to deny that there are unidentified flying objects and some life-form that controls them."

But he wondered if a military response to UFO violations of Japan's airspace would be justified in the absence of hostile intent. "Would that be mobilization for an act of defense? That would not be the case if they say, 'Everyone on Earth, let us be friends,'" Ishiba told Kyodo News. "Or what can we do when we can't figure out what they're saying?"

So the dialogue gets under way in Japan. For a few minutes, anyway.

Meanwhile, back in the States, the 100th Monkey Effect is profound. Responding to calls for more UFO transparency, the North American Aerospace Defense Command will be tracking Santa Claus in real time at www.noradsanta.org.

On that sad note, De Void is signing off. This exercise in futility will resume on the other side of Christmas.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 12:45:25 -0500
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 12:45:25 -0500
Subject: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting?

Source: The Progress-Index - Petersburg, Virginia, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/28awub>

12/22/2007

Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting?

If the 250-plus planets that scientists have discovered orbiting stars other than our own sun, one is believed to be somewhat like earth - rocky rather than gaseous, at a distance from its star that allows for moderate temperatures and liquid water. It's 68 light years away, 399 trillion miles or so, meaning that an object traveling at the speed of light would have to do so for 68 years to get from here to there, or from there to here.

Given that exhaustive research hasn't revealed any signs of life elsewhere in our own solar system, and that the next likely candidate is a goodly jaunt even at the speed of light, it's not likely that we're being buzzed by alien life forms.

NASA, then, might well be correct in insisting that there was nothing extraordinary about a UFO sighting near Kecksburg, in the southwestern corner of Pennsylvania, where something fell from the sky and was retrieved by soldiers in 1965. Yet it has reacted to requests for records of the incident as if it was keeping a little green man in a freezer.

NASA stonewalled but ran into a petitioner with resources, the Sci-Fi Channel, which persisted. Finally, NASA frustrated even U.S. District Judge Emmet Sullivan of Washington, D.C., who described NASA's document search as a "ball of yarn". The cost so far to taxpayers: \$100,000, not much by government standards, but still a lot of Tang.

The judge ordered both sides to search the documents and report to him. Meanwhile, the case illustrated how, to the government, full disclosure too often is an alien concept.

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Test - 01

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 14:18:49 -0500
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 14:18:49 -0500
Subject: Test - 01

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

C-C-Christmas Ch-Ch-Changes

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 19:48:36 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 19:48:36 -0500
Subject: C-C-Christmas Ch-Ch-Changes

In order to cut down on access difficulties, service outages, and waiting 24 hours for 'support' to respond, arrangements are being made to change hosts for the VSN sites.

The migration to the new host will take place over the next two-three weeks, with the UFO UpDates Archive and SDI podcasts areas moved only when their new homes are functioning as they should.

Naturally, things won't be as seamless as we'd all like them to be and I thank you for your patience in advance...

Some List-submissions may have gone astray in the last 24 hours or so. If a mail you sent does not appear by mid-day tomorrow, Christmas Eve, please re-send.

ebk

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

MoD To Release 160 UFO Files

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 17:57:56 +0000
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 19:57:54 -0500
Subject: MoD To Release 160 UFO Files

Source: UK-UFO.Org

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/di55docs.html>

December 21, 2007

MoD To Release 160 UFO Files

Following sustained pressure by a small number of UFO researchers during the last 8 years, the British Ministry of Defence have decided to release all of their UFO files.

Gary Anthony, Dave Clarke, and Joe McGonagle have been making full use of the Freedom of Information Act and it's precursor, the Code of Practice on access to Government information. At considerable personal expense, effort, and investment of time the three of us have submitted a steady stream of requests. As well as making requests ourselves, we actively encouraged and assisted other ufologists to make their own requests.

Dave Clarke obtained a listing of files held by the MoD on the topic of Unidentified Flying Objects during 2003. In the course of requesting the contents of some of those files, we discovered that 24 files created by DI55 (the Defence Intelligence Branch charged with the investigation of UFO reports) were contaminated by asbestos, and their destruction was being considered. Not only were the UFO records contaminated, but a total of 63,000 files estimated at between 6 to 12 million pages, most of them classified above Secret were facing the same fate. The files covered a wide range of topics from a key period of military and political history.

We campaigned to ensure the salvage of the file contents by gaining the active support of MPs, academics, the media, and ufologists. It didn't take long for the MoD to realise that destruction of the files would be inexcusable and they instigated a project to digitally scan the files before they were destroyed at an estimated cost of 3 million pounds. We continued to monitor the progress of the project, requesting periodic updates from the Departmental Records Officer at the MoD.

Another significant achievement in the course of our activity was identifying the existence of the 'Condign report' in 2005 and securing it's release in 2006. This was the first document obtained under the FoIA with a 'SECRET' classification.

Scanning of the 24 contaminated UFO files owned by DI55 was completed in the early part of 2007, and this prompted a dialogue within the MoD as to the future release of files. Due to the volume of requests about UFOs received by Defence Intelligence, they discussed the viability of a staged, wholesale release, and concluded in April 2007 that this was the preferred way forward. This encouraged the Directorate of Air Space (DAS, the MoD agency charged with filtering reports before passing those thought to be of defence interest to other MoD branches including DI55) to make a similar evaluation and they have now also reached a decision for a staged release of all of

their UFO records.

Our enquires have established the following details about the intended release;

1. There are a total of 160 files managed by DAS and DI55 which will be released. These cover a period from the late 1970s up to 2007, including a series of files containing FoIA requests and their responses on the subject of UFOs from 2005 to present.

[Link to a pdf file of the list of files scheduled for release. There is a pagination error in the file, but most of the information is visible.] <http://www.uk-ufo.org/downloads/filelist.pdf>

2. It is expected to take 3 years to review, redact, and release the files, but release will occur in batches as they become available. It is currently intended to process the files in chronological order.

3. Personal details of officials and members of the public will be redacted, but the unredacted versions will be released under the terms of the Public Records Act, normally after 30 years.

4. The files will not be generally published on the MoD web site, but will be released to the National Archives in both paper and digital form. TNA will publish them on-line, but there will probably be a fee charged for their download in accordance with existing TNA policy.

5. It is likely that the MoD will respond to many future FoIA requests about UFOs along the lines that publication is scheduled via TNA, and the requester will have to wait until the information is available from TNA (covered by section 22 of the FoIA, "Information intended for Future Publication").

6. The first tranche of documents are expected to be released during spring 2008.

The following is a direct quote from an FoIA response from the MoD explaining the rationale behind the release. Elsewhere in the response, the release was described as "a major exercise, which I believe is unique in MoD history".

"The subject of UFOs is one of the most popular subjects for FOI requests. Answering requests takes a considerable amount of time and resources and can involve officials in days of work, which frequently means trawling through old files to find the information requested. By placing the UFO files on-line at the National Archive in a structured manner, the MoD is able to follow its remit for more open government and, by re-directing applicants to the National Archive site, reduce the amount of time it spends answering requests. By opening our files in this way, we may also help to counter the maze of rumour and frequently ill informed speculation that surrounds the role of the MoD in the UFO phenomena."

Within the next three years, everyone will be able to see the true level of interest and effectiveness demonstrated by the MoD on the topic of UFOs for themselves. This release will be a source of disappointment or vindication for some, and embarrassment for others. Conspiracy theorists who believe that the various governments of the world are hiding secrets about the 'reality' of alien visitation will see this move as another whitewash effort by the MoD and will probably continue their self-sustaining 'campaign for the truth', when the 'truth' really will be 'out there' - just that they don't believe it!

Gary Anthony
Dave Clarke
Joe McGonagle

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 08:33:23 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:06:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 16:55:11 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>I thought that Dick's response was untypically subjective, and
>misleading.

>Dick ought to be more aware than most of the concept of 'myth',
>and how myths develop. The case in point is an excellent
>example, and I would like to go into more detail, but can't
>spare the time. Suffice to say that changed or 'refined'
>testimony over time is a significant factor, as any historian or
>psychologist ought to realise.

Joe,

Thanks for the lecture. I didn't respond to your rather
insulting remarks initially, but since you persist in your
quaint views as to what constitutes objectivity,

I will now. At least you are specific in calling Rendlesham
Forest a myth. How I would love to see you sit down face to face
with Halt and Penniston and say that directly to them.

When someone responds to my comments with smart alec remarks
like Martin did {e.g., "If you say so"}, I see nothing
inappropriate about citing some of my credentials for holding
that opinion. Whereupon I am called "pompous" and worse by both
of you. Name-calling is not rational discussion. I think you are
dead wrong about the Rendlesham Forest case, and I have read and
studied literally a boxful of documents and records on it and
interviewed Col. Halt about it in depth. Anyone's opinion no
matter how logically and rationally based technically is
"subjective." Yours included. I guess "objective" means agreeing
with you and Martin. Sorry, I strongly disagree.

You are certainly entitled to your opinion. At least I have
taken the time to respond to and comment on the alleged changes
in testimony in some detail. Both of you, in my humble and
misguided and subjective opinion, are grossly exaggerating the
degree and significance of changes in testimony. Further, I
supplied simple and logical alternative explanations for the
initial withholding of details that are well-grounded in both
human psychology and the history of UFOs and ridicule. I see no
reason why we can't agree to disagree in civil fashion.

A myth? Bah, humbug!

Merry Christmas,

Dick

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfl Fleming5.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 10:13:38 -0600
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:09:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 17:37:25 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lfl Fleming5.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2007 13:45:02 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2007 18:53:47 -0000
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>><snip>

>>>Did you really just put the words "descriptions of a mere will
>>>o'the wisp" into my mouth for the second time? I'm rapidly
>>>realising the futility of talking about this since you persist
>>>in failing even to even read accurately. In fact this more than
>>>a failure, it is a perverse and wilfull misrepresentation
>>>peddled a second time after I explicitly and with precise
>>>quotation as evidence proved to you that this was neither what
>>>I said nor what any rational reader could have conceived that I
>>>meant.

>>Your original statement was:

>>>They saw some wierd display of
>>>blue and red lights that behaved in an apparent will-o'-the-
>>>whisp fashion and vanished before they got nearer than 50m. At
>>>that distance Penniston (at least) was "positive" they were
>>>attached to an unknown mechanical device. Fine. The problem is
>>>with the emergence of a new narrative which claims that they
>>>got right up close and actually touched this thing.

>>A weird display of lights that behaves like a will o' the wisp
>>is, as far as I can tell, the description of something very
>>similar to, and something that just might be, a will_o'_the_
>>wisp_. You are the one who put those words into your own
>>mouth.

>>Don't blame me for it.

>Well the entire force of that paragarph turns on the phrase "as
>far as I can tell", which frankly is not far. You misinterpreted
>me innocently once, but after having refused to listen to my
>explanation of what I meant you have now persisted in
>deliberately_ misrepresenting me twice. Your credibility
>balance is now in negative figures.

I just quoted you verbatim, and I am not misinterpreting you at
all.

I understood that you were describing the apparently elusive
motion of "weird lights" that may have seemed to have structure.
I even agreed with your characterization of the written
descriptions as having a will-o-the-wisp quality to them.

My point, which I obviously think is more important than you do is that the omission of the triangular shape from their written statements was a significant omission, proving that they weren't writing down everything they knew in those statements, and therefore giving some support to their claim that they were being reticent with their interrogators. You can rant all you want, but I am not convinced the evidence is overwhelming that Penniston's later story is a lie, and neither are a lot of other reasonable people.

BTW: There's an unwritten debating rule that whoever compares the opponent to Hitler loses. The same goes for Bin Laden.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 13:43:09 -0600
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:12:34 -0500
Subject: The Fermi Death Sentence

Source: Nonotechnology Now

<http://www.nanotech-now.com/columns/?article=149>

December 21st, 2007

The Fermi Death Sentence
Mike Treder

Center for Responsible Nanotechnology

Abstract:

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the Fermi Paradox is what it suggests for the future of our human civilization. Namely, that we have no future beyond earthly confinement and, quite possibly, extinction. Could advanced nanotechnology play a role in preventing that extinction? Or, more darkly, is it destined to be instrumental in carrying out humanity's unavoidable death sentence?

Most readers of this column probably are familiar with the Fermi Paradox. In 1950, the physicist Enrico Fermi famously wondered, "Where is everybody?" He was referring to the strange silence in the universe, the apparent lack of any advanced civilizations beyond Earth.

Fermi reasoned that the size and age of the universe would indicate that many technologically advanced extraterrestrial civilizations ought to exist. However, this hypothesis is inconsistent with the lack of observational evidence to support it.

So, where is everybody? Nowhere, it seems, or at least nowhere that we can detect.

Many explanations have been offered for this conundrum, with none coming even close to finding consensus. Physicists, astronomers, and philosophers are as far from answering the question today as when Fermi first posed it.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the Fermi Paradox is what it suggests for the future of our human civilization. Namely, that we have no future beyond earthly confinement and, quite possibly, extinction.

But why should that be? Don't we have a potentially limitless future, with a solar system and eventually a galaxy waiting to be explored and settled?

It would seem so, and yet, the available evidence may suggest otherwise.

If there are no other advanced civilizations detectable, it must mean one of three things:

1. We are the first intelligent beings capable of expanding into the cosmos and making our presence known. There have been no others.
2. There have been others before us, but all of them, without exception, have chosen - or somehow been forced - to expand in such a way that they are presently undetectable by our most sophisticated instruments.
3. There have been others, but all of them, without exception, have run into a cosmic roadblock that either destroys them or prevents their expansion beyond a small radius.

The first proposition, that we humans are unique and special, appears quite absurd. It contradicts all that we have discovered during the last 500 years about the true nature of the universe and our place in it. We're not special: the Earth is not at the center of our solar system, the solar system is not at the center of our galaxy, and our galaxy is not at any special position in the universe. Our placement in space and time seems to be random and unremarkable.

Moreover, we humans, along with every other form of life, have evolved to our present state in accordance with natural selection. There's nothing special about us.

Why, then, would it even be conceivable that earthlings are destined to be the very first species to make a noticeable mark on the universe?

If we reject proposition 1, then we must choose between propositions 2 and 3.

There is a crucial distinction between the second and third propositions. The former relies on choice, while the latter implies restriction by some force or law of the universe.

It seems strange to imagine, as suggested by proposition 2, that all extraterrestrial civilizations would, without exception, choose to expand or exist in such a way that they are completely undetectable to us. If proposition 2 is correct, it requires every one of potentially hundreds, thousands, or even millions of advanced worlds to make the exact same decision. We might expect some to do so, perhaps even most, but all? That defies logic.

So we are left with the third answer. Whatever civilizations have come before us have been unable to surpass the cosmic roadblock. They are either destroyed or limited in such a way that absolutely precludes their expansion into the visible universe. If that is indeed the case - and it would seem to be the most logical explanation for Fermi's Paradox - then there is some immutable law that we too must expect to encounter at some point. We are, effectively, sentenced to death or, at best, life in the prison of a near-space bubble.

How might this sentence be carried out? Is it possible that nanotechnology could play a role, either in bringing about our extinction or possibly preventing it?

At the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology, we take seriously the danger that atomically-precise exponential manufacturing could enable such concentrations of unprecedented power as to result in either terminal warfare or permanent enslavement of the human race. Of course, that sounds terribly apocalyptic, but it is worth considering that the warnings we heard at the start of the nuclear arms race, and the very real risks we faced in the height of the Cold War, were but precursors to a much greater threat posed by an arms race involving nano-built weaponry and its accompanying tools of surveillance and control.

Could that be the pre-determined limiting factor that dooms all advanced civilizations? Or is it something else? In any case, we'd do well to carefully investigate the potential power of nanotech weapons systems and the destabilizing impacts they might have before they are actually produced. Otherwise, we may run the risk of pronouncing our own Fermi Death Sentence.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

'Alien' Seeks To Put An End To UFO Discussions

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:15:18 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:15:18 -0500
Subject: 'Alien' Seeks To Put An End To UFO Discussions

Source: The Daily Yomiuri - Osaka, Japan

<http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/national/20071223TDY03302.htm>

Dec. 23, 2007

'Alien' Seeks To Put An End To UFO Discussions

The Yomiuri Shimbun

Opposition lawmakers have joined ruling party members in calling on Cabinet members to stop talking about UFOs.

Democratic Party of Japan Secretary General Yukio Hatoyama on Friday told reporters that government officials and lawmakers should avoid getting deeply involved in the UFO discussions, adding his voice to similar comments by some ruling party lawmakers.

"If aliens existed and came to Earth, they would have to be creatures of far greater intellect than human beings, which is just impossible," said Hatoyama, who is often called an "alien" because of his appearance. "Since it's all complete fantasy, it makes no sense to discuss how the Defense Ministry should respond."

Hatoyama's eagerness to close the curtain on the UFO discussion stems partly from the fact that it was a DPJ lawmaker who triggered the discussion by submitting a written question to the Cabinet, which asked whether the government could confirm that UFOs were alien spacecraft, according to sources.

In response, the government on Tuesday issued a statement it was unable to confirm whether UFOs were piloted by aliens.

DPJ House of Councillors Ryuji Yamane, who submitted the question, has posted the response on his Web site, and says that he also wants to end the alien furor.

"I and my staff have been relieved to find that we haven't had any calls of complaint over the whole issue, which may be partly down to the fact that Chief Cabinet Secretary Nobutaka Machimura made a positive statement [regarding his personal views on the existence of UFOs]," Yamane said on his Web site.

"Now, I'd like to devote myself to welfare policy," he added.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: **Ed Gehrman** <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 19:29:46 -0800
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:17:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>Source: The Progress-Index - Petersburg, Virginia, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/28awub>

>12/22/2007

>Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting?

>If the 250-plus planets that scientists have discovered orbiting
>stars other than our own sun, one is believed to be somewhat
>like earth - rocky rather than gaseous, at a distance from its
>star that allows for moderate temperatures and liquid water.
>It's 68 light years away, 399 trillion miles or so, meaning that
>an object traveling at the speed of light would have to do so
>for 68 years to get from here to there, or from there to here.

>Given that exhaustive research hasn't revealed any signs of life
>elsewhere in our own solar system, and that the next likely
>candidate is a goodly jaunt even at the speed of light, it's not
>likely that we're being buzzed by alien life forms.

List,

What "exhaustive research"? There are signs of life: UFO and the
creatures who fly them. Mars and Venus may now be poor
candidates for existing life but both could have had periods
when life flourished.

Civilization and extensive tool use probably has happened before
in the solar system, just as it has on earth, with toolmakers
millions of years more advanced than us, possessing technology
which has allowed them to live wherever they feel secure.

To limit the discussion to either star travelers or illusion
seems fairly stupid, to me.

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

MoD To Open British UFO X-Files

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:21:15 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:21:15 -0500
Subject: MoD To Open British UFO X-Files

Source: The Daily Telegraph - London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/292ht2>

24/12/2007

MoD To Open British UFO X-Files
By Aislinn Simpson

Top-secret details about hundreds of sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects are to be released for public viewing in response to the nation's continuing fascination with the subject.

The Ministry of Defence will release a total of 160 files dating back to that time to the National Archives in Kew.

The first files will be made available in Spring 2008 and the process is expected to take three years.

The MoD has received reports of over 10,000 UFO sightings since the UFO project was set up in 1950.

After investigation, around 5 per cent remain unexplained. According to Nick Pope, who ran the Ministry of Defence UFO project from 1991 to 1994, some of the sightings are "highly credible".

He decided to speak out about the failure to seriously address the issue after resigning from his MoD post at the Directorate of Defence Security last year.

He claimed that he and his staff spent their time releasing documents in answer to Freedom of Information requests from the media or members of the public instead of interviewing witnesses to more credible sightings

It is understood that the MoD has decided to release the documents because it receives more FoI requests on the subject that on any other.

Mr Pope said that while he was initially sceptical about UFOs, access to the classified files and investigation of a series of spectacular UFO sightings - mainly by police and military personnel - had changed his mind.

One such sighting was of a "vast, triangular-shaped craft" firing a narrow beam of light onto the ground and emitting a low-frequency humming sound that was spotted flying over RAF Cosford in the West Midlands and RAF Shawbury in Shropshire in 1993.

In another incident, at the Twin Bases of RAF Bentwaters and RAF Woodbridge in Suffolk in December 1980, RAF staff were sent to investigate a suspected plane crash after bright lights were reported emanating from nearby woods.

They found a kind of lunar landing module standing on three

legs, decorated with strange hieroglyphic-type markings, which then flew off.

The indents it left in the ground were examined the next morning with a Geiger Counter and emitted ten times the normal levels of radiation.

However, the Ministry of Defence does not attempt to identify such aircraft unless it sees "evidence to suggest that UK airspace has been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity".

When the French government released all its UFO files earlier this year, the dedicated website promptly crashed due to the number of people trying to access the information.

Mr Pope said he expected to see similar a flurry of interest in the files, which he predicted would convert some sceptics.

"Whatever people think about UFOs, these documents are fascinating and show how the MoD has researched and investigated this mystery for nearly 60 years, without an answer," he said.

A Ministry of Defence spokeswoman confirmed the documents would be released from next year. "There has always been a great deal of interest in this subject," she said.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 12:28:46 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:23:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 13:05:47 -0500
>Subject: Re: Wikipedia UFO Entries & CSICOP/CSI

>[non-subscriber submission]

>Unfortunately, Wikipedia's strangely casual attitude towards its
>own credibility extends well beyond the controversial subject of
>UFOs.

>An example of the utter worthlessness of another entry is that
>for "Air Racing History", a subject that is known sufficiently
>well by the undersigned to warrant his election to the
>presidency of the Society of Air Racing Historians. I checked
>the entry on this topic a year or so ago and was shocked to read
>a few paragraphs which were riddled with errors. I promptly
>corrected the many mistakes, as requested by the website's
>policy, appending my credentials. I checked back a couple of
>weeks later and found my entry replaced by another one which was
>substantially wrong, though not quite as bad as the first.

>Don Berliner
>The Fund for UFO Research, Inc.

Wikipedia - in spite of something I myself posted about them -
isn't as bad as that. Of course there are bound to be mistakes.
There surely are mistakes in any encyclopedia. I've found some
big ones in the standard, expert-written 19-volume classical
music reference book, the New Grove Dictionary of Music. I
think it's 19 volumes. I might be more. I always use it online.

I use Wikipedia often on subjects I know a fair amount about,
just to check facts - dates, and the like - that I'm not certain
of. I find the articles mostly quite authoritative. And sometime
in the past year or so, the New York Times had a story about a
detailed comparison of Wikipedia and Encyclopedia Britannica
articles. Scientists made the comparison, to check the accuracy
of both. Wikipedia was just as accurate as the Britannica, and
sometimes more so.

Greg Sandow

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:40:14 -0500
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 20:28:59 -0500
Subject: TV Host At Kucinich Again

Chris Matthews on his show on MSNBC-TV, here in the US, today once again got on Kucinich's UFO incident, nominating Kucinich for an unfavorable goof for seeing an ET manifestation.

Matthews ignored Kucinich's statement that he saw something in the sky he couldn't identify. It is pop-culture and ufoology that equate UFOs = ET spaceships.

I have read thousands of UFO reports, the majority of UFO witnesses say they saw something they couldn't identify or understand. Few report they had an experience with ETs, at least initially. Perhaps on further contemplation some come to that conclusion, but most reports do not make that connection rather they report something outside ordinary experience which is why they report it.

I don't have much use for Kucinich's politics, but he at least can claim consistent policies that do not change with the political winds. That puts him head and shoulders above his peers, so his views should get a hearing, not some unusual event in his past that a hack (a purposeful characterization of Matthews) journalist thinks is a great taunt during a supposed serious debate. I think Matthews has neither the guts or gonads to ask Clinton if she stands by her "vast right wing conspiracy" remark.

Matthews also made comments about Kucinich's wife, a tall red-haired Brit who has a tongue ring and towers over her husband. I rather admire Kucinich's choice in women, it must be a secure man indeed who needs climbing tackle to scale her heights.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331, USA
(860) 546-9135

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Return Of The Giants?

From: Barry Chamish <chamish.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 11:34:45 -0500
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 08:57:47 -0500
Subject: Return Of The Giants?

Hello,

From 1987-99 Israel boasted a spectacular UFO wave and I was the reporter who covered it in depth. The incidents were profound, culminating in the close encounters with giants mostly around the town of Kadima. The book was once nearly impossible to find, but it's back:

Return Of The Giants

Available in two editions, with black and white illustrations or with the more expensive color illustrations.

Many, many color shots of UFO evidence.

<http://www.lulu.com/content/541532>

<http://www.lulu.com/content/541370>

In thirteen dramatic chapters, the book takes you from the pictographs of Shikmoneh Beach, the giant tracks of Yatztitz, the encounters of Kadima, following the flow of occasional frauds, much real physical evidence and two dozen photos of the adventure. Most spectacular are the three photos of the alien being filmed during the night of the sun at Ramat Hachayal. This is possibly the only alien being ever photographed with its shadow following its body. Lulu.com will let you download the book for under \$10 or will send a handsome copy to your home for under \$20. Between us though, order the color version for the best experience.

May I present the DVD of Return Of The Giants as well? Besides presenting programs I advised for NBC and Fox-TV, I include over 20 amateur clips including the now famous Hatzor "balcony" craft, a disc over Rishon Letzion chased by an Israeli jet in clear daylight, and the only known UFO attack, over Rosh Haayin, where two UFOs collide and explode. I hope \$20 is a fair price for my work.

If you wish to purchase the DVD, or invite me to lecture or be interviewed, write chamish.nul or call me at 904 501 7605

Meanwhile, here's the introduction to the book:

Introduction:

Return Of The Giants?

Are the Anakim or the Refaim, the giants of the Bible returning to Israel today? There are only two periods of recorded history when giants were reported in Israel; In biblical days from the time of the Flood to the ascension of King David and since 1993 in modern Israel.

The case for the return of giants to Israel is airtight. The giants thoughtfully chose reliable contactees as witnesses,

allowed their craft to be filmed and left in their wake ample physical evidence.

In fact, what characterizes the current Israeli UFO wave from others in the world, is the sheer abundance of physical evidence left behind by the visitors. Consider the first incident to usher Israel into the UFO age.

On the evening of Sept. 28, 1987, a 27 year old auto mechanic, Ami Achrai was driving just south of Haifa when he saw what he thought might be a helicopter in distress hovering just above the sands of Shikmona Beach on the Mediterranean Sea. He stopped his car and to his utter amazement saw a disc-shaped craft which emitted a bright red flash before disappearing.

Two days later he returned to the site with a ufologist the police referred him to, Hadassah Arbel. What they discovered remains one of the most lasting proofs ever left by a UFO of its physical existence. The flash emitted by the craft burned its image into the sands of Shikmona Beach. A fifteen meter ellipsoid disk was burnt black into the sand but what was more interesting was what wasn't burned. In the vegetation which wasn't burned was a clear image of the pilot of the craft facing a control board.

Seven years later I sent samples of the burnt sand to the television show Sightings which subjected it to laboratory tests. The sand seemed to melt in the heat of the camera light. The reason later discovered was the sand particles were covered by a low melting hydrocarbon material. The laboratory could find no natural or human explanation for the phenomenon.

Ami Achrai's incident was followed by a repeat performance on June 6, 1988 when a similarly shaped craft was once again burned into the sands of Shikmona Beach, about 100 yards north of the first site. This was followed by the most spectacular display of all. On April 27, 1989, two teenagers witnessed a UFO explode into thousands of shards over Shikmona Beach.

By now, Israeli ufologists were prepared to handle the latest incident more scientifically. The beach was strewn with burning white metal which was cool to the touch. The metal even glowed in water. When picked up, the shards turned into a white ash. Scientists from the Technion Institute of Technology tested the site and found that magnetism was 6000 times higher than the surrounding area. The shards were found to be very pure magnesium.

Two hundred yards above Shikmona Beach is a biblical shrine called Elijah's cave. Here Elijah preached and here or somewhere nearby in the Carmel Mountains, Elijah challenged the Canaanites to a duel of Gods. Two bulls were tethered and the gods were beseeched to roast them. Naturally, baal failed the Canaanites but Elijah's God sent a ray of light from heaven which cooked the bull on the spot. This ray must have been similar to the kind of beam which burned the sands of Shikmona Beach into a saucer shape.

Within the Cave of Elijah is an ancient drawing of something that was the spitting image of the craft burned into the sands below. The Sightings team decided the image "was a coincidence. Maybe it was a bat." When Michael Hesemann filmed the drawing he left certain it was a match for the burned sand pictures.

Although the cave drawing's meaning is in dispute, the fact of the modern UFO-burned inscriptions is not. Something unique occurred at Shikmona Beach. Alien craft decided to leave souvenirs there at least three times. By doing so, they revealed the dimensions of their craft and apparently pilot, as well as their construction material. These were not crop circles nor were they formed the same way. A very different message was left on Shikmona Beach's sands.

After the UFO explosion, there was a hiatus of UFO activity until 1993 broken only once in late 1991 over the village of Sde Moshe, some five miles from Kadima. There, after two straight nights of having the inside of his house lit up by an unexplained craft hovering above it, Eli Cohen captured the responsible UFO on videotape. Several minutes of the tape were filmed after daybreak making the result a most clear and convincing record of a UFO.

It seems the visitors were merely scouting the Kadima area in 1991 but they returned in force in 1993. And this time, the occupants of the crafts did more than merely hover in the sky.

In the early morning of April 20, Tsiporet Carmel's house glowed from within. She stepped outside and saw what she thought was a new fruit silo built outside her back yard. But then she saw the silo add a second storey to itself. Ten yards to the side of this magical silo, Tsiporet saw a seven foot tall being wearing metallic overalls. Its head was covered in a what looked like a beekeeper's hat. Tsiporet said, "Why don't you take off your hat so I can see your face?" The being answered her telepathically, "That's the way it is."

This was Israel's first publicized close encounter with an alien being. Tsiporet could easily have been made an object of ridicule but for the fact that a crop circle 4.5 metres in diameter was found exactly where she had seen the craft. Within the circle were shards of a material later found to be a very pure silicon. I add, Israel's ufologists are divided over the veracity of the silicon because there was a prankster loose in Kadima.

However, within ten days, two more circles were found just outside Tsiporet's back yard. This time, they were soaked with a red liquid and this fluid would be a constant feature of upcoming landing circles. It was tested by the National Biological Laboratory in Ness Tziona and found to be composed mostly of cadmium.

This was the end of Tsiporet's incidents. Now the visitors concentrated on two other woman in their late thirties living on Hapalmach Street. The first was a Russian immigrant Mara. Strange forces shook her house so hard they caused the outside airconditioning unit to fall out of its casing into the house. Voices called to Mara in her childhood nickname. Eventually she decided the house was haunted and she moved far from Kadima.

Shosh Yahud is the treasurer of the town of Kadima. She is down to earth and wants as little to do with her UFO experience as possible. In May, she awoke to see a seven foot, round faced being in silvery overalls circling her bed as if "floating on his shoes." The creature assured her he was not there to harm her and she became relaxed. After a few minutes the being floated through her wall outside.

Shosh thought she had dreamed the incident until she looked out her window in the morning and saw a 4.5 meter crop circle in her backyard. The ufologists descended on her home and discovered the silicon and cadmium within the circle.

Next, in June, it was Hannah Somech's turn to be visited by a giant. Hannah lives in Burgata, three miles from Kadima. She was startled to see her dog go flying across the kitchen into a wall. She stepped outside to investigate and her way was stopped by an invisible force. She then saw a seven foot, round-faced being in metallic overalls examining her pickup truck. She said to it, "What did you do to my dog?" It answered telepathically, "Go away. I'm busy. I could crush you like an ant if I wanted to. Go back to your husband."

Needless to say, a 4.5 meter circle crushed out of the grass was later found in Hannah's back yard. Within, the grass was soaked with red liquid cadmium.

By the end of the summer, the credible reports of giants roaming the land persuaded the normally staid television station Channel One, to broadcast a one hour program on the subject. Tsiporet and Shosh appeared as well as the ufologists who had examined the circles of Kadima. To the apparent shock of the host, the viewing audience believed the advocates of alien landings. The result was two more witnesses coming out into the open.

Both were women in their late thirties who lived within ten miles of each other south of Tel Aviv. Clara Kahonov of Holon was most reluctant to be quoted but acknowledged that she had seen a giant being.

Batya Shimon of Rishon Letzion saw far more than one. In early July, two seven foot tall, bald creatures beamed themselves into

her seventh floor apartment. They told her telepathically not to be frightened and she immediately relaxed. She then felt they had "friendly faces." They roamed her home, "floating on their shoes" dusting her shelves with a yellow, foul-smelling powder. One being saw her son's aquarium, became very excited and called his colleague over. After a few minutes, they beamed themselves outside. The next night at 3 AM, a dozen giants visited Batya arriving and leaving the same way.

I have had extensive conversations with the contactees and there is much in common with their stories. That is fit subject for a separate lecture. In short, all were the same age, all were white collar workers, three have been haunted since their encounters telepathically, all their men slept through the encounters, two had mysterious pregnancies etc. But the core commonality is that these women did not know each other and separately described the same seven foot tall, bald, round-faced giants.

And if absolute proof that giants were about in Israel was needed, it came in December in the village of Yatzitz, twelve miles east of Rishon Letzion. The giants had opened a new axis after Kadima, a triangle of twenty miles linking Rishon Letzion, Holon and Yatzitz.

Herzl Casatini, the village security chief and his friend Danny Ezra were sharing conversation when they heard an explosion and felt Ezra's house shake. Herzl opened the door and stood face to face with a nine foot tall creature in metallic clothes whose face was hidden in "a haze." He shut the door and called the police. They arrived and discovered deep boot tracks in the hard mud. The tracks sunk 35 centimeters into the ground meaning whoever made them had to have weighed, literally, a ton. Thinking there might have been a terrorist incursion, the army was called in.

Military trackers were totally stumped. The tracks carried on for 8 kilometers. The heel dug in only 5 cm. meaning whatever made the tracks was walking almost on tip-toes. If you can call it walking. Sometimes the distance between tracks was twelve feet, meaning the intruder was a world record holding broad jumper weighing about a ton.

The Yatzitz incident confirmed, even to the deepest skeptics, that giants were indeed sighted and they left proof that was nearly impossible to dispute. The best the Israeli authorities could come up with to explain the tracks was they were left by an unknown cult. It would have to be very unknown for records of cults whose ceremonies include dressing as giants and leaving miles of unidentifiable tracks are undoubtedly quite rare.

After Yatitz, giant sightings were reported in Ramat Hasharon, Rehovot and Afula. And 1996 became a vintage year for UFO evidence gathering with a good dozen craft filmed. Two incidents stand out. In August, a UFO was filmed over three nights with professional equipment at Kibbutz Hatzor. The results include a closeup of what appear to be rows of square-shaped vents on the craft. In December, a Netanya household reported constant contact with small greys, the first such report from Israel. The witnesses backed up their claims with an abundance of physical evidence, including stones that melt ice immediately without a known energy source.

The Israeli UFO experience is unique and very complicated. I have touched on just one aspect of it; but it is vital to understanding the Israeli puzzle. Of the seven best documented close encounters with alien beings provably connected to UFOs, six involved giants. These giants were determined to leave evidence of their arrival in the form of cadmium-imbued landing circles, miles of impossible boot tracks and deliberate communication with witnesses. Indeed, the abundant evidence more than indicates that there are giants roaming Israel today.

As there were 5,000 years ago and they also left proof of their existence. The giants were descended from the nefilim, literally the fallen ones. In ancient time, entities fell on Israel from the heavens and later became the mortal enemies of the Hebrew nations.

One giant king was Og of Bashan. The bible records that his bed was thirteen feet long. Bashan's territory included the Golan

Heights. Sitting on the Golan Heights is the Israeli version of Stonehenge. Called Gilgal Refaim, the Circle of the Refaim or giants in English, this site consists of five concentric rings whose beauty can only be appreciated from above. Unfortunately, there was supposedly no way for the simple nomads of 5000 years ago to see the circles from above.

The cite is enormous. The outside circle has a diameter of 159 meters and over 37,000 tons of rock went into the construction of the complex. Two openings in the circles may have been used to measure the solar solstice and the rising of Sirius in 3000 BCE.

The fact remains that Israeli archaeologists are totally mystified by the Gilgal Refaim. No other complex built in the Middle East resembles it and it predates the pyramids by over 500 years. The indigenous nomads of the time did not engage in this kind of megalith building, so outsiders were probably the builders. According to the Bible, the only outsiders living on the Golan Heights back then were giants.

Maybe it's a longshot, but no one has come up with a better explanation for Israel's current UFO wave. I believe the ancient giants may be coming home. I conclude on a somber note. The biblical giants were God's enemy and Israel's armies were the means to their utter destruction. There is a legitimate reason to contemplate the recent re-arrival of giants in Israel with a good measure of dread.

Best,

Barry

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Strange Lights In San Diego Night Sky

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:02:12 -0500
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:02:12 -0500
Subject: Strange Lights In San Diego Night Sky

Source: The San Diego Union Tribune - California, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/28s6yg>

December 23, 2007

Strange Lights Seen In Night Sky
by Tanya Mannes

Residents in Oceanside and Point Loma called to ask about mysterious lights that appeared in the sky at sunset Saturday. Both men reported two parallel orange lights that appeared for three or four minutes. One said the lights moved from north to west, then went straight up and disappeared.

San Diego police weren't aware of the incident. Neither were spokesmen for the Navy Region Southwest office, the Coast Guard or Harbor Police. The Federal Aviation Administration referred a call to the National UFO Reporting Center in Washington state.

Peter Davenport, director of the UFO-spotting organization, said Sunday that based on limited information provided by a reporter, he believed the lights were "almost certainly not a UFO." Davenport said the lights were likely contrails - vapor and condensation trails - behind a high-altitude jet, illuminated at an angle by the setting sun. But "it's one of about 10 million possibilities," he said.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

All's Quiet On The UFO Front?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 17:16:08 EST
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:04:30 -0500
Subject: All's Quiet On The UFO Front?

So let me get this past week's tally.

The head of the Japanese Government declares publicly that UFOs exist. This makes him the tenth or twelfth government official in the past few years to disclose or declare pro UFO data. Then today in the news it was announced again that the UK's MOD would pony up formerly classified UFO files.

Also, what happened to McKinnon? Is he still in stir awaiting extradition?

With all this going on it's all taking a backseat to Britney Spears' sister who got knocked up.

Maybe if Britney said she was abducted by a UFO suddenly the press would be all over the issue.

Gotta have that hottie blonde in danger to get those reporters hopping.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 08:09:09 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:12:59 -0500
Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:40:14 -0500
>Subject: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>Chris Matthews on his show on MSNBC-TV, here in the US, today
>once again got on Kucinich's UFO incident, nominating Kucinich
>for an unfavorable goof for seeing an ET manifestation.

<snip>

Lovely. Here is a truly brave man in the person of Mr. Kucinich,
a guy with every bit as much courage where Chris "copraporate
(sic) clown" Matthews is _bereft_, castigating Kucinich for the
courage he himself does not have; the very personification of
cowardice.

Not name calling, but assessment: What a crapacious (sic)
bastard.

To continue is to court a righteous and impassioned flurry of
four letter words, invective, and acrimony; however, know that
it is there.

alienview.nul
www.AlienView.net
AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>
U F O M a g a z i n e -- www.ufomag.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Townsend-Brown

From: David Iadevaia <api.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 08:34:58 -0700
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 10:47:39 -0500
Subject: Townsend-Brown

For those of you interested, my new sci-fi book based in part on one of Townsend-Brown's theories has now been published. More information is at the following url:

<http://www.authorhouse.com/bookstore/ItemDetail.aspx?bookid=47835>

David Iadevaia

Of Stranger Things

<http://www.authorhouse.com/bookstore/ItemDetail.aspx?bookid=47835>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: Walt Disney And The ETH

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 12:43:44 EST
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:27:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Walt Disney And The ETH

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=lr99XcaYDjg>

This is a real treat. From the Disney TV show's Tomorrow Land episode to us kids from the 50's and 60's.

If you haven't seen this video you're in for some laughs and wonders.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:29:34 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 13:43:09 -0600
>Subject: The Fermi Death Sentence

>Source: Nonotechnology Now

><http://www.nanotech-now.com/columns/?article=149>

>The Fermi Death Sentence
>Mike Treder

>Most readers of this column probably are familiar with the Fermi
>Paradox. In 1950, the physicist Enrico Fermi famously wondered,
>"Where is everybody?" He was referring to the strange silence in
>the universe, the apparent lack of any advanced civilizations
>beyond Earth.

>Fermi reasoned that the size and age of the universe would
>indicate that many technologically advanced extraterrestrial
>civilizations ought to exist. However, this hypothesis is
>inconsistent with the lack of observational evidence to
>support
>it.

>So, where is everybody? Nowhere, it seems, or at least nowhere
>that we can detect.

>If there are no other advanced civilizations detectable, it
>must
>mean one of three things:

>1. We are the first intelligent beings capable of expanding
>into the cosmos and making our presence known. There have been
>no others.

>2. There have been others before us, but all of them, without
>exception, have chosen - or somehow been forced - to expand in
>such a way that they are presently undetectable by our most
>sophisticated instruments.

>3. There have been others, but all of them, without exception,
>have run into a cosmic roadblock that either destroys them or
>prevents their expansion beyond a small radius.

Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
the chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 11:50:31 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:30:48 -0500
Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:40:14 -0500
>Subject: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>Chris Matthews on his show on MSNBC-TV, here in the US, today
>once again got on Kucinich's UFO incident, nominating Kucinich
>for an unfavorable goof for seeing an ET manifestation.

>Matthews ignored Kucinich's statement that he saw something in
>the sky he couldn't identify. It is pop-culture and ufology
>that equate UFOs = ET spaceships.

Uh, no. The ETH is surely the most scientifically defensible
speculation about UFOs if one judges them to represent the
operations of an unearthly intelligence.

Unfortunately, for many in the field, it's not exciting, exotic,
or esoteric enough, thus the popularity of "theories" like those
proposed by John Keel, cryptoterrestrialists, supernaturalists,
and the like. In other words, it has been a long time (the mid-
1960s?) since within ufology UFOs were more or less
automatically linked with extraterrestrial visitors.

Of course, the ETH is unproved; therefore, everybody ought to be
properly cautious in applying it to specific sightings. After
all, they're called UFOs for a reason. But Jan is going well out
of his way to insult ufology (can we retire the tired would-be
joke "ufology" now?) when in this instance they're an innocent
party to Chris Matthews's mindless insults.

And, while we're at it, what does Dennis Kucinich's wife have to
do with anything?

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 12:08:05 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:35:07 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 13:43:09 -0600
>Subject: The Fermi Death Sentence

>Source: Nonotechnology Now

><http://www.nanotech-now.com/columns/?article=149>

>The Fermi Death Sentence
>Mike Treder

<snip>

Proposition 2 was stated as:

>2. There have been others before us, but all of them, without
>exception, have chosen - or somehow been forced - to expand in
>such a way that they are presently undetectable by our most
>sophisticated instruments.

and was dismissed with the argument:

>It seems strange to imagine, as suggested by proposition 2, that
>all extraterrestrial civilizations would, without exception,
>choose to expand or exist in such a way that they are completely
>undetectable to us. If proposition 2 is correct, it requires
>every one of potentially hundreds, thousands, or even millions
>of advanced worlds to make the exact same decision. We might
>expect some to do so, perhaps even most, but all? That defies
>logic.

I would disagree strongly with the abandonment of proposition 2.

Our ability to detect extraterrestrial civilizations is extremely limited. Only narrow band frequencies can be detected, due to power/detection requirements, and we have decided that 1420 MHz, the frequency of molecular hydrogen, is our best bet.

It is a large leap of faith to believe that another life form, that may be totally different from us, would communicate in the same manner as us and also decide on the same frequency as us.

It also requires that an ET civilization purposely beam that signal in our direction. Moreover, we need to have our antenna directed at this star at the same time that they decide to beam at us and send us the signal.

So in summary, an ET civilization must use radio frequencies, they need to be tuned to 1420MHz, they need to be pointing their broadcast at the earth, we need to be pointing our receivers at them, and we need to be doing it all at the same time. The odds of success are very,very, very low. Better chance of winning the lottery.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 12:03:28 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 16:12:29 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
>crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
>the chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
>the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
>like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
>they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

Denial of probability is even more so, Mr. Rudiak. A fledgling
culture approaching a technology unforgiving to a predilection
for self-destruction adds to its own gambit incredulity to think
it would not be detected far in advance of itself detecting
extra-planetary intelligence.

And that its problematic state would not demand some form of
reserve, even, perhaps quarantine.

JCH

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 16:14:25 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 13:43:09 -0600
>>Subject: The Fermi Death Sentence

>Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
>"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
>millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
>time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

>One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
>crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
>the chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
>the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
>like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
>they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

Exactly, Dave, and well stated as usual.

It'll be the job of future historians of science to figure out
this one - by which I mean the persistence blindness, ignorance,
and bigotry - and it'll be a doozy in the annals of what Eddie
Bullard once called epistemological totalitarianism. One would
like to think, at least, that the laughter by now is starting to
get a little nervous.

My longtime suspicion is that it should have been possible no
later than the early 1950s to discern the extraordinary nature
of the UFO phenomenon and to contemplate its possible
relationship to intelligence elsewhere in the galaxy. In the
present moment, of course, science's long neglect is its excuse
for further neglect.

One day, in a future generation perhaps in the latter part of
this century, when nearly everyone reading this is gone and thus
not around to gloat in vindication, science will grow up and
acknowledge its responsibility, and we'll be spared further
bleatings about the alleged invisibility and silence of
civilizations elsewhere.

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

And So This Is Christmas...

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:19:26 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:19:26 -0500
Subject: And So This Is Christmas...

Gentle Reader,

Santa once again proved that the spirit of Christmas is yet alive and well in this neighbourhood. Would that that spirit had permeated the rest of this planet with its compassion, joy, and peace.

To all readers of this List, season's greetings and the trust that all will eventually come together in whatever manner you wish to see and feel. And may the coming years bring all that's needed to cause us all to relax, having been truthfully informed and confident that our collective work and lives have borne fruit...

ebk

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Kentaro Mori <kentaro.mori.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 18:52:42 -0300
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:08:46 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
>>"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
>>millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
>>time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

>Exactly, Dave, and well stated as usual.
>It'll be the job of future historians of science to figure out
>this one - by which I mean the persistence blindness, ignorance,
>and bigotry - and it'll be a doozy in the annals of what Eddie
>Bullard once called epistemological totalitarianism. One would
>like to think, at least, that the laughter by now is starting to
>get a little nervous.

Are all the extraterrestrial civilizations manifested only as
UFOs? Because, you see, we can still explain and predict
countless astronomical events, stellar systems and even
galactical structures without resorting to any artificial
interference. Why would the alien interference be felt only in
our atmosphere?

Granted, there are a lot of unexplained things in astronomy. But
none of them screams "artificial", like a galaxy formed in the
shape of an hexagon sending pulses of laser to another galaxy
shaped like the face of Spock.

If the Universe was teeming with civilizations, it wouldn't be a
matter of ignoring evidence for UFOs, alien abductions and such.
Those are all things on Earth, a pale blue dot in an infinite
Universe. It would be simply impossible to understand the
mechanics of the Universe around us, because it would be
presumably engineered by intelligent beings to best fit their
purposes.

It would be like an ant trying to explain how the house in which
it lives was formed. If it had good science, it would hardly be
able to explain it without realizing the human Overlords to
which it is so dependent.

That's why Fermi's paradox is a paradox. Either way, it makes no
sense. The Universe is infinite. Even our Galaxy is very large.
It's also billions of years old. One would reasonably assume
we're not alone. Reasonably assume at least one of our
intelligent pals may be perhaps a million years ahead of us. But
in a million-years, this one single civilization would be
capable to make its presence felt in the entire Galaxy. Really,
undeniably detected to anyone who looked at the night sky.

There are no obvious, undeniable signs of alien presence here,
that's for sure. They did not land in front of the White House.

Even if they didn't care about us, they didn't bulldoze the planet to create a hyperspace bypass. We can actually assume they don't exist and still live our lives, predicting astronomical events billions of light years away with great precision.

That's a paradox. As much as the irony that Fermi actually believed in aliens. <http://forgetomori.com/2007/ufos/fermi-believed-in-aliens-what-a-paradox/>

Whatever the real answer for the paradox, it's not simply "they are here as UFOs, stupid!". And I really hope it's not "we're alone" either.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:06:41 -0800
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:21:41 -0500
Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 11:50:31 -0600
>Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:40:14 -0500
>>Subject: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>>Chris Matthews on his show on MSNBC-TV, here in the US, today
>>once again got on Kucinich's UFO incident, nominating Kucinich
>>for an unfavorable goof for seeing an ET manifestation.

>>Matthews ignored Kucinich's statement that he saw something in
>>the sky he couldn't identify. It is pop-culture and ufoology
>>that equate UFOs = ET spaceships.

>Uh, no. The ETH is surely the most scientifically defensible
>speculation about UFOs if one judges them to represent the
>operations of an unearthly intelligence.

>Unfortunately, for many in the field, it's not exciting, exotic,
>or esoteric enough, thus the popularity of "theories" like those
>proposed by John Keel, cryptoterrestrialists, supernaturalists,
>and the like. In other words, it has been a long time (the mid-
>1960s?) since within ufology UFOs were more or less
>automatically linked with extraterrestrial visitors.

When you look at the history, just about every single present-
day theory or explanation of UFO origin was being discussed
back during the U.S. UFO wave of 1947: extraterrestrials, inter-
or trans-dimensionals, time travelers, supernaturals (linked to
Biblical prophecy), cryptoterrestrials, plus the usual
conventional explanations of hoaxes, hysteria, illusions,
misperceptions, secret U.S. projects, secret foreign projects,
meteors, birds, clouds, weather balloons, etc. Nothing has
really changed.

Perhaps parallel realities or universes (or even time travel)
has slightly more credence now with modern theories of physics
and cosmology, but the ETH, to my mind, still remains by far the
most probable explanation of the origins of these real metallic
craft that greatly outfly our own.

>Of course, the ETH is unproved; therefore, everybody ought to be
>properly cautious in applying it to specific sightings. After
>all, they're called UFOs for a reason. But Jan is going well out
>of his way to insult ufology (can we retire the tired would-be
>joke "ufoology" now?) when in this instance they're an innocent
>party to Chris Matthews's mindless insults.

It didn't strike me as Jan insulting UFOs, rather him being
rather disgusted at how the talking heads treat the subject and
try to hang the "crazy" mantle on anybody trying to discuss it
even half seriously. Kucinich (and also Jimmy Carter) tried to
tiptoe around the question recently by sticking to UFO simply
meaning "unidentified", when both obviously know and believe
otherwise.

>And, while we're at it, what does Dennis Kucinich's wife have
>to do with anything?

She's hot, which in this culture trumps everything else of
importance. Gee, Jerry, you must be getting old.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 00:07:26 -0000
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:23:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 10:13:38 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>My point, which I obviously think is more important than you do
>is that the omission of the triangular shape from their written
>statements was a significant omission, proving that they
>weren't writing down everything they knew in those statemetns,

The argument that Penniston's report can't be the source of Halt's adjective "triangular" obviously rests on the fact that Penniston does not describe anything triangular. This, for you, is a "significant omission" proving the statement is rigged. For me, it means there is no documentary evidence that Penniston explicitly reported a triangular device. This point of view receives support from Penniston's own contemporaneous drawing, which shows a rectangular device.

Burroughs however does draw a triangular shape of lights, and such a shape is implicit in the descriptions - i.e., broad base of lights, cone of white light, narrowing to red light on top. Is there "overwhelming evidence" here (to borrow your phrase) that Halt could not have got his "triangular" from here? I don't see that there is. There is an allegation that something other than what was reported was seen and suppressed, but that allegation is the very thing that's in question so it would be circular to rely on this as evidence.

Yes Halt obviously incorporated a couple of things he was told, I agreed this way back. The estimate of size is one, and explicit use of the word "triangular" could be another. Yes, Penniston could have used this word directly in connection with his "mechanical device". It's possible. But equally someone could have used it to describe something like the triangular pattern of lights (as drawn by Burroughs). The absence of this word from Pennistons' and Burroughs' written statements is not necessarily even an "omission" - the word could be entirely Halt's. And if it is an omission it is not a "significant omission" in the sense you mean. It is not evidence that Penniston made a 45-minute photographic and tactile inspection of a warm, black, glassy craft bearing symbols.

Consider that Penniston's own "triangular" description is only known to date from from after Halt's description became public. Penniston's first contact with investigators (Butler and Street) under the pseudonym James Archer was in October 1983, a couple of months after Halt's memo resurfaced and one week after the story first appeared in the News of the World. He told them he'd witnessed the landing on Dec 27, 1980, the same wrong date that was on Halt's recently released memo. That doesn't prove a connection but it is suggestive.

You can cite Penniston's notebook containing triangular drawings as "contemporaneous" evidence, but then you need to explain why it also bears the same wrong Dec 27 date as appeared in Halt's memo.

Consider also that, according to the above writers, Penniston (as Jim Archer) told them in 1983 that he had not touched the object, that he did not try to touch the object, that he thought Burroughs was going to try to touch it when they got close at one point, but that the object jumped away from them before he could do so.

Consider that this is an anonymous "deep-throat" account given not to AF superiors, to whom Penniston's might have had reason to play down a 45-minute tactile inspection, but to highly receptive ufologists.

He told them in 1983 that the object was "off-white" in colour, and "dirty" looking - not a "black, smooth, glasslike surface" as he has told us and shown in his notebook.

He also said that the first alert about the lights coming down was at 2:00AM. That at least does not follow Halt. But it also doesn't follow his own notebook, where he has the time as 20 minutes past midnight - "I remember that distinctly" he remarked in his 1996 OMNI interview, although everyone else's original statement says 0300.

Note that in his recent press conference statement he now says that the incident happened on Dec 26, apparently deferring to this date in preference to the date of Dec 27 written in his contemporaneous notebook.

(In 1996 he wasn't sure which date it was: "There is some confusion about the date. There are two duty rosters, both of which are dated December 26th, but it was either that night, the 26th, or the 27th." I don't understand the reference to duty rosters when he is quoting during this interview from his own real-time notes, which begin: "27 Dec 80. 12:20. Response notes. A/C crash".

(BTW, re the photos: I just noticed that in this recent NP conference statement he said, "The photos we retrieved from the base lab were apparently over exposed." But in 1996 he said he'd did not retrieve his photos from the lab: "I never got them back. I never saw them. I was just told that they didn't turn out. I didn't understand that but was not in a position to push the issue.")

>therefore giving some support to their claim that they were
>being reticent with their interrogators.

The story is that these statements were collected by Halt personally for his own use and were considered by him to be private papers. They were not made for those interrogators. If Penniston's own story is true then they do constitute evidence of disingenuousness. But this cannot be not merely "reticence", and not merely a sin of omission either. It has to be a coordinated sin of commission, involving changed times, durations, distances and the embedding narrative structure, in several different statements, changes which are largely arbitrary in terms of the claimed motivation. This is the nub. And unless there is "overwhelming evidence" to the contrary we ought to at least consider that there is a simpler explanation - that Penniston could be fantasizing, or just making stuff up.

>You can rant all you
>want, but I am not convinced the evidence is overwhelming that
>Penniston's later story is a lie, and neither are a lot of
>other reasonable people.

I don't think anyone needs to be "overwhelmingly convinced" of it to take the possibility seriously. Have I ever said that I am? But if specific negative evidence is not dealt with conscientiously then it will remain an attractive theory and that does not help anyone to get serious attention for claims they make about the case, or for ufology in general.

There are serious holes in this one.

>BTW: There's an unwritten debating rule that whoever compares
>the opponent to Hitler loses. The same goes for Bin Laden.

There is a super-rule which trumps that one: It says that people who falsely accuse their debating opponents of dishonourable

statements which not only were not made by them (I have never made any mention whatsoever of Bin Laden or Hitler in any post) but which, furthermore, were not even made by anybody (it's hard to imagine how a "reasonable person" could interpret Joe's figure of speech in such a ludicrous way) risks making themselves look a bit of a twit.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 16:25:39 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:24:13 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

<snip>

>It'll be the job of future historians of science to figure out
>this one - by which I mean the persistence blindness, ignorance,
>and bigotry - and it'll be a doozy in the annals of what Eddie
>Bullard once called epistemological totalitarianism. One would
>like to think, at least, that the laughter by now is starting to
>get a little nervous.

>My longtime suspicion is that it should have been possible no
>later than the early 1950s to discern the extraordinary nature
>of the UFO phenomenon and to contemplate its possible
>relationship to intelligence elsewhere in the galaxy. In the
>present moment, of course, science's long neglect is its excuse
>for further neglect.

>One day, in a future generation perhaps in the latter part of
>this century, when nearly everyone reading this is gone and thus
>not around to gloat in vindication, science will grow up and
>acknowledge its responsibility, and we'll be spared further
>bleatings about the alleged invisibility and silence of
>civilizations elsewhere.

"Epistemological totalitarianism": at best a 1930's version of wannabe "political correctness". "Plus =E7a change, plus c=92est la m=EAmE chose." [The more things change, the more they stay the same.] --Alphonse Karr (1808=961890), Les Gu=EApes (Paris, Jan. 31, 1849).

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 19:16:35 -0700
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:25:36 -0500
Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 11:50:31 -0600
>Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>>From: Jan Aldrich <project1947.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2007 14:40:14 -0500
>>Subject: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>>Chris Matthews on his show on MSNBC-TV, here in the US, today
>>once again got on Kucinich's UFO incident, nominating Kucinich
>>for an unfavorable goof for seeing an ET manifestation.

>>Matthews ignored Kucinich's statement that he saw something in
>>the sky he couldn't identify. It is pop-culture and ufoology
>>that equate UFOs = ET spaceships.

>Uh, no. The ETH is surely the most scientifically defensible
>speculation about UFOs if one judges them to represent the
>operations of an unearthly intelligence.

Jerry,

While I agree with the sentiment, your phrasing has a certain circularity to it. Indeed, it is difficult to state your point (as I gather it) without it sounding logically equivalent to "For all those cases where nothing else makes sense, the ETH is the most scientifically defensible".

Perhaps it could be phrased, "For that subset, if any, of UFOs that exhibit intelligent behavior and are genuinely anomalous (i.e., human activities - including hoaxes - are ruled out), the ETH is the most scientifically defensible". It would be difficult to replace ET in the latter with any of crypto-terrestrials, time travelers, trans-dimensionals, supernaturals, etc., and arrive at an equally plausible statement.

I believe Jan is wrong to limit "UFOs = ET spaceships" to pop culture and "ufoology", whatever the latter is supposed to mean. This identity is now effectively universal, to the severe detriment of the entire discussion. Thus we arrive at the incomprehensible query, "Do you believe in UFOs?". No one with a functioning mind can deny the existence of UFOs, as originally and properly defined. Yet, how many presidential candidates would dare to acknowledge this, no matter how much time they were allotted to qualify their terms? Had he not been 'outed' by Shirley McLain, and/or if he had any realistic shot at the nomination, I suspect Kucinich would have taken pains to avoid the subject in its entirety, this notwithstanding his genuinely courageous stand on a variety of issues.

It is thus with great sacrifice that I have posted to UFO UpDates at all, archived for all the world to see, effectively shattering any hope of aspiring to public office! To which Kucinich would undoubtedly reply, "Yeah, like you had any chance". Touche, Dennis.

Mike

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:09:06 +0000
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:27:38 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>One day, in a future generation perhaps in the latter part of
>this century, when nearly everyone reading this is gone and thus
>not around to gloat in vindication, science will grow up and
>acknowledge its responsibility, and we'll be spared further
>bleatings about the alleged invisibility and silence of
>civilizations elsewhere.

Always safe to make a prediction for when we're all safely dead,
isn't it Jerry? I suppose the real question is, who'll be doing
the gloating?

As Scrooge said when he finally saw the light, "Merry Christmas,
everyone"

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 10:42:12 +0000
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:28:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 16:55:11 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 00:30:58 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>Hello Gerald, thanks for the response, most of which I agree with
>but;

><snip>

>>6. Of the central protagonists, Dick is the only one who has put
>>forward an unambiguous view as to why Penniston's story should
>>have changed, and has actually offered some evidence (albeit of
>>a 'character witness' status) for his view.

>I thought that Dick's response was untypically subjective, and
>misleading.

I'm not sure whether you are saying that my highly abbreviated
summary of his position is inaccurate. I was trying to delineate
the overall form that the discussion had taken. In doing so I
was attempting to remove, as far as possible, all the noise
introduced by the process of advocacy - subjectivities and red
herrings attributable to all parties included. With that in
mind, if you go back over the thread, I think you'll find that
I've captured the core of Dick's argument quite accurately.

>Dick ought to be more aware than most of the concept of 'myth',
>and how myths develop. The case in point is an excellent
>example, and I would like to go into more detail, but can't
>spare the time.

What a pity Joe! It would have been most interesting to hear
your thoughts on this. However, It's not at all clear how an
awareness of Myth, or lack of it, on Dick's part (or that of the
other parties) has any bearing at all on the facts of the
situation and their interpretation: scholarly use of the term is
wholly neutral as to the truth or falsity of a narrative;
popular/pejorative use of the term amounts to no more than
labelling.

>Suffice to say that changed or 'refined'
>testimony over time is a significant factor, as any historian or
>psychologist ought to realise.

Significant indeed. But that significance is elusive: sometimes
refinement of a narrative increases its accuracy, sometimes it
has the opposite effect. And sometimes the question of veracity
is obscured altogether when a narrative is viewed in terms of
that most enduring of modern myths, the Urban Legend.

--

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:34:37 -0500
Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

On UK Pending UFO Document Release
Is A Faux Disclosure In The Works?

The statement below, is from the Drudge Report Dec 25, 2007. It quotes Nick Pope on the pending UK release of UFO documents as indicating 60 years of official effort probing and investigating UFOs has not provided any real answers.

Sadly, this release, which should not be taken at face value, by researchers who've studied carefully the full range of events and activity, UFO related, which has taken place in UK skies or countryside over the past few decades. It will however convince much of the media, here and abroad, that a truly full faith, honest opening has taken place.

This prompts one to speculate, that an immensely clever "disclosure deception" operation is possibly being coordinated behind the scenes with multiple governments acting together in a "faux" disclosure effort. With high confidence, it is easy to predict that the scheduled UFO document release, will not include genuine high sensitivity events, especially those where the US was peripherally or directly involved, and will not reference UK crash retrievals , super secret space fleet activity , UK space surveillance jointly conducted and pooled with the NRO , or detail what is going on at Warton BAE special projects site in Lancashire and other sensitive and often underground facilities.

"A former head of the Defense Ministry UFO project told the newspaper that no matter what an individual believes regarding UFOs, the released files should prove to be interesting reading.

'Whatever people think about UFOs, these documents are fascinating and show how the MoD has researched and investigated this mystery for nearly 60 years, without an answer,' former department official Nick Pope said." --Matt Drudge

Vince White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 10:50:00 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:36:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 19:29:46 -0800
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>Civilization and extensive tool use probably has happened before
>in the solar system, just as it has on earth, with toolmakers
>millions of years more advanced than us, possessing technology
>which has allowed them to live wherever they feel secure.

Probably? That's quite an assertion! We haven't even established
if anything has ever lived elsewhere in our solar system and
you're claiming that it's likely that entire civilisations
have flourished? That's a rather bizarre form of logic.

>To limit the discussion to either star travelers or illusion
>seems fairly stupid, to me.

And making baseless assertions?

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 11:28:27 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:37:56 -0500
Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 11:50:31 -0600
>Subject: Re: TV Host At Kucinich Again

>And, while we're at it, what does Dennis Kucinich's wife have to
>do with anything?

I've just figured it out! She's an android like the one in Mars
Attacks!, sent to infiltrate the White House.

Somebody alert Barry Chamish!

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 11:41:54 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:39:07 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: Terry Groff <terrygroff.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 13:43:09 -0600
>>Subject: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>Source: Nonotechnology Now

>><http://www.nanotech-now.com/columns/?article=149>

>>The Fermi Death Sentence
>>Mike Treder

>>Most readers of this column probably are familiar with the Fermi
>>Paradox. In 1950, the physicist Enrico Fermi famously wondered,
>>"Where is everybody?" He was referring to the strange silence in
>>the universe, the apparent lack of any advanced civilizations
>>beyond Earth.

snip

>Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
>"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
>millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
>time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

>One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
>crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
>he chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
>the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
>like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
>they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

The greatest psychological resistance to UFO/AFC reality is the
"self-cover up." This is a reality that few people really want
to admit or know about.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 11:51:38 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:41:34 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
>>"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
>>millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
>>time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

>>One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
>>crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
>>the chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
>>the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
>>like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
>>they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

>Exactly, Dave, and well stated as usual.

<snip>

>My longtime suspicion is that it should have been possible no
>later than the early 1950s to discern the extraordinary nature
>of the UFO phenomenon and to contemplate its possible
>relationship to intelligence elsewhere in the galaxy. In the
>present moment, of course, science's long neglect is its excuse
>for further neglect.

I have said for many years (since the 1970's) that if we knew
what really happened in the first 5 years, including the Year
Of The UFO (1952) we would know most of or all of 'the story'.

A key event that prevented us from knowing what happened was
General Samford's press conference in late July, 1952, when he
said essentially that there was nothing to it (all weather
phenomena). The press and scientific community bought that
'argument'... and so here we are multi-years and multi-
sightings later, still trying to convince the scientific
community and skeptical press that there really is something
"unusual" going on!

Maybe the corner has been turned in some other countries, like
Japan. A city in Japan, Hakui, northwest of Tokyo on the western
coast, held international UFO conferences twice: 1990 and 1997.
Each time they got good press coverage. Perhaps it has had a
lasting effect!(?)

One day, in a future generation perhaps in the latter part of
this century, when nearly everyone reading this is gone and thus
not around to gloat in vindication, science will grow up and
acknowledge its responsibility, and we'll be spared further
bleatings about the alleged invisibility and silence of
civilizations elsewhere.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: **Eleanor White** <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 16:44:08 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:48:03 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

<snip>

>Of course there is at least one more option, namely there is no
>"paradox" - they have been observed, by the thousands if not
>millions, they're here and probably have been for a very long
>time. We call them UFOs or flying saucers or UAP, or whatever.

>One gets the feeling sometimes that the subject is like the
>crazy uncle hidden and chained in the attic. Everybody can hear
>the chains rattling around and the moaning and screaming, but
>the "super-sophisticated" are still afraid to say, "That sounds
>like the crazy uncle chained in the attic", instead pretending
>they hear nothing. Psychological denial is an amazing thing.

So is being ordered what to write and what not to write.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 23:52:31 EST
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:49:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 00:30:58 +0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2007 12:51:38 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>Joe, here's another way to look at what has happened to date on
>this particular thread:

>1. Martin raised some legitimate concerns about inconsistencies
>over time in Penniston's Rendlesham story.

>2. There was a lively discussion around the possible reasons for
>these inconsistencies, with particular reference as to whether
>they discredit Penniston's original testimony, subsequent
>testimony, both, or neither.

>3. A subtle shift then occurred as the focus drifted away from
>discussion of the primary evidence towards a dispute as to the
>quality of advocacy of the respective protagonists'
>interpretation of that evidence.

>4. To varying degrees, the protagonists have lost patience with
>each other's conduct of that secondary dispute and are now at
>loggerheads.

>5. Despite this, the central question remains as to why
>Penniston's story should have changed, and what is the
>significance of this change.

>6. Of the central protagonists, Dick is the only one who has put
>forward an unambiguous view as to why Penniston's story should
>have changed, and has actually offered some evidence (albeit of
>a 'character witness' status) for his view.

>7. The central protagonists are now so annoyed with each other
>(and very possibly themselves for becoming so annoyed) that the
>thread is probably at, or close to, its useful end.

This is a fair summary of the controversy to date. I have an explanation that resolves the confounding issues. I examined this case in great detail around 1999-2002 and was in extensive contact with a number of researchers, skeptics and debunkers. I poured over the Ordnance Survey maps at great length and obtained technical details about the lighthouses in the region.

First, I must insist on a methodological rule. Certainties must control over uncertainties. Only facts that are certain and conclusive can resolve contradictions, discrepancies and confusion caused by a plethora of uncertain claims or "uncertain facts" (actually, if it is uncertain then it really cannot be a "fact"). No matter how many uncertain points are adduced they cannot add up to a certainty.

If you cannot accept this basic principle of epistemology and the scientific method then you don't belong in a scientific discussion, and I won't engage in what will prove to be a fruitless dialogue based on a hopelessly false principle. I do not see how anything can ever be resolved based on dubious or uncertain points. If you believe in the use of political or other force to "win," or that "might makes right," or "truth is determined by vote," then don't bother me with your pointless and unscientific arguments.

Here is a conclusive, hard fact: It is an absolute physical impossibility for anyone to have seen and "chased" the Orfordness (or Orford Ness, ON for short) lighthouse for 2 miles east of the east end of the Woodridge base back in 1980, because the beacon is only visible at one tiny area where it is high enough to see it and it is unobstructed by trees. As one progresses eastward from this small spot the land slopes downward till it reaches sea level only 0.4 mile to the east. The view of the ON lighthouse is blocked by a ridge on the east banks of the Butley river, around Gedgrave Hall.

The area where the ON lighthouse is visible is less than 1/10th mile in size at the beginning of the forest clearing that opens onto the farmer's field at Green Farm and Capel Green. This is obvious from the OS maps I've examined in great detail and from simple calculations and it was confirmed by local skeptic Robert McLean who went out there at night around 2000 (who told me he couldn't see anything except at that one spot), and by Dave Rudiak in the daytime in April 2002. See Dave's webpage:

http://www.roswellproof.com/Rendlesham_pictorial.html

No skeptics or debunkers have ever been able to do the simple scientific experiment and take a video camera out to Rendlesham forest and photograph the ON lighthouse, to prove that it can be seen in the woods and followed for 2 miles. Various film crews reporting on the Rendlesham incident have likewise never been able to prove the ON lighthouse was visible for a 2-mile "chase," not even the caustically anti-UFO BBC.

Moreover, as nautical charts show and as Rudiak proved with his closeup photo of the ON lighthouse, the blinding light is "masked" to the west. Skeptics and debunkers have claimed it was the blinding light of the ON lighthouse that dazzled the USAF witnesses, when in fact no such blinding light was ever beamed in their direction. It is a simple fact that the hundreds of thousands of residents in SE England do not want to be blinded every frikkin night by a lighthouse beaming into their houses and bedrooms, so that direction is blocked and only a tiny amount of light leaks out by backscattering from mist in front of the eastward beam.

So when the statements of USAF Security Police airmen Cabansag and Burroughs allege that they all had conducted a foolish 2-mile chase of the lighthouse through the woods and an "open field" near a "farmer's house," this was an absolute physical impossibility and a total lie. In fact, the 2-mile trek through the open field near the farmhouse was what Col. Halt's group did two nights later, not Penniston, Cabansag, Burroughs trio ("PBC" for short).. How did this 2-mile Halt trek get inserted into the statements of Cabansag and Burroughs (and is also in Penniston's by implication)?

But there is more inserted than just a purported 2-mile hike in the Rendlesham forest at night, but also the almost snide comments about how they were purportedly just foolishly pursuing a lighthouse beacon. There is no possible innocent explanation here. A hypothetical secretarial slipup with drafting statements for both Halt and the PBC group (but Burroughs' statement is handwritten) could hypothetically have gotten Halt's 2-mile hike inserted into PBC's statements but it would not have resulted in the creation of an utterly fictitious and impossible lighthouse chase which didn't come from Halt.

Halt's team did not pursue the ON lighthouse and their magnetic compass readings prove it, as recorded on audio tape right while they were in the pursuit (their readings were about 110- 120 degrees, whereas the ON lighthouse was at 98 degs Magnetic, after correcting for 1980 declination of 5.2 degs and 2.7 degs for "grid north"; the OS maps show that about 110 Mag was the

only possible route Halt and his men could have followed without running into walls or more forest and it fits their real time descriptions on the tape). Needless to say, there was and is no lighthouse or beacon light out at about 110-120 Magnetic.

Here are the lying statements from the Cabansag and Burroughs documents. First from Cabansag, right after admitting that "nothing was visible" when they were passing "through the woody forrest [forest]" (correct from the standpoint of a lighthouse, not correct from the standpoint of a UFO maneuvering through the trees) and it was only after getting through the woods into the clearing that they could see any lights, namely the "lit up farm house."

Then Cabansag's false statement alleges:

"But we ran and walked a good 2 miles past our the vehicle, until we got to a vantage point where we could determine that what we were chasing was only a beacon light off in the distance. Our route through the forrest [sic] and field was a direct one, straight towards the light. We informed CSC [Central Security Control by radio] that the light beacon was farther than we thought, so CSC terminated our investigation."

This statement if it had been true would have been extremely damaging, not to Cabansag but to _Halt_. Here was a lowly airman on his first or second day on the job who makes a a laughingstock out of a Lt Colonel who evidently cannot tell a lighthouse from a UFO! Even though on different dates, a lighthouse has to be visible every night that is relatively clear, so the "fact" that the "same lighthouse" was seen on "multiple nights," as debunkers would claim, would ruin Halt and his UFO observation. The fact there were some odd date discrepancies could have been used to muddy the waters even further, enabling a propaganda innuendo that these were even one and the same incident.

But a handwritten note at the bottom of the Cabansag statement, signed by "H" (possibly Halt) says: "I'm convinced that this is a 'cleaned up' version of what happened. I talked with Amn [Airman] Cabansag + can say he was shook up to the point he didn't want to talk."

Georgina Bruni interviewed Cabansag and he "denied he walked a distance of two miles or anything close to it. He also denies that he mistook the lighthouse for the UFO" (p. 192).

In fact Cabansag says he saw BOTH the UFO and the lighthouse at the same time (p. 193):

"It wasn't the lighthouse. I saw the lighthouse, this wasn't it, it was to the right of the lighthouse."

We have a very similar situation with Burroughs' alleged statement:

"Once we reached the farmer's house we could see a beacon going around, so we went toward it. We followed it for about 2 miles before we could see it was coming from a lighthouse."

But it was an absolute physical impossibility to see the ON lighthouse from the vicinity of the Green Farm farmhouse, which is at the 5-meter elevation level about sea level, in a depression in the terrain, as noted before. From the one spot where the ON lighthouse was actually visible a course straight towards the lighthouse would have run the PBC group into the walled property of the Butley Abbey after 0.5 mile into the alleged 2-mile chase, something none of them reported seeing or running into.

Burroughs also later denied the lighthouse theory. He told Antonio Huneeus that they saw the UFO then when it disappeared they then saw the evidently much less prominent lighthouse.

We must use certainties to resolve uncertainties. It is certain that the ON lighthouse could not be seen and followed for 2 miles east from the Woodbridge base perimeter road or from the start of the clearing leading to the Green Farm. It is therefore certain that the statements in the Cabansag and Burroughs documents claiming to have done so (and evidently repudiated by them later) are absolute lies. Then the question is who put

those lies into their statements?

The notion that a nineteen-year-old airman after only a few days on the job could have concocted the elaborate lying scenario of chasing a lighthouse beacon 2 miles through forest and glen is highly improbable. Cabansag's later testimony to Bruni has the ring of simple observational truth: "It couldn't have been two miles; it was cold out there." (p. 193)

My interpretation of the situation is that AFOSI deliberately falsified the statements of Cabansag and Burroughs (and probably that of Penniston as well but to a much lesser degree) in order to discredit Col. Halt, not them, and that it only incidentally had the effect also desirable to AFOSI of discrediting the PBC trio too.

The most threatening testimony to the AF coverup of UFO's was clearly Col. Halt's, with his multiple channels of evidence, including real-time taped witness narrative, compass readings, radioactivity readings, radio communications tied in with radar tracking, over a dozen witnesses in the group, and Halt's observations of UFO maneuvering near the Bentwaters AFB nuclear weapons storage area (WSA), certainly one of the most disturbing observations of all.

By inserting false material into the PBC statements suggestive of Col. Halt's 2-mile trek two nights later, AFOSI apparently intended to insinuate that Halt had chased the Orfordness (or Orford Ness or ON for short) lighthouse over the 2 miles. Since Halt had followed magnetic compass bearings that clearly proved they were not heading towards the ON lighthouse, it was easier to fraudulently suggest instead that PBC had followed the lighthouse (they apparently did not use a compass) and then try to confuse the Halt and PBC incidents so they appeared to be one and the same. The date discrepancies helped the intentional confusion of the two incidents as one incident.

The PBC trio never had a 2-mile trek into the Rendlesham woods. They never crossed the "open field" and passed a "farmer's house" (the Green Farm and Capel Green) -- that was what Halt did two nights later. The statements of Lt Buran and Sgt Chandler both indicate that Penniston told them by radio that the unidentified lights were just beyond the end of the access road leading from the base's East Gate by no more than about 100 meters. That would have been the approximate location of the Penniston close encounter.

Penniston's interview with Bruni indicates that after his close encounter with the landed object he headed farther east perhaps about 1/2 mile (p. 175). This is in fact the correct distance through the woods from that 100-meter point to the clearing into the open field and the only point in the entire area where the ON lighthouse can in fact be seen. This last spot is where they saw the ON lighthouse, nowhere else. Then they turned back to base.

Once these absolutely certain facts have been established we can then move on to less certain facts and issues with more confidence and with some keys to interpreting truth and falsehood and accuracy and inaccuracy.

Brad Sparks

This 2-mile journey from the Halt incident has been falsely inserted into the Cabansag and Burroughs statements, along with explicit assertions of "chasing a lighthouse" (my paraphrase) that they later denied ever making. Some parts of their statements were in fact their own so they later had difficulty understanding the problems with the statements. Since they were the junior members of the security team they were more susceptible to AFOSI pressure and threats, and S/Sgt Penniston as the senior member was the least susceptible. Cabansag had only been on duty at the base a day or two and was the least experienced.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 08:33:09 -0600
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:51:26 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Kentaro Mori <kentaro.mori.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 18:52:42 -0300
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 09:49:16 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>There are no obvious, undeniable signs of alien presence here,
>that's for sure. They did not land in front of the White House.
>Even if they didn't care about us, they didn't bulldoze the
>planet to create a hyperspace bypass. We can actually assume
>they don't exist and still live our lives, predicting
>astronomical events billions of light years away with great
>precision.

Of course the presence of extraterrestrial visitors is not
"undeniable". It is denied all the time, and that was precisely
my point. My point was further that future scientists may well
judge the denial an exercise in denial of historic proportions.

Whether "we can actually assume [ETs] don't exist and still live
our lives," of course, says nothing in particular, except that
so far we appear to have done so without too much trouble,
except for the regular expenditure of energy devoted to making
sure that potential evidence isn't seriously considered or
investigated. Whether we can continue to assume the non-presence
of ETs forever remains to be seen.

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 08:36:34 -0600
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:52:52 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:09:06 +0000
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 14:09:00 -0600
>>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>>One day, in a future generation perhaps in the latter part of
>>this century, when nearly everyone reading this is gone and thus
>>not around to gloat in vindication, science will grow up and
>>acknowledge its responsibility, and we'll be spared further
>>bleatings about the alleged invisibility and silence of
>>civilizations elsewhere.

>Always safe to make a prediction for when we're all safely dead,
>isn't it[,] Jerry? I suppose the real question is, who'll be doing
>the gloating?

Yeah, hard as it may be to believe, the world will go on after
you and I - and even Magonia and UFO UpDates - are no longer
here. I do hope that in their later lives, my children, now
young adults, will be around to do the gloating in their old
man's absence.

Happy New Year,

Jerry Clark

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Truth Is In There For 'Ufologists'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:57:00 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 09:57:00 -0500
Subject: Truth Is In There For 'Ufologists'

Source: The Sun - London, UK

<http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/article619195.ece>

26 December 2007

Truth Is In There For 'Ufologists'

By Paul Sutherland
Sun Spaceman

The Ministry of Defence is to publish all its 160 =93X Files=94 on UFOs.

It will declassify dossiers dating to the late 60s after pressure from flying saucer spotters.

The 'ufologists' are now hoping to get to the truth behind some of Britain's most baffling UFO mysteries.

They include The Cosford Incident =96 dozens of UFO 'sightings' in western Britain in 1993, The Berwyn Mountain Incident when a UFO 'crashed' in North Wales in 1974 and The Flying Cross Incident in Devon in 1967 when two cops in a car 'chased' a UFO.

It is also hoped they will clear up The Manchester Incident when, in 1995, a BA Boeing 737 was 'buzzed by a UFO' and The Rendlesham Incident when a brilliant light plunged into a Suffolk forest on Boxing Day, 1980.

The MoD is releasing the files because Freedom of Information Act data requests by ufologists are taking up too much staff time.

It said it hoped to =93counter the maze of rumour... over its role in UFO phenomena=94.

The files will be available for a fee through the National Archives in Kew.

France put its X Files on the web last year. They can be studied free.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 10:07:58 -0800
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:42:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
>Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>On UK Pending UFO Document Release
>Is A Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>The statement below, is from the Drudge Report Dec 25, 2007. It
>quotes Nick Pope on the pending UK release of UFO documents as
>indicating 60 years of official effort probing and investigating
>UFOs has not provided any real answers.

>Sadly, this release, which should not be taken at face value, by
>researchers who've studied carefully the full range of events
>and activity, UFO related, which has taken place in UK skies or
>countryside over the past few decades. It will however convince
>much of the media, here and abroad, that a truly full faith,
>honest opening has taken place.

>This prompts one to speculate, that an immensely clever
>"disclosure deception" operation is possibly being coordinated
>behind the scenes with multiple governments acting together in
>a "faux" disclosure effort. With high confidence, it is easy to
>predict that the scheduled UFO document release, will not
>include genuine high sensitivity events, especially those where
>the US was peripherally or directly involved, and will not
>reference UK crash retrievals , super secret space fleet
>activity , UK space surveillance jointly conducted and pooled
>with the NRO , or detail what is going on at Warton BAE special
>projects site in Lancashire and other sensitive and often
>underground facilities.

Without speculating on what may or may not be going on now, 160
total files for 60 years of investigation does not remotely
constitute "disclosure." That's not even 3 cases a year. Give me
a break!

Yes, 160 lousy files for 60 years, and suddenly "Disclosure" is
happening in the UK. If the mainstream press boys buy that,
they'll buy anything. You called it right Vince. Faux disclosure
it is.

In 1949, the FBI was told by Army and Air Force intelligence
that the subject was classified Top Secret. In 1957, Brazilian
Ufologist Dr. Olavo Fontes (who worked with APRO) was similarly
told by Brazilian naval intelligence that all the world's
militaries classified UFOs Top Secret.

How many "Top Secret" files on the subject have been released in
the last 60 years? I bet we could count them all on one hand.

If we're going to have real disclosure, how about the files of
the most interestingly named "Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit,"
whose files were turned over to AFOSI in the 1950s, according to
the Army Directorate of Counterintelligence? Not a single file
of the IPU has ever been released. What's the big secret? Could
it be that "Interplanetary" has something to do with it?

If the subject has been classified Top Secret worldwide for 60 years, there must be thousands of Top Secret files that have never been released. Release all of those, and maybe real disclosure will have taken place.

>"A former head of the Defense Ministry UFO project told the >newspaper that no matter what an individual believes regarding >UFOs, the released files should prove to be interesting >reading.

>'Whatever people think about UFOs, these documents are >fascinating and show how the MoD has researched and investigated >this mystery for nearly 60 years, without an answer,' former >department official Nick Pope said." --Matt Drudge

As Bruce Maccabee keeps pointing out, they probably knew the answer to the main big question within the first few years, namely these things were real and from somewhere else. They probably knew that within the first few months.

The rest of the big questions, "Who are they?", "What do they want?", "How does their technology work?", etc. may have kept them scratching their heads for the last 60 years.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 13:53:14 -0500
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:45:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
>Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>Sadly, this release, which should not be taken at face value, by
>researchers who've studied carefully the full range of events
>and activity, UFO related, which has taken place in UK skies or
>countryside over the past few decades. It will however convince
>much of the media, here and abroad, that a truly full faith,
>honest opening has taken place.

>This prompts one to speculate, that an immensely clever
>"disclosure deception" operation is possibly being coordinated
>behind the scenes with multiple governments acting together in a
>"faux" disclosure effort. With high confidence, it is easy to
>predict that the scheduled UFO document release, will not
>include genuine high sensitivity events, especially those where
>the US was peripherally or directly involved, and will not
>reference UK crash retrievals , super secret space fleet
>activity , UK space surveillance jointly conducted and pooled
>with the NRO , or detail what is going on at Warton BAE special
>projects site in Lancashire and other sensitive and often
>underground facilities.

I'm having some difficulty understanding what it is you're trying to say. Surely, the UK government is not about to reveal every last detail about its own secret military projects. No matter what one chooses to think with regard to the UFO phenomenon, surely it must be agreed that governments do have military projects that they like to keep safe from prying eyes. Given that, it seems safe to assume that some information for which there may be hints of will not be included in this disclosure. To suggest that this is in fact due to a reticence on the government's part to fully disclose UFO-related information is, I think, a bit simple-minded. Top-secret military projects do exist. A lack of disclosure of same may be deeply unsatisfying but I think it does not warrant this paranoia.

In any event, keep in mind that it is pretty unlikely that publicly elected officials are briefed on UFO matters to any great degree. If there is a group that has been holding onto this information I suggest that it's likely that they are doing so without the knowledge of anyone so pedestrian as an elected representative. Briefing the Prime Minister or US President and their staffs on such matters would surely lead to the information getting out.

What you are referring to by 'super secret space fleet activity' is anyone's guess.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 12:01:15 -0700
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:47:58 -0500
Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

>From: Kentaro Mori <kentaro.mori.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2007 18:52:42 -0300
>Subject: Re: The Fermi Death Sentence

<snip>

>If the Universe was teeming with civilizations, it wouldn't be a
>matter of ignoring evidence for UFOs, alien abductions and such.
>Those are all things on Earth, a pale blue dot in an infinite
>Universe. It would be simply impossible to understand the
>mechanics of the Universe around us, because it would be
>presumably engineered by intelligent beings to best fit their
>purposes.

>It would be like an ant trying to explain how the house in which
>it lives was formed. If it had good science, it would hardly be
>able to explain it without realizing the human Overlords to
>which it is so dependent.

Hi Mori,

I have snipped away most of your well-argued comments to address the above point a little further. I am in complete agreement that the Fermi paradox is substantive and profound, regardless of the status or origin of UFOs.

Let us suppose that the ants don't have particularly good 'science' - even if they don't see it that way. Is it not conceivable that they could develop a 'Theory of Houses' that doesn't incorporate, or even recognize, what we would consider the obvious clues to its 'artificial' nature?

Similarly to humans, they may uncover physical 'laws' based on empirical data that seem quite general and predictive. For example, "The Intersection of the Floor and a Wall Follows a Straight Line"; If Such a Straight Line is Followed to an End Point, A New Wall Emerges At Right Angles to the First", etc.

While they can only speculate as to how the Walls actually came into being (whence came the Big Bang?), the properties of the house as a whole can be made to fit quite nicely into a set of 'models' that account for what the ants are able to observe, with perhaps a Ptolemaic 'epicycle' added now and again as anomalies arise. The 'artificial' aspect of Houses per se is transparent to the ants, or perhaps only vaguely suspected (analogous to the human perception of the "unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics").

By now you must have a growing sense of foreboding as we teeter on the edge of the 'intelligent design' abyss. I similarly recoil, but let us make bold for a moment and consider a less sweeping proposal: is it possible that at least some of the phenomena and processes in our cosmic environment derive from intelligent behavior, but are unrecognized as such, and indeed have been subsumed into our theories of physical 'laws'?

I offer this only for the sake of discussion, and not as a

viable resolution of the Fermi Paradox. Even if intelligence on such a grand and exotic scale were extant, we are left with the 'continuum' problem: the default expectation is that there should be a continuous spectrum of technological/intellectual advancement amongst the ensemble of civilizations. It seems unreasonable that all, or even most, of them would be unrecognizable as such.

Mike

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 19:33:32 -0400
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:51:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
>Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>On UK Pending UFO Document Release
>Is A Faux Disclosure In The Works?

<snip>

I would like to point out that the NSA released 160 pages of UFO documents formerly classified TOP SECRET UMBRA. Unfortunately, all but a line or 2 on each page were whited out. The reason supposedly was that sources and methods information could not be released.

Furthermore, the CIA released a number of TOP SECRET UFO documents. Unfortunately, almost all of each document was blacked out. Again sources and methods supposedly were the problem.

Now how could 95% be sources and methods information?

These instances do establish that these two agencies are withholding UFO information. They certainly give no clue about what information was being withheld.

The MOD situation could be similar.

I should point out that in each case all the documents are more than 25 years old.

I wouldn't get my hopes up very high.

Stan Friedman

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

'UFO' Hits Orbiting NASA Satellite

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:58:58 -0500
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 07:58:58 -0500
Subject: 'UFO' Hits Orbiting NASA Satellite

Source: Satellite-CATV News - Ocala, Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2u76a6>

Thursday, 27 December 2007

UFO Hits NASA Satellite In Space
by Patrick Lynch

The orbiter took some damage

In the eternity of space, the chance of a meeting between two free-floating objects would probably not produce odds you'd want to bet on.

But in the ever-more-crowded arena of low-Earth orbit, the area up to about 1,200 miles above the surface, those odds might be improving.

An unknown object apparently collided with a satellite with NASA Langley Research Center connections in November, sending several broken pieces flying into orbit. The satellite was decommissioned in December 2005, but was one of NASA's largest and brightest in low-Earth orbit, and popular among amateur sky watchers. Called UARS, Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite, it was launched in 1991 and carried a NASA Langley instrument called HALOE that captured data about the chemistry of the atmosphere.

On Nov. 10, something apparently hit the school bus-sized orbiter. It could have been one of the many pieces in a growing field of 'space junk'. It could have been a meteoroid. Space debris often leaves dings and dents in satellites and even the space shuttle, and aging satellites decay over time. But a collision that actually creates new pieces of debris is more rare.

"When I heard this, I was shocked," said Jim Russell, a Hampton University professor who was the project lead for HALOE. "This is very unexpected. That's not normal decay."

Nicholas L. Johnson, chief scientist for NASA's Orbital Debris Program, said it remains unclear what happened to UARS. Four pieces bigger than 4 inches in diameter - roughly the size of a trackable piece of space junk - were sent into orbit, but it is unclear how large those pieces are.

A collision from a meteoroid or another piece of debris is the best hypothesis, Johnson said. The core of the spacecraft appears to still be intact.

"Unfortunately, we might not ever learn what caused the event," Johnson said.

Mark Matney, who works with Johnson in the Orbital Debris Program, said satellites with still-functioning pressurized

systems sometimes eject new debris if a tank explodes. But UARS had no such systems, so a collision is the best explanation.

Only three known collisions between two satellites have ever occurred, Matney said. But these 'anomalous' events, where it's not clear what one of the colliding objects was, do happen occasionally, he said.

"It's very hard to determine," what might have hit UARS, Matney said.

Decommissioned satellites typically continue to orbit for years before losing energy and falling toward Earth, usually to burn up. UARS was expected to fall out of orbit around 2011, Russell said.

UARS weighed about 13,000 pounds and measured 35 feet long and 15 feet wide, perhaps making it a better target than most.

The U.S. Space Surveillance Network, run by the Air Force, estimates there are about 10,000 objects in low-Earth orbit that are larger than 4 inches. The network's sensitive ground-based instruments can track those objects. The objects range from communication satellites to the International Space Station to junk - pieces of decaying satellites and the remnants of rocket boosters.

The field of debris has become an increasing concern as the number of pieces continues to increase. The debris field was also significantly expanded in January of this year, when China angered the U.S. and other nations by testing an anti-satellite missile. The Chinese destroyed their FY-1C satellite, an aging weather observer.

The missile test exploded the satellite into more than 1,000 pieces of debris, and U.S. intelligence and defense analysts almost immediately deduced what had happened, before the Chinese government admitted it a few weeks later.

The UARS collision created only a handful of new pieces of debris, but still, "You hope it's not anything sinister," said Ellis Remsberg, a Langley scientist who worked on HALOE with Russell.

Two of the large pieces that broke off UARS have apparently already burned up in the atmosphere, Johnson said. The other two pieces will likely do the same.

What remains of the craft's core will continue to orbit for some time - barring another collision.

"It was a bright object in the sky," said Russell. "You could see it over the Peninsula every 33 days."

What is UARS?

The Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite was launched in 1991 and carried multiple atmospheric-observing instruments, one of which was built at NASA Langley Research Center in Hampton. The satellite, which weighed about 13,000 pounds and was more than 30 feet long, was decommissioned in 2005 but continued to orbit Earth. It was apparently struck by an object in space in November.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 13:03:23 -0000
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:20:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 10:07:58 -0800
>Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

<snip>

>Yes, 160 lousy files for 60 years, and suddenly "Disclosure" is
>happening in the UK. If the mainstream press boys buy that,
>they'll buy anything. You called it right Vince. Faux disclosure
>it is.

<snip>

Right David,

Think the Brits are playing it by the (CIA) book: here's an
extract from the (now rare) popular version -

[Quote]

"The failure of this cover story illustrates - among other
things - several points about cover stories in general; they
should not be too precise, nor too detailed, and they should not
be forthcoming too quickly, nor all at once.

[story paragraph]

To be too precise in a cover story qualitatively increases the
chances of repudiation of the story; to be too detailed
increases those chances quantitatively. To speak out too fast is
to show your hand before you know all you can about what your
opponent is holding in his; and to tell all in one bleat
eliminates your chances to improvise as the Situation develops.
The proof of this British pudding lay in the fact that the
Soviet visit went on to its planned completion, and, following
their single protest, the Russians dropped the matter."

[End Quote]

That's available in full on-line at:

http://www.xenu.net/archive/go/felix/ch_i4.htm

go 'Find' for Bulganin

Interesting book, have an old hard-back copy and it's still
getting pounded.

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Greg Boone <evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 05:55:00 -0800
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 09:19:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 10:07:58 -0800
>Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
>>Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>>On UK Pending UFO Document Release
>>Is A Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>>The statement below, is from the Drudge Report Dec 25, 2007. It
>>quotes Nick Pope on the pending UK release of UFO documents as
>>indicating 60 years of official effort probing and investigating
>>UFOs has not provided any real answers.

>>Sadly, this release, which should not be taken at face value, by
>>researchers who've studied carefully the full range of events
>>and activity, UFO related, which has taken place in UK skies or
>>countryside over the past few decades. It will however convince
>>much of the media, here and abroad, that a truly full faith,
>>honest opening has taken place.

>>This prompts one to speculate, that an immensely clever
>>"disclosure deception" operation is possibly being coordinated
>>behind the scenes with multiple governments acting together in
>>a "faux" disclosure effort. With high confidence, it is easy to
>>predict that the scheduled UFO document release, will not
>>include genuine high sensitivity events, especially those where
>>the US was peripherally or directly involved, and will not
>>reference UK crash retrievals , super secret space fleet
>>activity , UK space surveillance jointly conducted and pooled
>>with the NRO , or detail what is going on at Warton BAE special
>>projects site in Lancashire and other sensitive and often
>>underground facilities.

>Without speculating on what may or may not be going on now, 160
>total files for 60 years of investigation does not remotely
>constitute "disclosure." That's not even 3 cases a year. Give me
>a break!

>Yes, 160 lousy files for 60 years, and suddenly "Disclosure" is
>happening in the UK. If the mainstream press boys buy that,
>they'll buy anything. You called it right Vince. Faux disclosure
>it is.

>In 1949, the FBI was told by Army and Air Force intelligence
>that the subject was classified Top Secret. In 1957, Brazilian
>Ufologist Dr. Olavo Fontes (who worked with APRO) was similarly
>told by Brazilian naval intelligence that all the world's
>militaries classified UFOs Top Secret.

<snip>

My head hurts whenever I reiterate this opinion. The world's big
shots are aware of the origin of some of these UFO reports.
Whatever that is, and yes I know, it's something they all fear

in unison. What could that be? Obviously without burning out a brain cell it boils down to losing control of the established control mechanisms governments and religions and ethnic groups engage in. Being told "you're wrong" is like hitting a human in the face with a brick.

You can't screw people over if they're too smart.

When you keep people in the dark you can keep tripping them up.

It doesn't get any more complicated than that.

White, black, tall, short, Christian, Jew, Muslim, all fall apart to some degree with the truth and grow in some degree with the truth but not in ways that allows them to be continually controlled and ripped off.

Throw down on some Sherlock Holmes here gang and what's not done and said says and does more.

What's even sadder are the UFOlogists who danged sure know and won't disclose because they'd be out of work and not so popular at the discos.

I've said it a thousand times, we're part of a larger social group of beings that the term extraterrestrial is a play on words. The technologies employed to control and corral us are very impressive but not perfect. There's been a constant degradation in that control sphere due to the emergence of the United States because freedom of thought is the first step to total freedom of being. Uncle Sam's been able to throw a monkey wrench in the works and no matter how imposing the opposition looks the bottom line is no one can hold you down except you.

>As Bruce Maccabee keeps pointing out, they probably knew the
>answer to the main big question within the first few years,
>namely these things were real and from somewhere else. They
>probably knew that within the first few months.

>The rest of the big questions, "Who are they?", "What do they
>want?", "How does their technology work?", etc. may have kept
>them scratching their heads for the last 60 years.

I want a David Rudiak t-shirt and lunch box and superhero poster.

David, we need to talk. Doc Maccabee is spot on. The authorities knew from jump street what was going on and it shook em' up so bad they went into all sorts of agreement with the powers that be to maintain the cover up.

Presidents who knew and I'm saying Clinton knows too won't talk. It upsets their apple carts that's why.

We are 'They'. We're all part and parcel and it's sort of like those family secrets no one talks about. The U.S. was a wild card that kept beating the odds and our 'visitors' didn't know what to do with us. Their favored ethnic social groups used the oldest tricks in the book to undermine the U.S. but we're getting wise to it. Expect some new religion or social thing to emerge which is the same ol' same ol' with a new dressing on it.

I've said it over and over again, the biggest clue is in the fact we have every kind of bit of evidence except irrefutable physical proof. Some of us have seen it, but it's like Sisyphus of ancient Greek lore as soon as you get that boulder to the top it rolls right back down again. That's control but it's not perfection. Our enemies best weapons are already built-in to us, greed, fear, hate, bigotry, arrogance. There're no shortages of those round these parts.

Saying this phenomenon is extraterrestrial is a play on words. Everything is extraterrestrial.

The Earth is not a source point. It's made up of cosmic stuff and more's added each day.

Are 'they' us or are we 'they'? It's irrelevant, there are no new goodies just the same old stirred stuff but residence and behavior might clash with superstition and if disclosed scare the snot out of the customers. Let's just say some of the

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

disclosure is good because if misinterpreted about 4 billion people will crap themselves and never get to sleep at night because some of the data mirrors old superstitious nonsense that was included to control us.

So again, if the only thing the world's leaders agree upon is to keep this stuff secret then you have to ask yourself what would mortal enemies have in common that they'd keep it all secret to the point of this magnitude?

That's your answer and that's that.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:54:27 -0800
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:42:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 10:50:00 -0500
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 19:29:46 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>Civilization and extensive tool use probably has happened before
>>in the solar system, just as it has on earth, with toolmakers
>>millions of years more advanced than us, possessing technology
>>which has allowed them to live wherever they feel secure.

>Probably? That's quite an assertion! We haven't even established
>if anything has ever lived elsewhere in our solar system and
>you're claiming that it's likely that entire civilisations
>have flourished? That's a rather bizarre form of logic.

Brian,

I believe Betty and Barney and Charles Hickson and Calvin Parker so their stories allow me to believe that alien creatures exist and drive fancy machines. I do not believe that star travel is possible nor will it ever be possible. Therefore I think it's only logical that these creatures and machines come from civilizations in our own solar system. What is bizarre about that?

>>To limit the discussion to either star travelers or illusion
>>seems fairly stupid, to me.

>And making baseless assertions?

I don't find it "baseless". How do you explain these encounters with other forms of life? ET (star folks)? Or do you deny they ever took place and that Barney, and Charles were bold-faced liars?

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

From Roswell To Rose Bowl

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:47:37 -0500
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:47:37 -0500
Subject: From Roswell To Rose Bowl

Source: The Valencia County News Bulletin - Belen, New Mexico, USA

<http://www.news-bulletin.com/news/76704-12-26-07.html>

Wednesday, December 26, 2007

From Roswell To Rose Bowl, UFO Float Caravan Stops In Los Lunas

Kenn Rodriguez
News-Bulletin Staff Writer
krodriguez.nul-bulletin.com

Los Lunas Valencia County is not known for UFO sightings, but it will play a part in a UFO encounter Friday and Saturday, Dec. 28 and 29, as A Cruise To The Rose Parade rolls through Los Lunas on the famed Route 66.

The cruise of classic cars, which is sponsored by the New Mexico Department of Tourism, Expo New Mexico and Roswell UFO Museum, starts in Roswell at the city's UFO Museum Friday morning and stops in Moriarty at El Comedor de Anaya restaurant before making its way to Los Lunas for a reception at the village hall at 6:30 p.m. Friday.

Karen Duffy, marketing director for Expo New Mexico, said the reception is "part of the promotion for the excitement of having a float in the Rose Parade.

Valencia County so great about always participating in car events and activities, so we're making our way through Los Lunas in addition to Moriarty and Gallup because it's always so good about helping the car culture out."

The reception, which will include appetizers and music, is being hosted by Los Lunas Mayor Louis Huning.

The group will leave Saturday morning after a breakfast at their host hotel, the Los Lunas Inn and Suites. After the breakfast, which is open to the public, the cars will caravan out of town. Duffy said local car enthusiasts are welcome to come show their cars and ride out to Gallup on N.M. 6. She added some local cars are planning to be part of the caravan.

"We have 15 cars, some vintage cars, but we don't want to exclude anyone," she said. "We don't want to be snobs. We want everyone to come. Anyone who wants to go is more than welcome to come along."

Duffy said a group of New Mexicans headed out Wednesday to begin working on the float itself. So far the caravan itself is planned to have 33 people in it, she said.

In addition to the stop in Gallup, the caravan has stopovers planned in Kingman, Ariz. On Saturday, Dec. 30 and Pomona, Calif. on Sunday, Dec. 31.

"Our promotion in Kingman is sort of 'Space Cowboys,' the old west meets aliens," Duffy said. "We're just going to have fun along the way and promote New Mexico tourism."

Rachel Pugh, director of the Valencia County Chamber of Commerce, was instrumental in bringing the cars to Los Lunas. For information or to reserve a place at the breakfast, call her at 352-3596.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 20:11:36 -0000
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:52:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 23:52:31 EST
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>First, I must insist on a methodological rule. Certainties must
>control over uncertainties. Only facts that are certain and
>conclusive can resolve contradictions, discrepancies and
>confusion caused by a plethora of uncertain claims or "uncertain
>facts" (actually, if it is uncertain then it really cannot be a
>"fact"). No matter how many uncertain points are adduced they
>cannot add up to a certainty.

Agreed. Certainties control over uncertainties.

<snip>

>Here is a conclusive, hard fact: It is an absolute physical
>impossibility for anyone to have seen and "chased" the
>Orfordness (or Orford Ness, ON for short) lighthouse for 2 miles
>east of the east end of the Woodridge base back in 1980, because
>the beacon is only visible at one tiny area where it is high
>enough to see it and it is unobstructed by trees. As one
>progresses eastward from this small spot the land slopes
>downward till it reaches sea level only 0.4 mile to the east.
>The view of the ON lighthouse is blocked by a ridge on the east
>banks of the Butley river, around Gedgrave Hall.

I generally agree.

It is a certainty that Burroughs (B) refers to walking "about 2
miles" from the edge of the forest towards the light, and
Cabansag (C) says that the point where it was identified as a
lighthouse was "a good 2 miles past our vehicle".

It is certain that these statements are not exactly equivalent,
as C's 2 miles includes the walk through the forest from the
point where they left the truck.

It is certain that the two accounts are discrepant, but I agree
that in either case a long walk is implied.

I'd say it is fairly certain that B's 4-mile round-trip from the
forest edge, stumbling in darkness through farm fields in
pursuit of a lighthouse, is wholly unrealistic, psychologically
as well as topographically. C's 4-mile trip from the vehicle
could conceivably (depending on assumptions) include 1/2 mile
out and 1/2 mile back through the forest, reducing the potential
walk through the fields to a 3-mile round trip. But I agree this
is still very unrealistic.

IMO it is not certain that these discrepant guesstimates, in
rather cursory statements said to have been written a week after
the event for the personal use of Col Halt (not as part of the
then-completed AF formalities), should bear as much weight as if
they were measured or calculated distances between clearly
agreed points. Distances over unfamiliar terrain at night are

hard to judge at the best of times, and the men had other things on their minds. They were greatly excited by their encounter in the forest. It isn't certain that they recollected accurately how far they'd gone afterwards and how long it really took. Typically the direction of the error in such cases is to inflate judgments of duration - lab experiments show that estimated duration increases in proportion to the eventfulness of a period (i.e., the number and novelty of stimuli).

It is fairly certain that they talked about it afterwards and their memories of details like distance could easily have been formed by a degree of confabulation during the ensuing week. It is far from certain, but possible and consistent, that someone had estimated the total excursion as about 2 miles (this could fit the map) and that a figure of 2 miles entered B's and C's narratives in slightly different but equally inaccurate ways.

It is certain that Buran's statement says that the order to turn back was radioed from CSC at 0354.

It is certain that 0300 is consistently given for the start of the affair in the witness statements that Halt had prepared for him, and 0300 appears in Halt's memo too.

It isn't certain that this is the correct time. The witnesses may have been lying, coerced by AFOSI (say) to give an orchestrated wrong time-line for the purpose of throwing off later investigators. There are difficulties with this because these statements were not made as part of the official AF investigation but afterwards and privately for Col Halt, who by this time of course had his own experiences and his own motivations for being interested.

Conceivably Halt and P, B & C could have had their own reasons for obfuscating the time in documents that Halt made sure remained private for 12 years, but such speculation is fraught with uncertainty and takes us away from the immediate and certain facts.

It's also true that statements made a week after the fact could just be seriously in error. And although Halt's memo was presumably not written under coercion it was compiled even later and could even be based solely on erroneous week-old witness statements. On the other hand we appear to know (from Penniston and Halt) that Halt spoke to the Security people the following morning and had access to P & B's Form 1569 Incident & Complaint Report. It was this "very detailed report of what we observed out there" (said Penniston) that alerted Halt to "what had really happened" so that a new entry was authorised for the eviscerated Security Police blotter. Halt potentially had various oral and written sources available to confirm the time.

Statements from personnel who were not involved directly as witnesses also give 0300. Chandler, at Benwaters, said that he monitored Burroughs' initial radio report at this time. Buran's statement, from the point of view of the Center for Security Control, gives "approximately 0300" for the time when he was first informed of this "initial report", and said P and C arrived "shortly after this". He concedes straight away that his recollection "may be inaccurate" given the lapse of time, but his record of the time he issued the order to terminate the search (0354) is rather specific.

So although it isn't certain that 0300 is correct, there needs IMO to be a rather good reason for overturning it.

There is another more recently claimed start time, 20 past midnight. But this is arguably less certain still. It is inconsistent with another time given by the same claimant (P) in 1983 - 2:00 AM - and the documentary support for it - the alleged contemporaneous notebook - has also an inconsistent date (Dec 27) and an inconsistent object description - smooth, black and glassy - whereas in 1983 he had said it was "off-white" and "dirty". Overturning the original 0300 on this basis doesn't look like an attractive bet to me.

Inference: From the account of the preparation and dispatch of the second security team after the initial a/c-down report one imagines that some minutes would elapse before the truck got to the start of the P & B expedition. Say they had about 45 minutes from 0310 to get from the truck to the final position at 0354.

This would be consistent with Penniston's original statement of arriving back at the truck "after a 45 minute walk". At a reasonable steady walking rate of 2 mph they could have got about a mile and a half from the truck before turning back, but allowing for the initial UFO encounter and pursuit in the forest, the darkness, trees, fences and other obstacles a mile might be more reasonable. Making possibly a total round trip out and back of about 2 miles.

Tentative conclusion: It isn't ruled out that the origin of the "2 mile walk" could be uncertainty and normal confabulation. If there is a sinister origin for this figure (as part of a deception to implicate the lighthouse) one might expect the stories to be more coordinated. In fact the two uses of the figure by B and C are different and inconsistent. This is suggestive of extremely subtle and elaborate deception, of which B and C would not (it is claimed, in support of the theory that the statements were part of an AFOSI plot to implicate the lighthouse) have been capable. Or it is suggestive of ingenuous, rather than ingenious, inaccuracy in different recollections of a confusing event, of which they probably would have been capable.

In support of the latter there is the certainty that Burroughs stands by the account written in his own hand, and defends it against "twisting" by sceptics who try to claim that it implicates the lighthouse as the source of the object in the woods. He objects strongly - and correctly - that it does no such thing and that it explicitly distinguishes the blue-and-red-lit UFO from the lighthouse which he says was only seen once they got out from the forest into the field. Burroughs' recent accounts seem to cleave quite closely to that written statement. He has had every opportunity to disclaim it and tell us that he wrote it under duress, but (AFAIK) has never done so.

There is also the certainty that Penniston's account reports "positive identification" from close range of a "mechanical device", which seems to counter-indicate the theory that it was written to suppress evidence of a mechanical craft and implicate the lighthouse.

>The area where the ON lighthouse is visible is less than 1/10th
>mile in size at the beginning of the forest clearing that opens
>onto the farmer's field at Green Farm and Capel Green. This is
>obvious from the OS maps I've examined in great detail and from
>simple calculations and it was confirmed by local skeptic Robert
>McLean who went out there at night around 2000 (who told me he
>couldn't see anything except at that one spot), and by Dave
>Rudiak in the daytime in April 2002. See Dave's webpage:

>http://www.roswellproof.com/Rendlesham_pictorial.html

>No skeptics or debunkers have ever been able to do the simple
>scientific experiment and take a video camera out to Rendlesham
>forest and photograph the ON lighthouse, to prove that it can
>be seen in the woods and followed for 2 miles. Various film
>crews
>reporting on the Rendlesham incident have likewise never been
>able to prove the ON lighthouse was visible for a 2-mile
>"chase," not even the caustically anti-UFO BBC.

>Moreover, as nautical charts show and as Rudiak proved with his
>closeup photo of the ON lighthouse, the blinding light is
>"masked" to the west. Skeptics and debunkers have claimed it
>was the blinding light of the ON lighthouse that dazzled the USAF
>witnesses, when in fact no such blinding light was ever beamed
>in their direction. It is a simple fact that the hundreds of
>thousands of residents in SE England do not want to be blinded
>every frikkin night by a lighthouse beaming into their houses
>and bedrooms, so that direction is blocked and only a tiny
>amount of light leaks out by backscattering from mist in front
>of the eastward beam.

I'm not aware of any evidence or persuasive argument that what was initially seen in the trees on Dec 26 was the lighthouse. There's no way that this could be visible through well over 1/2 mile of dense plantation from the base or near the E gate access road (the argument by Halt and others that everybody at the base knew about the lighthouse because they saw it every day could be said to suffer by this; but I understand that the lighthouse _beam_ was regularly visible above the forest, so this could be what is meant.) I think that in connection with the initial

sighting of the red, white and blue lit object by PBC, which has been the subject of this thread, arguments about the lighthouse are a red herring and I have tried to avoid getting involved with the lighthouse. However its visibility is certainly relevant to reconstructing the route PBC may subsequently have taken and therefore material to the above estimates of time and distance.

It seems possible to me that the subsequent sighting by PBC of what proved to be the lighthouse could have begun within the forest well before they emerged from the E edge of the trees into the field.

Here

<http://www.ianridpath.com/ufo/photos.htm>

is a photo taken in Nov 1983 from what appears to be a few hundred yards inside the forest, most of which has been felled except a narrow stand along the E edge which borders the farmer's field. You can see the eastern skyline beyond fairly clearly despite the gloomy weather

Here

<http://www.ianridpath.com/ufo/rendleshamla.htm>

is the same stand of trees in darkness, again from inside the felled forest looking E in Nov 1983. This appears to prove that the potential area of visibility of the lighthouse is not restricted to the small area in the field beyond, indicated in David Rudiak's map here

http://www.roswellproof.com/Rendlesham_pictorial.html

(BTW the the horizon gap through which the light house is visible appears not to be a "gap in the hills" as characterised but is a gap between stands of trees. The left hand patch is deciduous woodland which in winter could be seen through in places. This is well shown here

<http://www.ianridpath.com/ufo/farmandlighthouse.JPG>

where the trees are shown leafless in 2005. The practical area of visibility of the light in winter, 25 years earlier, could have been larger than some photos appear to indicate.)

Anyway, back to the view from within the forest: Of course there were many more trees in 1980. Nevertheless it seems possible that the lighthouse could have been visible to PB intermittently in gaps through the trees during a walk through the forest. The fact that the trees were mature and tall means that there would have been minimal or no low branches and foliage and minimal undergrowth, not like the dense low growth of the new replanting. As everyone knows, mature plantations produce thick tree-top canopies but near ground level are sparse, being regular rows of bare trunks over basically dead ground.

So I can imagine that they began seeing the lighthouse when still well within the forest and were not sure of its identity until they'd emerged and started down the field towards the farm house. But this cannot extend the distance to anything like 2 miles, which remains a gross exaggeration.

>So when the statements of USAF Security Police airmen Cabansag >and Burroughs allege that they all had conducted a foolish 2- >mile chase of the lighthouse through the woods and an "open >field" near a "farmer's house," this was an absolute physical >impossibility and a total lie. In fact, the 2-mile trek through >the open field near the farmhouse was what Col. Halt's group >did two nights later, not Penniston, Cabansag, Burroughs trio >("PBC" for short).. How did this 2-mile Halt trek get inserted >into the statements of Cabansag and Burroughs (and is also in >Penniston's by implication)?

I don't think it can be called "certain" in terms of your methodological rule (which I applaud) that the "2 miles" is a "total lie", inasmuch as the figure appears in slightly different contexts in the statements by B and C - in B's case, the distance they went past the edge of the forest, in C's case the distance from the vehicle. Well, is it acceptable that two guesstimates,

at least one of which must be wrong, should be the same by coincidence? Yes it's possible, but there could easily be a causal connection if a 2-mile figure had been mentioned by somebody and they both echoed this imprecisely in their different recollections a week after the event. A subtle imposture is possible, but I wouldn't say it is certain.

>But there is more inserted than just a purported 2-mile hike in
>the Rendlesham forest at night, but also the almost snide
>comments about how they were purportedly just foolishly
>pursuing a lighthouse beacon. There is no possible innocent
> explanation here. A hypothetical secretarial slipup with drafting
>statements for both Halt and the PBC group (but Burroughs'
>statement is handwritten) could hypothetically have gotten Halt's
>2-mile hike inserted into PBC's statements but it would not have
>resulted in the creation of an utterly fictitious and impossible
>lighthouse chase which didn't come from Halt.

Burroughs himself seems to be clear that his account most certainly does not implicate the light house and that to make it read this way is a sceptical "twisting" of his words. I think he has a point. As you say this is in his own hand, and he does not disown it as an AFOSI forgery.

It's difficult to interpret Penniston's account of a "positively identified mechanical device 50m away illuminating a 30m area with steady blue light and a red light on top" as being designed to implicate the lighthouse. Not by AFOSI anyway, because, according to Bruni, Penniston accepts the content of the statement as being his own words. Well that's an opinion many years later, he couldn't - and didn't - swear that it was word for word. But he evidently didn't complain to Bruni, "Hey, I never said anything like this!" Penniston doesn't actually mention the lighthouse. Maybe such an omission could be calculated to suggest that P wasn't aware of it and might have been deluded by it? But Chandler's statement tells us that P did report the lighthouse separately at the time, placing this in the context of P's inability to "reach the area" (therefore not necessarily in the context of P's approach to within 50m of the initial object).

Chandler's corroboration that Penniston reported being within 50m of an object, and identified the light house separately, doesn't read to me like a ruse to implicate the light house. Given that they were now bound to be extra alert for mystery lights, and that the lighthouse was bound to be a striking presence among the trees when they approached the E side of the forest, I think it's quite natural that B, P (apparently along with C, see later) would be attracted by it and follow it out into the field to a point where they were sure of what it was. The sole area of difficulty here seems to me to be the "2 miles" ambiguously recollected by Burroughs and Cabansag, which I've discussed above.

Cabansag's account is the least specific where it counts, and most easily interpreted as a possible smokescreen, even though he too explicitly describes seeing the beacon separately from the UFO lights and at the same time. But he was a very junior new boy, his role is the least interesting and according to P and B peripheral. According to them he wasn't actually present at the close encounter. Would OSI fixers concentrate on C, leaving P's and B's statements either only inconsistently tampered with or (as in B's case, apparently) untouched? Maybe, but it seems far from certain to me, and more likely that if C's account is deliberately smudged, rather than just vague and confused, then it was done by him and/or P & B for personal reasons.

>Halt's team did not pursue the ON lighthouse and their magnetic
>compass readings prove it, as recorded on audio tape right while
>they were in the pursuit (their readings were about 110- 120
>degrees, whereas the ON lighthouse was at 98 degs Magnetic,
>after correcting for 1980 declination of 5.2 degs and 2.7 degs
>for "grid north"; the OS maps show that about 110 Mag was the
>only possible route Halt and his men could have followed without
>running into walls or more forest and it fits their real time
>descriptions on the tape). Needless to say, there was and is no
>lighthouse or beacon light out at about 110-120 Magnetic.

That's interesting, but I think the Halt affair should be kept separate from discussion of the 26 Dec events. I'll come back to

this later if I may.

>Here are the lying statements from the Cabansag and Burroughs
>documents. First from Cabansag, right after admitting that
>"nothing was visible" when they were passing "through the woody
>forrest [forest]" (correct from the standpoint of a lighthouse,
>not correct from the standpoint of a UFO maneuvering through
>the trees) and it was only after getting through the woods into
>the clearing that they could see any lights, namely the "lit up
>farm house."

C says clearly that he too could see the red, blue and white lights during the walk from the truck into the forest. He says that when he was walking through the forest they weren't visible any more. Possibly a lie? But when was he walking through the forest?

This depends on niceties of timing we can't really be sure about. B and P seem to say that C wasn't actually with them during the close encounter but stayed back - apparently as an intermediate radio relay between them and Chandler back at the vehicle. All this is very far from clear, but it does seem possible that C did not follow B and P directly into the clearing after the blue-red object so didn't share their close-range view of it flying up through the trees and away, that he only caught up with them after this for their walk through to the E edge of the forest during which the lighthouse was under suspicion.

C does not say that the blue and red lights he saw were anything to do with the light house. He identifies a separate "yellow light" which he says turned out to be the lighthouse beacon. Granted he appears to describe seeing this from an early stage of the walk at the same time as the "UFO" lights, which is a bit difficult to tie into the sequence of events. But his whole recollection of time and distance appears suspect, including the statement that they left the vehicle and proceeded on foot from only 100m away from the East Gate, which makes no sense and is further reason to suspect that his "good 2 miles" of walking should be taken with a large pinch of salt.

>Then Cabansag's false statement alleges:

>"But we ran and walked a good 2 miles past our the vehicle,
>until we got to a vantage point where we could determine that
>what we were chasing was only a beacon light off in the
>distance. Our route through the forrest [sic] and field was a
>direct one, straight towards the light. We informed CSC
>[Central Security Control by radio] that the light beacon was
>farther than we thought, so CSC terminated our investigation."

>This statement if it had been true would have been extremely
>damaging, not to Cabansag but to Halt. Here was a lowly
>airman
>on his first or second day on the job who makes a a
>laughingstock out of a Lt Colonel who evidently cannot tell a
>lighthouse from a UFO! Even though on different dates, a
>lighthouse has to be visible every night that is relatively
>clear, so the "fact" that the "same lighthouse" was seen on
>"multiple nights," as debunkers would claim, would ruin Halt
>and his UFO observation. The fact there were some odd date
>discrepancies could have been used to muddy the waters even
>further, enabling a propaganda innuendo that these were even
>one and the same incident.

>But a handwritten note at the bottom of the Cabansag statement,
>signed by "H" (possibly Halt) says: "I'm convinced that this is
>a 'cleaned up' version of what happened. I talked with Amn
>[Airman] Cabansag + can say he was shook up to the point he
>didn't want to talk."

Possibly C did see more than he wished to let on about, but P & B took pity on him, being a junior, and agreed to keep his involvement to a minimum. I think I read somewhere (possibly a remark by Bruni, or Jenny Randles) that P & B gave the impression that they might be covering for a third party.

According to Bruni the annotation is indeed Halt's. And this is relevant to motive in the question of who these statements were made for, and why.

>Georgina Bruni interviewed Cabansag and he "denied he walked a
>distance of two miles or anything close to it.

Yes, it does seem a grossly exaggerated distance, as discussed above. I wonder when, and after what exposure to questions, suggestions, personal reflection etc Cabansag was in a position to say in recent years that he did not walk the 2 miles originally stated in 1980? Because denying today that he really walked 2 miles is not quite the same as denying that he could have mistakenly thought it was 2 miles in 1980. As I read it C is not claiming that he could not have said this. He is not claiming that he remembers saying anything else. He is saying that he doesn't remember much of anything about what he said, was vague, and paid scant attention to what he was signing.

I suppose that leaves open the possibility that he was duped. But by whom? These statements were, according to Bruni (quoting Halt), prepared after the official investigation and at Halt's personal request, and were held by him as private papers, so I'm not sure where AFOSI comes in. A probably-correct revision of opinion years later about circumstances that were probably far from clear at the time is surely not proof that the original evidence was doctored. The best we can say, again, is that the truth is uncertain, and I agree with you that the product of several uncertainties can never be a new certainty.

>He also denies
>that he mistook the lighthouse for the UFO" (p. 192).

Indeed he does, and did so originally.

>In fact Cabansag says he saw BOTH the UFO and the lighthouse
>at the same time (p. 193):

>"It wasn't the lighthouse. I saw the lighthouse, this wasn't
>it, it was to the right of the lighthouse."

This is in his original statement, as discussed above, where he says the yellow beacon light was visible independently of the UFO lights.

>We have a very similar situation with Burroughs' alleged
>statement:

>"Once we reached the farmer's house we could see a beacon going
>around, so we went toward it. We followed it for about 2 miles
>before we could see it was coming from a lighthouse."

>But it was an absolute physical impossibility to see the ON
>lighthouse from the vicinity of the Green Farm farmhouse, which
>is at the 5-meter elevation level about sea level, in a
>depression in the terrain, as noted before. From the one spot
>where the ON lighthouse was actually visible a course straight
>towards the lighthouse would have run the PBC group into the
>walled property of the Butley Abbey after 0.5 mile into the
>alleged 2-mile chase, something none of them reported seeing or
>running into.

I think it would be more realistic to allow some latitude in these rather loose narratives that were written for Halt apparently after all the AF debriefings and reports were finished and evidently without much concern for absolutely precise language. When Burroughs says "once we reached the farmer's house" I think we can allow that this might mean "when we were in the field where the house was" rather than insisiting he means "once we'd reached a position perpendicularly abreast the farmhouse on our route due east". This seems to me to be the logical inference from the "absolute physical impossibility" of seeing the lighthouse from the position of the farmhouse: if they saw the lighthouse at all then they must have been in a place from which it was visible, which would be nearer the edge of the wood. I wouldn't personally insist that Burroughs ought to have been absolutely certain, a week later, of exactly the spot in the field where he first became aware of the lighthouse - possibly a disorientated moment in the immediate aftermath of the UFO vanishing; or, if he did recall, that he thought such exactitude much mattered when writing it down.

I don't think we need to insist either that "we followed it for 2 miles" means that it was continuously in view for 2 miles. It could mean that they walked in its direction, lost sight of it

in the dip, regained sight of it later at which point its identity was obvious. But I agree the supposed "2 miles" from this point is completely unrealistic anyway, so this is neither here nor there.

It's possible that Burroughs inserted this as a cunning decoy to call the rest of his account into question, or that some agent did it on his behalf (unknown to Halt, for whom it was prepared). But Burroughs does not say that his account was tampered with. Burroughs does not accept that his account implicates the lighthouse, and criticises those who "twist" his words to fit that meaning. (I suppose he could have been acting then and ever since as an agent of disinformation, but if we took that seriously then we might as well throw the whole story in the bin and give up.)

>Burroughs also later denied the lighthouse theory. He told >Antonio Huneeus that they saw the UFO then when it disappeared >they then saw the evidently much less prominent lighthouse.

Burroughs never did claim that the UFO was the lighthouse, did he? He says in his original statement that they followed the red and blue UFO lights through the woods and into the field. They disappeared. Then they checked out the lighthouse beacon. As far as I can tell he stands by that statement (adding only some mainly subjective detail about sensations and impressions). He had no need to deny anything.

>We must use certainties to resolve uncertainties.

Still agreed.

>It is certain
>that the ON lighthouse could not be seen and followed for 2
>miles east from the Woodbridge base perimeter road or from the
>start of the clearing leading to the Green Farm. It is therefore
>certain that the statements in the Cabansag and Burroughs
>documents claiming to have done so (and evidently repudiated by
>them later) are absolute lies. Then the question is who put
>those lies into their statements?

I disagree that you can reach such a very strong conclusion about deliberate "absolute lies". You can suggest it as an interpretation, but a certain fact it is not. The witnesses may have been confused about times and distances, got an exaggerated impression of how long they were walking, and confabulated an approximately similar version of the half-remembered route that firmed up during questioning and re-telling. That is also very far short of a certainly established fact. It's just another interpretation, but one which (IMO) is consistent with the fact that B & C use "about 2 miles" and "a good 2 miles" in contradictory (=uncertain) ways to describe different routes.

But if your "lie" interpretation wins out, then we have to consider again the fact that these statements were not considered by Halt to be AF property and were not made for the AF. Halt had them made up and he kept them privately for 2 1/2 years unknown to anyone, then after his memo got out he gave them to CAUS on condition that as long as he was in the service the AF wouldn't find out about it. There they remained for another 10 years. You are in a position to know more about the background to that than me, but I find it very intriguing.

>The notion that a nineteen-year-old airman after only a few
>days on the job could have concocted the elaborate lying
>scenario of chasing a lighthouse beacon 2 miles through forest
>and glen is highly improbable. Cabansag's later testimony to Bruni
>has the ring of simple observational truth: "It couldn't have
>been two miles; it was cold out there." (p. 193)

Yes I agree, this does have the ring of simple truth. He remembers that it was cold. But he also "remembers" that he saw spinning lights with flakes of metal falling off, which appears to come from the Halt tape of two nights later. On the other hand he doesn't remember saying anything to Halt or remember what he signed in Halt's presence. He also does not recall separating from P & B as a radio relay in the forest, although P explicitly describes this. He doesn't recall returning with P in the vehicle to the base afterwards, either. So it isn't just things in his own statement that he is vague or conflicted about. Bruni interprets his absence of memory about the P & B

landed UFO scenario as "missing time". P says he just wasn't there (although B originally said he was). C concedes he was green, nervous and confused and inclined to defer to what people told him. If he did say "2 miles" having heard this from, say, Burroughs (albeit attaching it to the wrong points of the walk, as pointed out above) then it would not be too surprising. So I wouldn't follow you so far as to say that the polarised alternatives are either complete accuracy and consistency from C, or an elaborate lie from someone else. We can't rule out a vague and confabulated account from C, at least not with certainty.

>My interpretation of the situation is that AFOSI deliberately
>falsified the statements of Cabansag and Burroughs (and probably
>that of Penniston as well but to a much lesser degree) in order
>to discredit Col. Halt, not them, and that it only incidentally
>had the effect also desirable to AFOSI of discrediting the PBC
>trio too.

It's a highly ingenious scheme. I wonder how this would have been accomplished? Did AFOSI intercept the statements en route to Halt and make forgeries, changing dates, times, durations and interpolating what you see as "almost snide comments about how they were purportedly just foolishly pursuing a lighthouse"? Would not P and B be keen to decry such wholesale and insulting exploitation, akin to identity theft? That would be very different from saying that you'd "toned down" or "watered down" your statement. If either man is saying this then I have yet to hear about it. P apparently says the content of the typescript appears to be his own. B stands by his statement, and by implication his own handwriting. And there is a problem about enlisting C's recent memories in support of this scenario, inasmuch as he recalls (Bruni 195) that his summoning by Halt to sign the statement was that same morning, Dec 26, immediately after he got back and came out of the shower. At that time Halt had not even had any UFO experience, so an imposture at this stage would be fortune telling. (Unless the Halt tape was a staged event designed to discredit PBC by means of the lighthouse - I don't know if anyone has ever tried to run with that one! It would certainly make Halt's present support of P ironical.)

<snip>

>The PBC trio never had a 2-mile trek into the Rendlesham woods.
>They never crossed the "open field" and passed a "farmer's
>house" (the Green Farm and Capel Green) -- that was what Halt
>did two nights later.

Agreed.

>The statements of Lt Buran and Sgt
>Chandler both indicate that Penniston told them by radio that
>the unidentified lights were just beyond the end of the access
>road leading from the base's East Gate by no more than about
>100 meters. That would have been the approximate location of
>the Penniston close encounter.

The problem I have here is that if the AFOSI-statement-forgery theory is true, then Buran's and Chandler's statements - which interlock with B's and P's in terms of time, 50m distance and lighthouse references, all features of the supposed cover story - are also subject to it. It becomes awkward to appeal to them for support because we are being selective about which details we wish to regard as true.

>Penniston's interview with Bruni indicates that after his close
>encounter with the landed object he headed farther east perhaps
>about 1/2 mile (p. 175). This is in fact the correct distance
>through the woods from that 100-meter point to the clearing
>into the open field and the only point in the entire area where
>the ON lighthouse can in fact be seen. This last spot is where they
>saw the ON lighthouse, nowhere else. Then they turned back to base.

In general I don't object to this, but without necessarily insisting on the exact distances. This is my pro tem narrative of Dec 26 in a nutshell:

Heading off on foot at about 0310 they had the close encounter described by Burroughs and Penniston where the blue and red lighted object shot away. They headed E after it and picked up

the lighthouse instead as they got nearer the edge of the forest. They "followed" that out of the trees and into the field for a distance, until they could be certain that it was only the lighthouse, then turned back at 0354. Later they were confused about how far they'd actually walked. I think that is probably the best we can offer.

>Once these absolutely certain facts have been established we
>can then move on to less certain facts and issues with more
>confidence and with some keys to interpreting truth and
>>falsehood and accuracy and inaccuracy.

I don't know how absolutely certain any of the supposed facts are, but I think there's a plausible scenario in there somewhere that makes reasonable sense. Something unidentified was seen in that forest, which one man at least was convinced was an unknown mechanical device.

My concern is that Penniston's desire to turn that honest conviction into an "absolutely certain fact", by way of his 45-minute 360-degree tactile inspection, involves embroiderings (the inconsistent notebook jottings, inconsistent date, time, descriptions of shape, surface colour and texture) that are more likely to undermine the foundations of the case.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 10:34:30 -0000
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:53:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 08:02:11 EST
>Subject: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>On UK Pending UFO Document Release
>Is A Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>The statement below, is from the Drudge Report Dec 25, 2007. It
>quotes Nick Pope on the pending UK release of UFO documents as
>indicating 60 years of official effort probing and investigating
>UFOs has not provided any real answers.

>Sadly, this release, which should not be taken at face value, by
>researchers who've studied carefully the full range of events
>and activity, UFO related, which has taken place in UK skies or
>countryside over the past few decades. It will however convince
>much of the media, here and abroad, that a truly full faith,
>honest opening has taken place.

>This prompts one to speculate, that an immensely clever
>"disclosure deception" operation is possibly being coordinated
>behind the scenes with multiple governments acting together in a
>"faux" disclosure effort. With high confidence, it is easy to
>predict that the scheduled UFO document release, will not
>include genuine high sensitivity events, especially those where
>the US was peripherally or directly involved, and will not
>reference UK crash retrievals , super secret space fleet
>activity , UK space surveillance jointly conducted and pooled
>with the NRO , or detail what is going on at Warton BAE special
>projects site in Lancashire and other sensitive and often
>underground facilities.

<snip>

This is not "faux disclosure", disinformation, or anything other than what MoD has said that it is. The files are being released in line with MoD's commitment to open government. Additionally, it is a way of dealing with the current administrative burden of responding to UFO-related FOI requests, because MoD will re-direct applicants to the National Archives.

You won't find a 'saucer in a hangar' smoking gun in the files, because there isn't one. But you will find a wealth of new information about UFO sightings and MoD's handling of the subject.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 08:56:13 -0500
Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread, and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when effective disclosure has really been made?

Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily achieved for everyone?

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 11:14:54 -0400
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:15:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:54:27 -0800
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 10:50:00 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

<snip>

>I believe Betty and Barney and Charles Hickson and Calvin Parker
>so their stories allow me to believe that alien creatures exist
>and drive fancy machines. I do not believe that star travel is
>possible nor will it ever be possible. Therefore I think it's
>only logical that these creatures and machines come from
>civilizations in our own solar system. What is bizarre about
>that?

>>>To limit the discussion to either star travelers or illusion
>>>seems fairly stupid, to me.

>>And making baseless assertions?

>I don't find it "baseless". How do you explain these encounters
>with other forms of life? ET (star folks)? Or do you deny they
>ever took place and that Barney, and Charles were bold-faced
>liars?

Hi Ed,

Here's how.

http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

This pretty much is my thinking about it as well but without the
genius as applied by Kaku and those before him.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 11:27:20 -0400
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:17:05 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>effective disclosure has really been made?

>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily
>achieved for everyone?

I guess we won't know the status of these reports until they are released but reports released is not reports investigated with conclusions drawn. Can we expect that?

Some, no doubt, will be interesting due to the credibility of the reporters and the detail provided.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 15:59:18 +0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:19:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 10:07:58 -0800
>Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

Hello David,

<snip>

>Without speculating on what may or may not be going on now, 160
>total files for 60 years of investigation does not remotely
>constitute "disclosure." That's not even 3 cases a year. Give me
>a break!

<snip>

I am afraid that you are a victim of exaggerated claims about the efficacy of the MoD UFO desk (grandiosely and misleadingly described as the 'British UFO Project' and invalidly compared to 'Project Blue Book').

You must also have missed the first paragraph that I wrote specifically about the release:

"1. There are a total of 160 files managed by DAS and DI55 which will be released. These cover a period from the late 1970s up to 2007, including a series of files containing FoIA requests and their responses on the subject of UFOs from 2005 to present."

I think I need to explain a few things here.

Prior to 1967, UFO files in the UK were routinely destroyed after 5 years. Due to the efforts of UK NICAP Committee chairman at the time (Julian Hennessey), an undertaking was given to Members of Parliament that UFO files would be retained in the future. Consequently, there are very few files which have survived from before 1962 (5 years before 1967).

Files are normally released to The National Archives by the MoD after 30 years. In fact, some have been released early, and files are currently available at TNA from 1962 up to 1978 at least.

The 160 files due to be released mainly cover from 1978-2007, though there are some earlier documents within them.

Contrary to your apparent expectation, a file may contain correspondence, multiple reports of UFOs, discussion of UFO policy, newsclippings, etc. It is not usually the case that details of a specific incident are exclusively housed in an individual file, though there are notable exceptions, such as the so-called 'Cosford Incident', and the 'Rendlesham file'.

Most of the reports comprise a report form (one or two pages), often with just handwritten remarks by the UFO desk written on them. Occasionally, there is some internal discussion of the report (often along the lines of the UFO desk asking DI55 what they think, and DI55 responding that it was/wasn't a satellite). Less frequently there is more substantial dialogue about a

particular case, but rarely more than 7 or 8 pages in addition to the report.

Your raised expectations aren't your fault - one could get the impression from the 'Head' of the 'UFO Project' that cases were regularly investigated in-depth, but in fact this was a very rare occurrence. The 'UFO Project' consisted of a single person who divided their UFO activities with other duties, typically spending in the order of 25 percent of their time on UFOs. Allowing for holidays and weekends, that only amounts to 50 man-days of resource per _year_ and much of that time would be spent drafting responses to dignitaries such as MP's on the topic of UFOs and responding to enquiries from members of the public. There wasn't the time or the resources to _really_ investigate reports, just time to assess whether or not they were of Defence significance in the vast majority of cases.

The quality of material will generally be better in the DI55 files, since the cases had already been filtered to a large extent by the public-facing UFO desk (which was it's 'Raison d'etre').

It will be interesting to see how many recorded radar/visual cases there are for example, following claims elsewhere that there are rather a lot of them. As I wrote at my site:

"Within the next three years, everyone will be able to see the true level of interest and effectiveness demonstrated by the MoD on the topic of UFOs for themselves. This release will be a source of disappointment or vindication for some, and embarrassment for others. Conspiracy theorists who believe that the various governments of the world are hiding secrets about the 'reality' of alien visitation will see this move as another whitewash effort by the MoD and will probably continue their self-sustaining 'campaign for the truth', when the 'truth' really will be 'out there' - just that they don't believe it!"

Will the hype match the goods? We will soon see for ourselves.

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 16:12:14 -0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:20:34 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily
>achieved for everyone?

Hello Joe,

You might more answerably ask 'How will we know that reports are no longer being suppressed' - because we have a rough idea of how many amateur and professional were reporting sightings frankly and honestly before 1949-ish, after which such reports seemed to be 'discouraged'.

For an idea, maybe see a compilation at:

www.perceptions.couk.com/fortrel883.html

and note that even by 1952, Hynek got "off the record" sighting reports from about 12.5% of the professional astronomers he interviewed; details at:

www.bluebookarchive.org/page.aspx?PageCode=MAXW-PBB1-958 and onwards.

Interestingly, he ends the report (Aug 1952?) saying that (public?) sightings reports for that year so far were 'nearly as many as all previous years together' - see:

www.bluebookarchive.org/page.aspx?PageCode=MAXW-PBB1-982

Cheers

Ray D

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: **Brian Ally** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:31:23 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:35:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Ed Gehrman <egerman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:54:27 -0800
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>I believe Betty and Barney and Charles Hickson and Calvin Parker
>so their stories allow me to believe that alien creatures exist
>and drive fancy machines. I do not believe that star travel is
>possible nor will it ever be possible. Therefore I think it's
>only logical that these creatures and machines come from
>civilizations in our own solar system. What is bizarre about
>that?

Let's put it this way: your logic is not the same as my logic.
If one states that something is probable one should be prepared
to at least buttress that opinion in some fashion.

>I don't find it "baseless". How do you explain these encounters
>with other forms of life? ET (star folks)? Or do you deny they
>ever took place and that Barney, and Charles were bold-faced
>liars?

Do you really believe that that's what I was implying?

Brian

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:56:31 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:08:00 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>effective disclosure has really been made?

>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily
>achieved for everyone?

Of course it is 'impossible' to know everything about almost
anything, especially that which has been covered up.

Some conspiracy folks won't be happy until everyone on the Black
Budget payroll has been water-boarded or otherwise tortured to
reveal everything they know.

Alternatively it will be necessary to take what information is
revealed and do a historical and scientific context analysis to
see whether or not (a) it makes sense and (b) there are no
obvious holes in the history or the science-based information.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 20:41:16 +0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:09:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 20:11:36 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>I'm not aware of any evidence or persuasive argument that what
>was initially seen in the trees on Dec 26 was the lighthouse.
>There's no way that this could be visible through well over 1/2
>mile of dense plantation from the base or near the E gate access
>road (the argument by Halt and others that everybody at the base
>knew about the lighthouse because they saw it every day could be
>said to suffer by this; but I understand that the lighthouse
>_beam_ was regularly visible above the forest, so this could be
>what is meant.)

Remember that when on-base personnel would not be limited to
ground-level viewing. Perhaps that is why Halt is confident that
everybody on the base knew about the lighthouse and could easily
identify it.

--
Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

SDI #452 Twenty Questions

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 14:43:03 -0600
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:13:53 -0500
Subject: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

SDI #452 Twenty Questions

20 Questions regarding the omnipresent, including a kindling representative of the mainstream, and more: addressed by the always incisive Dave Furlotte, the pugnacious Michael J. Woods, a thoroughly promising Billy Cox, and finally, award winning loose cannon Alfred Lehmborg. Lashing this querulous team across the stark ufological Iditarod is one Errol Bruce-Knapp - Mush!

1. Does British ufological nay-seer John Rimmer avoid his own gaze in a mirror?
2. Does a saber slashing Dave Furlotte paint a detailed portrait so decisively confuting to Rimmer's sophistic soliloquy on a 'Kenneth Arnold' solution that it is sufficient enough to provoke a wholesale rejection of Rimmer's decidedly simplistic insouciance to same? <LOL>
3. Were there more observers of the seminal Kenneth Arnold event than just Kenneth Arnold?
4. Did 1947 Aircraft tails ever have atypical appearances or utter absences?
5. Does the listener appreciate Errol's use of 'bumper-music' decidedly bereft of the woo-woo and illustrative of a point at the same time?
6. What wipes the smirk off Woodsie's face?
7. What's up with the Drama involving Jose Escamilla and others involving ownership, rights, and royalties of strange structures/ships photographed in Earth orbit, recently, the pictures taken as a result of some mysterious proprietary process?
8. Is John Lenard Walson the inventor of this proprietary process allowing for regular telescopes to be used beyond their means?
9. Does Woods' admonition to keep our eyes on this John Lenard Walson thing provoke an observance to do so?
10. How large is "great honking huge enormous"? Have similar monsters been observed before?
11. Why are big military Helicopters flying around the homes of private citizens?
12. Does life become ever more apparent on the surface of Mars?
13. Is concern for the long running twin Mars Rovers misplaced given they are five years into a 90 day warranty and still making Earth-shattering discoveries?
14. When will the first SDI All Nude Podcast be produced?
15. Why is Billy Cox all alone in Mainstream "Journalistia" to have a studied appreciation for a real history involving UFOs, and how is it that Mr. Cox doesn't entirely know himself?
16. All the preceding considered, what accounts for a seriously

leaning new mainstream interest in UFOs and the apparent ramping up of same?

17. What is the "cult of UFO" according to Parade magazine? Does the pot call the kettle a "UFO buff"?

18. Does the mainstream itself believe that UFOs will not go away, in fact make themselves more apparent in balance to how much they are denied by a mainstream?

19. Is there any doubt that Dennis Kucinich may be the bravest person running for President, ever?

20. Are links to Billy Cox's blog:

<http://tinyurl.com/2tz57x>

with all deliberate speed by an attendant ufologia well advised?

Great barragugousness and festiviuss ZOT but over 45 minutes remains! More on a salient Dennis Kucinich, the surprising salience of Shirley McClaine, and our specious social system's paucity of that same salience.

All manner of sterling pearls are cast... without regard, reader, in and around what's been described here! It is left to the listener to perceive real value in the form of efficaciously exploding cognitive candy, micro-mini-mind-missiles of real novelty, capering hyperspace elves facilitating an accelerating future. Step up!

Ufological sensibilities empowered are the listener's own! Subscribe!

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/>

alienview.nul

www.AlienView.net

AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>

U F O M a g a z i n e -- www.ufomag.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Aeroshell Flying Saucer

From: **Kevin Randle** <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 15:48:42 EST
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:16:03 -0500
Subject: Aeroshell Flying Saucer

List, All -

For those interested, I have a short piece about the Aeroshell Flying Saucer posted on my blog at:

www.KEVINRandle.blogspot.com

The pictures were taken at White Sands and show a 'real' flying saucer there.

KRandle

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

But Hey I'm Big In Japan

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:22:09 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:22:09 -0500
Subject: But Hey I'm Big In Japan

Source: Billy Cox's Blog | De Void

<http://tinyurl.com/3db2wx>

Friday, Dec. 28, 2007

But, Hey, I'm Big In Japan

By Billy Cox

billy.cox.nul

Nearly a week since any UFO-debate headlines rolled out of Japan. Guess that's it. For now.

The last we heard, Japanese daily Yomiuri Shimbun was reporting how the leaders of the opposition parties were urging Cabinet members to shut up already. Even Ryuji Yamane, the lawmaker who initially asked why his government hadn't initiated a UFO study, appeared to back off.

"I and my staff have been relieved to find that we haven't had any calls of complaint over the whole issue," Yamane stated on his Web site. He added, "Now, I'd like to devote myself to welfare policy."

Yukio Hatoyama, secretary general of the Democratic Party of Japan, said the fuss was an utter waste of time. "If aliens existed and came to Earth," he declared, "they would have to be creatures of far greater intellect than human beings, which is just impossible. Since it's all complete fantasy, it makes no sense to discuss how the Defense Ministry should respond."

Well, that settles it. Especially the part about infinite scope of human intellect. Now, if I could only dislodge this Tom Waits earworm...

"I got the house, but not the deed
I got the horn, but not the reed
I got the cards, but not the luck
I got the wheel, but not the truck
But, hey, I'm big in Japan."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfl Fleming5.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 20:47:16 -0600
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:27:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 00:07:26 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Lan Fleming <lfl Fleming5.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 10:13:38 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

><snip>

>>My point, which I obviously think is more important than you do
>>is that the omission of the triangular shape from their written
>>statements was a significant omission, proving that they
>>weren't writing down everything they knew in those statemetns,

>The argument that Penniston's report can't be the source of
>Halt's adjective "triangular" obviously rests on the fact that
>Penniston does not describe anything triangular. This, for you,
>is a "significant omission" proving the statement is rigged.

Whoohah there, cowboy! I never said anything about something
"proving" the statement was rigged. I said what Halt's memo
proved was that there were details about the case that were not
reported in the written descriptions of any of the witnesses. I
don't see how I could have made that any clearer. And you're the
one making assinine attacks on my "credibility" for supposedly
misinterpreting you.

>For me, it means there is no documentary evidence that Penniston
>explicitly reported a triangular device. This point of view
>receives support from Penniston's own contemporaneous drawing,
>which shows a rectangular device.

If Penniston was being reticent in his written statement, then
the drawing of the small boxy thing could well have gone along
with his minimalist description of a machine composed of some
conventional more conventional appearance than what he described
in the OMNI interview.

>Burroughs however does draw a triangular shape of lights, and
>such a shape is implicit in the descriptions - i.e., broad
>base of lights, cone of white light, narrowing to red light on
>top. Is there "overwhelming evidence" here (to borrow your
>phrase) that Halt could not have got his "triangular" from here?

Maybe, but the notations on Burroughs' drawing indicate that the
triangular shape was intended to depict a conical beam of light,
not of an object. And where did the estimate (2 to 3 meters at
the base and 2 meters high) of the size come from? I haven't
seen anything in any of the written statements about the
dimensions of the object, and only Penniston's statement
suggested that anything solid was seen that could have
dimensions.

>There is an allegation that something
>other than what was reported was seen and suppressed, but that
>allegation is the very thing that's in question so it would be

>circular to rely on this as evidence.

Nobody has made such a stupid circular argument, so why do you bother to bring it up?

>You can cite Penniston's notebook containing triangular drawings
>as "contemporaneous" evidence, but then you need to explain why
>it also bears the same wrong Dec 27 date as appeared in Halt's
>memo.

The explanation might be that the incorrect date in Halt's memo was taken from Penniston's notebook and that Penniston wrote down the wrong date at the time of the incident. If he were faking his notebook entry somewhere around 2003 for the documentary in which the notebook appeared, he had 22 years to find out that it had been generally agreed upon years ago that the date in the Halt memo was wrong. That seems more plausible than the notion that Penniston just mindlessly copied the date from the Halt memo just so that his "fraudulent" notebook would match it, but didn't bother to parrot the description of the object as "metallic" in the Halt memo and instead said it was composed of a bizarre translucent glassy material.

As for the time discrepancy, you apparently are too intent on discrediting Penniston to notice the odd similarity between the statements Chandler and Buran. They both use the exact same phrase: "at approximately 0300 hrs, 26 December 1980". Saying exactly the same thing might be an indication that their stories were coordinated. Stories told by different people in which some elements seem too similar may be more cause for suspicion than stories freely told that have discrepancies that may be due to faulty memory or discomfort about what is being described. Penniston was the eye witness to what was obviously a remarkable event, and he might be expected to notice the time more accurately than Buran and Chandler, who saw nothing and who gave their own statements seven days later.

>Consider also that, according to the above writers, Penniston
>(as Jim Archer) told them in 1983 that he had not touched the
>object, that he did not try to touch the object, that he
>thought Burroughs was going to try to touch it when they got
>close at one point, but that the object jumped away from them
>before he could do so.

>Consider that this is an anonymous "deep-throat" account given
>not to AF superiors, to whom Penniston's might have had reason
>to play down a 45-minute tactile inspection, but to highly
>receptive ufologists.

>He told them in 1983 that the object was "off-white" in colour,
>and "dirty" looking - not a "black, smooth, glasslike surface"
>as he has told us and shown in his notebook.

Even under a pseudonym, he might still have been too uncomfortable talking about it to give all the details. Not having read that it's interesting that the subject of touching the object came up at this early date. To me, that anyone would actually want to touch such a thing is what seemed most suspicious. This description suggests an object constructed of a more conventional material than the glassy material he first described in the OMNI interview.

>He also said that the first alert about the lights coming down
>was at 2:00AM. That at least does not follow Halt. But it also
>doesn't follow his own notebook, where he has the time as 20
>minutes past midnight - "I remember that distinctly" he remarked
>in his 1996 OMNI interview, although everyone else's original
>statement says 0300.

>Note that in his recent press conference statement he now says
>that the incident happened on Dec 26, apparently deferring to
>this date in preference to the date of Dec 27 written in his
>contemporaneous notebook.

>(In 1996 he wasn't sure which date it was: "There is some
>confusion about the date. There are two duty rosters, both of
>which are dated December 26th, but it was either that night, the
>26th, or the 27th." I don't understand the reference to duty
>rosters when he is quoting during this interview from his own
>real-time notes, which begin: "27 Dec 80. 12:20. Response notes.
>A/C crash".

>(BTW, re the photos: I just noticed that in this recent NP
>conference statement he said, "The photos we retrieved from the
>base lab were apparently over exposed." But in 1996 he said he'd
>did not retrieve his photos from the lab: "I never got them
>back. I never saw them. I was just told that they didn't turn
>out. I didn't understand that but was not in a position to push
>the issue.")

>>therefore giving some support to their claim that they were
>>being reticent with their interrogators.

>The story is that these statements were collected by Halt
>personally for his own use and were considered by him to be
>private papers. They were not made for those interrogators.

I don't know what story you're talking about here, since you
give no source or quotations. You seem to be jumping to the
conclusion that kind old Col. Halt was interviewing his pal
Penniston directly, but I've seen no indication that any of the
witnesses talked directly with Halt at the time or that they
even Penniston knew Halt. In the OMNI interview, Penniston did
not say he told anyone about touching the object at the time
andsaid he only discussed the incident with Halt "much later."

>Penniston's own story is true then they do constitute evidence
>of disingenuousness. But this cannot be not merely "reticence",
>and not merely a sin of omission either. It has to be a
>coordinated sin of commission, ...

The Pope, perhaps should be left to judge of the gravity of
these "sins." It seems to me that Penniston may have just
attributed more conventional features to the object rather than
the bizarre things he later says he witnessed later because he
was uncomfortable talking about it regardless of whether the
interrogator was a UFO researcher or an Air Force officer.

>>You can rant all you
>>want, but I am not convinced the evidence is overwhelming that
>>Penniston's later story is a lie, and neither are a lot of
>>other reasonable people.

>I don't think anyone needs to be "overwhelmingly convinced" of
>it to take the possibility seriously. Have I ever said that I
>am? But if specific negative evidence is not dealt with
>conscientiously then it will remain an attractive theory and
>that does not help anyone to get serious attention for claims
>they make about the case, or for ufology in general.

>There are serious holes in this one.

That's your conclusion. There are explanations for the "holes"
that are equally or more plausible than the thoery that
Penniston, Cabansag, Burroughs, and Halt were all delusion
and/or lying.

>>BTW: There's an unwritten debating rule that whoever compares
>>the opponent to Hitler loses. The same goes for Bin Laden.

>There is a super-rule which trumps that one: It says that people
>who falsely accuse their debating opponents of dishonourable
>statements which not only were not made by them (I have never
>made any mention whatsoever of Bin Laden or Hitler in any post)
>but which, furthermore, were not even made by anybody (it's
>hard to imagine how a "reasonable person" could interpret Joe's
>figure of speech in such a ludicrous way) risks making
>themselves look a bit of a twit

It was you who dragged the discussion down into the toilet with
your assinine attack on my "credibility," just because I
correctly pointed out that the spin you were giving the
incident did not jibe with the details of the Halt memo.
McGonagle apparently wanted to play follow the leader, after his
nonsensical Greek chorus praising unspecified merits of your
arguments, by comparing the persistence of dissent from your
revealed wisdom with the fanaticism of Osama Bin Laden. You make
yourself look ridiculous and dishonest by pretending this would
not be deeply offensive (kind of like using the word "twit").
Only a seriously disturbed sociopath could honestly claim that
such a slur was not offensive.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

From: **Lan Fleming** <lfleming5.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 23:10:10 -0600
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:31:35 -0500
Subject: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

Another Seeming Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

Although I know we're not supposed to question the credibility of anyone involved in the Rendlesham incidents except the witnesses who claim that something extraordinary occurred, I've already had the temerity to comment on the seemingly odd use of an identical phrase concerning the time of the incident in the official statements of J. D. Chandler and Fred Buran. So I might as well stick my neck out a bit further at the risk of getting my head bitten off by Mr. Shough and comment on something else I find rather odd about these two statements:

The identical boilerplate legalese at the beginning of both their statements. Apparently photocopied onto the top of the blank statement form used by both men is the following sentence:

"I do hereby voluntarily and of my own free will make the following statement without having been subjected to coercion, unlawful influence, or unlawful inducement."

Perhaps someone with knowledge of Air Force procedures can say whether adding such boilerplate to incident reports is routine?

If so, it is just plain silly and pointless. Clearly, if the testimony had been coerced or induced by bribery, the signatory would as willingly have lied about the lack of coercion or bribery as he would about the substance of his statement. This may just indicate the hand of an Air Force lawyer, and lawyers have been known to write things that seem silly and incomprehensible to mere mortals.

But if, on the other hand, this boilerplate was especially added to these two witnesses' statements and not in accordance with any required Air Force procedure, then it would be a highly suspicious indication of "protesting too much" on the part of whoever added it.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Couple Videos Mystery Dark Spiral

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:54:19 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:54:19 -0500
Subject: Couple Videos Mystery Dark Spiral

Source: CBC News - Prince Edward Island, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/2q8t3p>

Friday, December 28, 2007

Couple Videos Mystery Dark Spiral
CBC News

Environment Canada and the Transportation Safety Board of Canada can't explain just what it was a P.E.I. couple videoed in the Island skies on Wednesday evening.

When Tony Quigley and his wife Marie of North Tryon, just east of the Confederation Bridge, saw a dark spiral in the sky they went for the video camera.

"When we first saw it, it was going so slow. We said, is it a meteorite, or what the heck is it? So when we did start to tape, it was above the cloud and that's the part we missed," said Marie Quigley.

"When it came out of the cloud, we have it from there until it's out of sight. I have no idea. I mean I didn't think it was a UFO or anything but to me I thought something was in trouble, but it was going so slow. I mean it was at least a half an hour from the time we first spotted it till it went out of sight."

The couple has no clue what it was. Their first calls, to the Charlottetown Airport and the RCMP, were no help. They called Environment Canada, which was also unable to identify the phenomenon.

The Transportation Safety Board of Canada has reviewed the footage to ensure the sighting was not of an aircraft in distress. A representative from the board confirmed it was not, but had no further details.

[Lead thanks to Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Space Invaders On The Campaign Trail

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:00:32 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:00:32 -0500
Subject: Space Invaders On The Campaign Trail

Source: U.S. News & World Report - New York, New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2vvv5p>

December 28, 2007

[Several links in item]

Space Invaders On The Campaign Trail

They laughed way back in the 1980s when President Reagan suggested that the people of the world would unite if an alien space form threatened the globe. But now the idea is back - and to cheers - because Sen. Hillary Clinton has raised the specter of world unity. It came during a campaign event when she referenced the movie Independence Day. According to the New York Post, she said, "Remember that movie Independence Day, where invaders were coming from outer space and the whole world was united against the invasion? Well, why can't we be united on behalf of our planet?"

Some presidential UFO watchers noted that she was actually ripping off her husband, former President Bill Clinton, who used the same language after watching the Will Smith movie.

Now Reagan allies tell us that the whole thing started with former President Reagan, who made repeated comments about world unity in the face of an alien attack, especially around the time of the last flyby of Halley's Comet. "It looks like she stole the idea from Bill who stole it from Reagan," says one.

Of course, you could be asking: Why is there a site dedicated to what presidents say about UFOs? Check it out here:

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

[Lead thanks to Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:05:24 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:05:24 -0500
Subject: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

Source: The Daily Post - Llandudno Junction, Wales

<http://tinyurl.com/2ze4k3>

Dec 29 2007

Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last
by Steve Bagnall
Daily Post

Ministry of Defence files on what conspiracy theory fans believe may have been a UFO crash in North Wales are expected to be released next year.

The Berwyn Mountains incident sparked mystery in 1974 with unexplained lights in the sky, an earthquake and secretive men in suits.

MoD chiefs confirmed yesterday they are publishing a raft of so-called UFO (Unidentified Flying Object) files stretching back to the 1960s.

This is because of the huge number of inquiries on UFOs.

The Berwyn Mountains incident happened on January 20, 1974.

The people of Llandderfel and Llandrillo villages in the Berwyn mountains near Bala, sat down to that evening=92s TV.

But the quiet was shattered by the rumbles of an earthquake, registering 3.5 on the Richter scale.

As people ran from their houses, fearing another tremor, they witnessed a blaze of light on the mountainside above.

A local nurse and her daughters claimed they watched as a huge egg-shaped craft lay on the ground with a pulsating orange and red glow.

Police and the military converged on the hills, expecting to discover a crashed passenger jet =96 but what they did find has never been divulged.

Some think it was an experimental man-made top secret military aircraft, possibly a prototype Stealth bomber.

Local farmer Hugh Lloyd was just 14 at the time.

He told the Daily Post: "It was pretty scary. I have never experienced anything like it.

It was pretty dark. You could hardly see anything on the mountain and then all of a sudden this incredibly bright light lit up the sky, like an arc welder, two or three miles away, lasting for about 20-30 seconds. You could make out details in the countryside around."

In the days following, scientists and investigators, some of whom could have been from official departments, combed the area.

Mr Lloyd was questioned about the incident, the light and asked exactly what it looked like. "I do not believe that it was a UFO but I would like to find out exactly what it was."

Although the MoD would not confirm categorically the incident - widely dubbed the "Welsh Roswell" =96 would be in the documents, it said a large amount of material would be released.

An MoD spokeswoman said: "There is no date set but it will be published next year.

"It is going to take time because there are a lot of handwritten documents."

stevebagnall

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Giant ETs?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:45:58 EST
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:15:27 -0500
Subject: Giant ETs?

Over the years there've been some startling claims regarding UFO reports and giant occupants.

Also of past civilizations where inhabitants were of enormous stature. Of course our most familiar story is that of Goliath the Philistine in the Old Testament.

People reaching amazing heights of 8 or 9 feet seem very likely but past that is improbable. My own family we can average 6-7 feet tall easily.

On occasion guests will appear on the radio shows claiming such things as people being of heights in the 18 ft range and more but I've yet to see any solid proof of this such as a femur or skull.

Like UFOs the data is fuzzy or blurry at the last second.

Anyone have links to such data?

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:10:29 -0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:20:24 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 11:27:20 -0400
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

<snip>

>I guess we won't know the status of these reports until they are
>released but reports released is not reports investigated with
>conclusions drawn. Can we expect that?

It's a mixed bag. Some cases will have been investigated thoroughly, but with other cases the details provided by witnesses were so vague that little or no meaningful investigation was possible. With the investigations, sometimes an assessment is given as to the likely explanation, but in other instances the sightings remained unexplained. Practices have varied over the years, but I gave some information about MoD's investigative methodology in this interview:

<http://www.officialdisclosure.com/lead-story1.htm>

>Some, no doubt, will be interesting due to the credibility of
>the reporters and the detail provided.

Yes. Having said that, some of the policy files are likely to be just as interesting as the sighting files. These deal with MoD's handling of the subject internally, with politicians, with the media and with the public.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:24:38 EST
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:25:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 20:11:36 -0000
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 23:52:31 EST
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

<snip>

>>First, I must insist on a methodological rule. Certainties must
>>control over uncertainties. Only facts that are certain and
>>conclusive can resolve contradictions, discrepancies and
>>confusion caused by a plethora of uncertain claims or
>>"uncertain facts" (actually, if it is uncertain then it really
>>cannot be a "fact"). No matter how many uncertain points
>>are adduced they cannot add up to a certainty.

>Agreed. Certainties control over uncertainties.

<snip>

>>Here is a conclusive, hard fact: It is an absolute
>>physical impossibility for anyone to have seen and
>>"chased" the Orfordness (or Orford Ness, ON for short)
>>lighthouse for 2 miles east of the east end of the
>>Woodridge base back in 1980, because the beacon is
>>only visible at one tiny area where it is high enough
>>to see it and it is unobstructed by trees. As one
>>progresses eastward from this small spot the land
>>slopes downward till it reaches sea level only 0.4 mile
>>to the east. The view of the ON lighthouse is blocked
>>by a ridge on the east banks of the Butley river,
>>around Gedgrave Hall.

>I generally agree.

Hi Martin,

Since we agree on fundamental methodology, I don't want to lose focus on what I wanted to accomplish here. I wanted to use absolutely certain facts about the non-visibility of the Orford Ness lighthouse over 1.9 miles of the alleged 2-mile lighthouse chase to invalidate key portions of the statements of Cabansag and Burroughs that claimed such a 2-mile lighthouse chase, and therefore by implication invalidate key portions of the Penniston statement that has been subject of much controversy on this thread.

My interpretation of the reason for the clearly false statements of a 2-mile lighthouse chase is a separate matter from the fact that those statements are false. We must not confuse the falsity with the interpretation of the reason for the falsity. They are at differing levels of confidence. The falsity is certain, the exact reason or cause of the falsity is less certain.

My interpretation is that the Halt 2-mile chase has been back-

projected into the earlier reporting of the Penniston-Burroughs-Cabansag (PBC) trio, who did not have any such 2-mile chase of their own, whether of a UFO or of a lighthouse. My contention is that Halt's 2-mile UFO chase has been artificially injected into the Cabansag and Burroughs statements by whatever means.

Please hold off at this point on discussion of the exact modes by which this forced insertion of Halt's 2-mile chase into the PBC reporting might have been carried out, it is not directly relevant at this point in the discussion but will be considered in later postings. (However I will note that Cabansag later told Georgina Bruni that on return to base he was immediately pressured by higher ranking AF personnel to dismiss the whole experience as due to the lighthouse and that he should accept influences he would receive to inject the lighthouse into his story. Bruni p. 195.)

It is for these reasons that I want to return now to the Cabansag and Burroughs false statements, respectively:

"But we ran and walked a good 2 miles past our the vehicle, until we got to a vantage point where we could determine that what we were chasing was only a beacon light off in the distance. Our route through the forrest [sic] and field was a direct one, straight towards the light. We informed CSC [Central Security Control by radio] that the light beacon was farther than we thought, so CSC terminated our investigation."

"Once we reached the farmer's house we could see a beacon going around, so we went toward it. We followed it for about 2 miles before we could see it was coming from a lighthouse."

The false Cabansag and Burroughs statements (above) lead to the following conclusions based on the physical impossibility of seeing the Orford Ness Lighthouse for 1.9 miles of any 2-mile path that PBC could have taken:

(a) They clearly say they "chased" and "followed" the alleged "lighthouse" for "2 miles" on a "direct" and "straight" line "straight towards the light," regardless of exactly how the 2-mile distance is defined (see below for that issue), and thus they claim they observed the lighthouse continuously, which is an absolute lie by someone (see more on the physical impossibility proven by skeptic Robert McLean's investigations as well as by Ordnance Survey maps, etc.). The 2 miles also cannot be a roundtrip distance because the return trip would face the wrong direction from heading towards the ON lighthouse.

(b) The definition of how or where the 2 mile distance is counted from is not a relevant issue here at this particular point because they could not possibly have seen the ON Lighthouse for 1.9 miles of any such alleged 2-mile path however counted, in any case.

(c) They could not simply have lost sight of the Orford Ness Lighthouse then regained sight of it again from "the vantage point" (actually this is the place reached at the end of Halt's 2-mile trek, not at the end of PBC's alleged and impossible 2-mile trek): Why?

What would they have been "chasing" and "following" for 2 miles on a "straight" line "straight towards the light" if they couldn't see anything at all for 1.9 miles? What would keep them on a "straight" line route if they couldn't see anything after the tiny 0.1 mile area of visibility of the ON Lighthouse? Why would they have plunged into the darkened fields and trees when they saw nothing to spur them on? If this alleged pursuit lasted some 45-50 minutes why would they just plunge ahead in the dark for 45 minutes, seeing nothing after the first few minutes?

(d) Since Halt's "vantage point" at Burrow Hill was indeed 2 miles from the beginning of the farmer's field and clearing, and there is nothing else in the near-sea-level depression past the farmhouses at Green Farm/Capel Green that could possibly serve as a "vantage point" to the PBC trio (or to anyone), then the 2-mile figure is not merely an exaggeration or poor estimate of distance. It is the correct distance to the only possible "vantage point," at Burrow Hill.

(e) The statements do not actually conflict as to where the 2-

mile distance was to be counted. The Cabansag statement say they walked and ran "a good 2 miles past our the vehicle," which seems to be a colloquial way of saying "at least" 2 miles. Whereas the Burroughs statement refers to "about 2 miles" from the farmer's house, meaning 1.5 to 2.5 miles. In fact, the distance from their vehicle to the "vantage point" at Burrow Hill would be about 2.5 miles and the distance from the Capel Green (owner David Boast) farmhouse to Burrow Hill would be about 1.5 miles, both distances well consistent with each other.

Local skeptic Robert McLean visited the Rendlesham forest area at night and in the day in the summer of 2000 and measured the only area from which the Orford Ness lighthouse was visible. He found that the ON lighthouse was only visible from about 100 meters within the forest's east edge at a certain spot and then for about 126 meters out into the open field as he walked towards the farmhouse (Capel Green owned by David Boast). The field slopes downward towards the river and a heavily forested ridgeline a few miles away obstructs the view of the ON lighthouse 5 miles to the east.

From McLean's Aug. 26, 2000, message:

I have this summer measured late at night the area of the field where this [the Orford Ness lighthouse beacon] can be seen, again by pacing off distances. It is a roughly rectangular area that extends in the field east-west only about 126 m (because of the sharp drop off in elevation as you walk east)... In 1980, the lighthouse would have been visible well into the forest as the ground slopes gradually up towards the west... In fact, I know of nowhere else where the lighthouse is visible in the forest in the summertime....

At the position of Ian Ridpath's photo, the lighthouse beacon is at the left hand side of a small notch in the skyline just to the right of the farmer's house. If you go a couple of feet north (i.e. to the left as seen in the photo) of this location, the lighthouse beacon disappears, even at night.

On Aug. 28, 2000, McLean wrote:

Because it is only possible to walk about 126 m into the field immediately to the east of the accepted landing site before the lighthouse beam disappears behind the ridge 4 km to the east, the lighthouse beam could never be seen in proximity with Butley Abbey....

Even allowing a further 50 m to 100 m further depth inside the forest, it is difficult to see what the lighthouse can line up with (at least when leaves are still on the trees).

McLean wrote on Sept. 4, 2000:

Along the East bank of the Butley River is a ridge of land that rises to between 15 m and 20 m high. It is this ridge of land that completely blocks the Orfordness lighthouse beam when you have walked no more than about 136 m [typo for 126 m] into the farmer's field....

If you look at the OS map to locate possible high points of land roughly East of the accepted landing site and roughly 2 miles away, the first thing that is apparent is that there is no point in heading a bit North of East as you still have that ridge of land in the way, much of which is forested by Gedgrave Broom. But if you head a bit South of East, then there are two possibilities. The first is Burrow Hill, which rises to 15 m... The second possibility is the rise in the land 1 km South-West of Burrow Hill ... - and the field at this location is Col Halt's "second farmer's field".

McLean wrote on Sept. 5, 2000:

What seems clear, is that Col Halt and men then went the very short distance, say 100 m, to the edge of the forest to find out what the pulsating red light was, and then out into the open farmer's field. The elevation of the field drops away quite quickly as you walk towards the light, and at night, the lighthouse beacon soon disappears behind the ridge 4 km away south-west of Orford. In the summer, the lighthouse beacon is

visisble only in a very small rectangular portion of this field. I have measured this at night by pacing off the distance and the area is ... about 126 m east-west. It is possible this area might be wider in the winter, as trees on the ridge 4 km away which in summer block out the lighthouse might let some light through. But the distance of 126 m into the field will be the same, because it is the ridge itself which blocks the beam as your elevation drops while you walk towards the farmhouse.

After the direct view of the beacon disappears, it is a further 200 m before you reach the farmhouse....

Adding up these distances, following this path from the accepted landing site to the "second farmer's field" gives a distance of 3326 m (or 2.07 miles [sic]), during which the lighthouse beacon was directly visisble for only the first 226 m [consisting of 100 meters within the forest then 126 meters in the open field].

On Sept. 10, 2000, McLean wrote:

If you start off at the "accepted" landing site and walk towards the "accepted" farmer's house, you have a direct view of the Orfordness beacon up until about 126 m into the field, and then it disappears behind the ridge 4 km away, and you don't see it again until the end of the two mile trek to the "vantage point" or "second farmer's field"....

>I'm not aware of any evidence or persuasive argument that what
>was initially seen in the trees on Dec 26 was the lighthouse.
>There's no way that this could be visible through well over 1/2
>mile of dense plantation from the base or near the E gate access
>road....

Agreed. More on this below.

>So I can imagine that they began seeing the lighthouse when still
>well within the forest and were not sure of its identity until
>they'd emerged and started down the field towards the farm house.
>But this cannot extend the distance to anything like 2 miles,
>which remains a gross exaggeration.

As mentioned above, Robert McLean checked onsite and found that the Orford Ness lighthouse was visible only about 100 meters within the forest just before the clearing and only for about 126 meters further.

Simple calculations verify McLean's firsthand observations. The Jan 1981 Bustinza photo of the forest from Woodbridge base's East Gate shows a dense grove of trees at the end of the east-west road leading from the gate. Rough photogrammetry based on scaling from the approximately 15-foot wide road (as measured on satellite/aerial photos) yields trees roughly 50 feet high and about 15 feet apart on average and about 2 feet in diameter on average.

Thus the average space between trees would be about 13 ft, and would be filled by about 6.5 trees. Given the average spacing this means about a $6.5 \times 15 = 97.5$ ft (round off to 100 ft) depth of trees would fill up all spaces for light to pass. To account for deviations in average spacing and diameter double or triple this 100 ft depth to say 300 ft (100 meters) thus in agreement with McLean's empirical determination of what depth of forest is opaque to the Orford Ness lighthouse.

To sum up, the 2-mile lighthouse chase in the Cabansag and Burroughs statements is a fabrication (absolute certainty), which appears to be derived from Halt's actual 2-mile UFO chase two nights later (high probability), which I interpret as due to a coercive influence that has caused or influenced C and B to alter their testimony and/or alter their written statements with the purpose of undermining the Halt story using the artificially inserted and false 2-mile "lighthouse chase" (inferential).

The conclusive falsity of the invalidated portions of the C and B statements leads to questioning similar apparent insertions into the Penniston statement and calls into question his claimed close encounter details that go far beyond what he radioed to CSC at the base as the events unfolded (inferential).

One non-sensational detail in the Penniston statement that seems utterly bogus is the claim that when he arrived at the base's East Gate he could see a large yellow light about 1-1/2 miles directly to the east. No one could possibly determine such a distance that exactly (the word "about" does not rescue the absurd exactitude, which would have been more appropriate if stated as, say, "about" 1 to 2 miles or some such).

In fact, the 1-1/2-mile distance appears to be designed to put the alleged lighthouse beacon directly behind the farmhouse (which was at 1.1 miles), but close enough to justify the security policemen going out to investigate. The farmhouse of course was not visible at all from East Gate, the view being completely blocked by a half mile of dense forest.

If official disinformation agents had suggested or inserted the actual 5-mile distance to Orford Ness' lighthouse instead of the 1-1/2 miles, in putting words in Penniston's mouth (or pen), it would have been too obviously absurd and would not explain why PBC thought it was close enough to go out there. Other more reliable statements contradict the 1-1/2 mile distance (not reported anywhere else even by Penniston) including the radio reports from Penniston as the events transpired.

Lt Fred Buran at base security control reported that Penniston radioed that the unidentified "lights appeared to be no further than 100 yards from the road east of the [base] runway." This would be about 1/3 mile not 1-1/2 miles from the East Gate. Chandler's statement likewise reports that Burroughs radioed that "he was observing strange lights in the wooded area just beyond the access road leading from the east gate."

Brad

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:46:14 EST
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:27:27 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:56:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>>effective disclosure has really been made?

>>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily
>>achieved for everyone?

>Of course it is 'impossible' to know everything about almost
>anything, especially that which has been covered up.

>Some conspiracy folks won't be happy until everyone on the Black
>Budget payroll has been water-boarded or otherwise tortured to
>reveal everything they know.

>Alternatively it will be necessary to take what information is
>revealed and do a historical and scientific context analysis to
>see whether or not (a) it makes sense and (b) there are no
>obvious holes in the history or the science-based information.

Well once again let me say we will never get full disclosure
from any major government. Just ain't gonna happen. We'll get
teased about it and led on about it if it fits some investor's
agenda.

We need to stop wasting our time and resources chasing that wild
goose.

We have enough bona fide smart people with credentials to now
take all the solid data that's been collected over the past
umpteenth decades and call a UFO a UFO. A panel of you all just
stating what the data suggests, what can be proven and what the
professional and eyewitness conclusions are.

I'm quite sure by now the rest of the world will listen to the
people who actually cared enough to put their lives and fortunes
on the line vs those who've cowered and complied with
undermining agendas.

Ha, me make a funny, I said undermining.

So I for one would like the latest comprehensive analysis. If
the next day new data arrives that suggests otherwise so be it
but for now why waste time with bs and government?

you old timer Ufologists might be surprised that after all the
documentaries and articles and books etc. that the people
actually admire and seek your counsel.

Worth a shot says I.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 12:53:29 +0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:28:38 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>effective disclosure has really been made?

The answer to that one is pretty straightforward, and comes in two parts:

1. Conspiracy theorists will know at the same time that everybody else will know.
2. That time will be somewhere between fifty and a hundred years after the event(s), if and only if it can be demonstrated that no significant records have been destroyed or permanently suppressed in the interim.

These are the epistemological facts of the matter, taking into account the bureaucratic machinery attendant upon the issue.

It is fairly clear from these facts that 'Disclosure' is destined to remain a grey area for all time. Academic historians, archivists, independent researchers and enthusiasts will debate the issue endlessly, driven by their own agendas ranging from the honest to the scurrilous, but that debate will only serve to make the area greyer.

Clearly, for those who might seek the full, honest truth of the matter, 'Disclosure' is not going to provide the final word. In this respect, it is no different to any other resource in the process of historical analysis, and it would be naive to expect things to be any other way.

>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be satisfactorily
>achieved for everyone?

Let's all hope, Joe, that it proves to be self-sustaining. Were there to be no further need for books, magazines, websites, mailing lists, bulletin boards, blogs, podcasts, pamphlets and videos dealing with the topic, I dread to imagine where some (a minority, granted, but some) of the protagonists might direct their energies...

--

Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 07:20:24 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:31:07 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:56:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>Some conspiracy folks won't be happy until everyone on the Black
>Budget payroll has been water-boarded or otherwise tortured to
>reveal everything they know.

Really? As a self-identified "conspiracy folk" (since reading from Tacitus as a child) I would be quite satisfied if the cottage industry that has developed around secret keeping provided ANY degree of accountability to researchers for why materials known to exist are not provided upon request.

And that there was someone of honest concern and authority involved in the overview making determinations on verifying the reasons given.

Like my military records. The excuse of -lost- just doesn't cut it with me. For example. Another is my FBI file that supposedly doesn't exist when I was once notified that agency had been given permission to bug my phone by the Attorney General, by the Attorney General's office.

Otherwise, let's just use the same ole same ole used on us, the citizenry, when we protest responding to probes into our past:

Why kick if you have nothing to hide?

JCH

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:39:12 -0500
Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence (entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the hypothesis, or course).

The reference is:

Lineweaver, Charles. 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?' in 'Australasian Science', Vol. 29, No. 1, (Jan./Feb. 2008), pp. 38-9.

The magazine link:

<http://www.australasianscience.com.au/>

I have been unable to find any public link to the full text, but have found a a paper from which the article is derived - a .pdf at:

<http://au.arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0711/0711.1751.pdf>

James T. Molesworth
VUFORS, Australia

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:40:21 -0400
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:59:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

>Source: The Daily Post - Llandudno Junction, Wales

><http://tinyurl.com/2ze4k3>

>Dec 29 2007

>Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last
>by Steve Bagnall
>Daily Post

>Ministry of Defence files on what conspiracy theory fans believe
>may have been a UFO crash in North Wales are expected to be
>released next year.

Another 'babe in the woods' expert. Now all UFO witnesses are
conspiracy theory fans.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 16:08:37 -0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:46:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

>Source: The Daily Post - Llandudno Junction, Wales

><http://tinyurl.com/2ze4k3>

>Dec 29 2007

>Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last
>by Steve Bagnall
>Daily Post

>Ministry of Defence files on what conspiracy theory fans believe
>may have been a UFO crash in North Wales are expected to be
>released next year.

>The Berwyn Mountains incident sparked mystery in 1974 with
>unexplained lights in the sky, an earthquake and secretive men
>in suits.

>MoD chiefs confirmed yesterday they are publishing a raft of so-
>called UFO (Unidentified Flying Object) files stretching back to
>the 1960s.

<snip>

>Although the MoD would not confirm categorically the incident -
>widely dubbed the "Welsh Roswell" - would be in the documents,
>it said a large amount of material would be released.

<snip>

Some papers on this case are already available in a file at the
National Archives, opened previously under the 30 Year Rule:

<http://tinyurl.com/23qm8x>

The new files may contain some further papers on this incident,
but I don't think they'll add much. The likely explanation for
this case is conventional: a combination of meteor/fireball
activity and a small earthquake.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope
<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 16:20:07 +0000
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:48:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Berwyn UFO Puzzle To Be Solved At Last

>Source: The Daily Post - Llandudno Junction, Wales

><http://tinyurl.com/2ze4k3>

>Dec 29 2007

<snip>

Another case of an ill-informed journalist and inflated expectations.

The MoD information on Berwyn Mountain was released to Andy Roberts in 1998 and at TNA in 2005, and comprises a few scant reports of a bolide. More detailed information has been available from the British Geological Survey at Edinburgh for considerably longer (including copies of the Police logs).

Articles on the case can be read at:

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/berwart.htm>

and

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/berwsec.htm>

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 16:37:43 -0000
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:31:55 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding
>the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence
>(entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the
>hypothesis, or course).

>The reference is:

>Lineweaver, Charles. 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like
>Intelligence?' in 'Australasian Science', Vol. 29, No. 1,
>(Jan./Feb. 2008), pp. 38-9.

>The magazine link:

><http://www.australasianscience.com.au/>

>I have been unable to find any public link to the full text, but
>have found a a paper from which the article is derived - a .pdf
>at:

><http://au.arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0711/0711.1751.pdf>

I've heard it said that intelligence is a survival strategy,
entirely consistent with Darwinian theory.

Only time will tell how effective a survival strategy it is for
humans.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope
<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:39:05 -0800
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:35:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Brian Ally <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:31:23 -0500
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:54:27 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>I believe Betty and Barney and Charles Hickson and Calvin Parker
>>so their stories allow me to believe that alien creatures exist
>>and drive fancy machines. I do not believe that star travel is
>>possible nor will it ever be possible. Therefore I think it's
>>only logical that these creatures and machines come from
>>civilizations in our own solar system. What is bizarre about
>>that?

>Let's put it this way: your logic is not the same as my logic.
>If one states that something is probable one should be prepared
>to at least buttress that opinion in some fashion.

Hi Brian,

I thought I did explain my opinion. I know that we are being visited by creatures and these creatures travel around in machines that are not made by us or the Chinese. Since I don't believe that star travel is possible, and since I know for sure that these creatures exist, then my simplest option is that they come from our own solar system. The existence of the creatures allows me to conjecture about their genesis. You are free to have faith that they come from other stars, but there's no scientific basis for this belief, just wild conjecture and science fiction musings, and hope.

>>I don't find it "baseless". How do you explain these encounters
>>with other forms of life? ET (star folks)? Or do you deny they
>>ever took place and that Barney, and Charles were bold-faced
>>liars?

>Do you really believe that that's what I was implying?

I have no idea what you were implying, but why imply? Do you believe their stories and if so, where do you think the creatures who abducted them came from?

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:37:26 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:37:26 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding
>the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence
>(entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the
>hypothesis, or course).

>The reference is:

>Lineweaver, Charles. 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like
>Intelligence?' in 'Australasian Science', Vol. 29, No. 1,
>(Jan./Feb. 2008), pp. 38-9.

>The magazine link:

<http://www.australasianscience.com.au/>

>I have been unable to find any public link to the full text, but
>have found a a paper from which the article is derived - a .pdf
>at:

<http://au.arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0711/0711.1751.pdf>

My gratitude to you, Mr. Molesworth, for referencing this article to our attention. Although I have no access to the periodical in which it appears, I just read the paper from which it is drawn, Paleontological Tests: Human-Like Intelligence is Not a Convergent Feature of Evolution, by Charles H. Lineweaver.

Mr. Lineweaver draws his conclusions on fossil evidence and on his firm rooting in the conventional view of that record. A record, I dare say, that is oblivious to many, both paleontological and archeological finds not viewed as conventional.

However, based on his firm footing in what he views as absolutes, he still has the courage to broach the topic and to begin discussion on what might very well become increasingly significant to earth-based humanity in the years ahead.

It is understandable that this scientist would come slowly to the mix. It is also, that he would take a stance that invited reaction. I for one am going to respond and I suggest some others might as well, not informally but in kind, with the same regard for presentation he has shown.

We are not dealing with slight issue here. We are dealing with something more even than the expanse of space; we are dealing with the expanse of mind.

Can we approach this firmly rooted in absolutes or must we take some leaps?

I would like to take the position we can't and have another take its counter. Or others.

JCH

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 09:59:31 -0800
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:43:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 11:14:54 -0400
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2007 08:54:27 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>>I don't find it "baseless". How do you explain these encounters
>>with other forms of life? ET (star folks)? Or do you deny they
>>ever took place and that Barney, and Charles were bold-faced
>>liars?

>Here's how.

>http://www.mkaku.org/articles/physics_of_et.php

>This pretty much is my thinking about it as well but without the
>genius as applied by Kaku and those before him.

Hi Don,

I realize that Kaku is considered a god by some, but to me he's
only a mistaken scientist. I don't buy into his reasoning or his
conclusions, or his take on human history.

As far as I can see, there is a speed limit for humans and their
machines. You can speculate as much as you wish, but as far as
science is concerned, star travel isn't possible, not by us or
by them.

But I don't care if you speculate until the cows come home as
long as you allow me to do the same. When the question is asked
as to the nature of the creatures and their machines, I'd like
the possibility of ancient solar system civilizations to be
included in the mix of ETs, extra dimensions, and time
travelers.

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: **Ed Gehrman** <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:12:42 -0800
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:45:32 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding
>the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence
>(entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the
>hypothesis, or course).

Hi James,

I think the mistake here is regarding 'intelligence' as the benchmark when 'tool-making' is the what sets humans apart from our fellow creatures. Tool-making is convergent. Once that niche is occupied by a species, certain physical and mental traits will follow.

I realize that convergence is a complicated concept, but it's a fact and should be considered when trying to understand our visitors.

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 18:30:26 +0000
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:47:28 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 12:53:29 +0000
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>>effective disclosure has really been made?

Thanks to all the respondents so far. I think I need to clarify what I mean by 'conspiracy theorist' - my intended meaning was anyone that is convinced that the authorities have positive evidence of alien visitation and are covering that fact up. I do think however, that the answers would be relevant to other conspiracies.

>The answer to that one is pretty straightforward, and comes in >two parts:

>1. Conspiracy theorists will know at the same time that >everybody else will know.

I disagree with this. I am personally satisfied that the pending release of the MOD files amounts to effective disclosure here in the UK. I know that many others see this as a whitewash, and don't accept it as effective, or full disclosure.

>2. That time will be somewhere between fifty and a hundred years >after the event(s), if and only if it can be demonstrated that >no significant records have been destroyed or permanently >suppressed in the interim.

Unfortunately, I am already aware of files which have been lost or erroneously destroyed. While I think that such loss is inexcusable, I also find it unsurprising, given the volume of material in question. It definitely does provide (justifiable to an extent) fuel for conspiracy theories, however.

>These are the epistemological facts of the matter, taking into >account the bureaucratic machinery attendant upon the issue.

>It is fairly clear from these facts that 'Disclosure' is >destined to remain a grey area for all time. Academic >historians, archivists, independent researchers and enthusiasts >will debate the issue endlessly, driven by their own agendas >ranging from the honest to the scurrilous, but that debate will >only serve to make the area greyer.

This is my concern. As someone else may have mentioned, the conspiracy theories are in a way justified by known examples of conspiracies, and popular trust in the authorities has broken down. In my mind though there has to come a point where the evidence suggests that no conspiracy is in effect, based on the documented facts, even if some of those documents are missing.

>Clearly, for those who might seek the full, honest truth of the
>matter, 'Disclosure' is not going to provide the final word. In
>this respect, it is no different to any other resource in the
>process of historical analysis, and it would be naive to expect
>things to be any other way.

I think that a difference between 'disclosure' and 'absolute truth' needs to be highlighted. For example, I think that the Condign Report was a genuine attempt to evaluate whether or not defence intelligence should participate in the UFO field. I also feel that the study itself was flawed, and the conclusions it reached are unjustified in military _and_ scientific terms. I regard it as a genuine disclosure at the end of the day in that the reasons for the inception of the project are genuine, and that no parallel project with the potential to reach different conclusions which has not been disclosed was in place.

>>Is it possible to know when 'full disclosure' has been made, or
>>is it a self-sustaining concept that can never be
>satisfactorily >achieved for everyone?

>Let's all hope, Joe, that it proves to be self-sustaining. Were
>there to be no further need for books, magazines, websites,
>mailing lists, bulletin boards, blogs, podcasts, pamphlets and
>videos dealing with the topic, I dread to imagine where some (a
>minority, granted, but some) of the protagonists might direct
>their energies...

I feel that pursuing (IMO) unjustified belief in a conspiracy is a waste of both private and public time and money. If that resource could be applied instead to practical efforts towards resolving the UFO issue, then acceptance of disclosure would be useful.

Cheers,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

'UFOs Seen As Joke But Absolute Certainty They

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:57:00 -0500
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:57:00 -0500
Subject: 'UFOs Seen As Joke But Absolute Certainty They

Source: South Wales Echo - Cardiff, Wales

<http://tinyurl.com/2bjru4>

Dec 29 2007

'UFOs Are Seen As A Joke But It's Almost An Absolute Certainty
They Exist'

by Laura Wright
South Wales Echo

If reports of UFO sightings are to be believed, we are not alone. Echo reporter LAURA WRIGHT delves into South Wales' very own X Files...

SIGHTINGS of unidentified flying objects have soared in the last month, with at least two a week seen by airline pilots in South Wales.

Dancing lights, large craft and mysterious flashes are among dozens of UFOs sighted above Cardiff and the South Wales Valleys in the last few years.

And only four days ago, on the night of Christmas Day, a couple saw spherical orange lights in the sky above their home in the capital.

According to figures released under the Freedom of Information Act, the Ministry of Defence has looked into 13 reports of UFOs in South Wales in the past three years. Several other sightings have been posted on UFO websites but it is thought that many more go unreported.

David Coggins has been a UFO investigator for 30 years and says there has been a spate of sightings in recent months.

He said: "There have been lots of reports by airline pilots flying in and out of South Wales who are seeing a lot of unidentified craft on a frequent basis, one or two a week.

"Generally speaking, they are large triangular shaped objects. It's not just during the night but in daylight as well.

"I've come across people who have seen UFOs very close up, from a distance of 12 feet."

Just three weeks ago, Martin Dupres and two friends had a close encounter when they saw a strange light in the sky in Lisvane at 5pm on Tuesday, December 11.

Martin, 43, of Riverside, Cardiff, said: "I saw an extremely bright light come straight across the sky. Then it faded out but it might have sped up.

"It wasn't a satellite or an aeroplane. This thing was not like

that. The light shone towards my eyes then carried on. I'm curious, I've never seen anything like it before."

There was another sighting of a UFO at 4am on September 9 in St Mellons, Cardiff. The witness saw an incredibly bright star but it suddenly started moving up and down and side to side swiftly and then flashing lights appeared around it like cameras.

One account comes from a Cardiff man left shaken after he saw three lights dancing around each other before flying away in April 2006.

He said: "I saw something that I never believed I would. I saw what at first I thought was a plane, until it changed direction at such an acute angle. At this point it was by two more lights =96 they were very blurry, orange in colour. They danced around each other and then moved off.

"I don't make silly claims. Quite frankly this has shaken me considerably."

UFO investigator Mr Coggins, 67, of Pontypridd, hypnotises people who have seen UFOs and then experienced periods of missing time.

Mr Coggins, who is featured in the alien encounter book Does It Rain In Other Dimensions, said: "Strange as it may seem, people who had seen a UFO close up have ended up on the crafts and while they've been on, strange things happen to them such as medical examinations.

"They don't remember until they are hypnotised. One man in South Wales had lost one-and-a-half days. He recounted what had happened under hypnosis and when I played him back the tape, he broke down in tears and said =9ldid that happen to me?'. It's impossible not to believe in it.

"UFOs are seen as a joke but it's almost an absolute certainty they exist and are visiting this earth on a regular basis."

The MoD examines UFO reports to establish whether what was seen has any defence significance.

A spokeswoman said: "We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose."

For more information about the views of Mr Coggins and other paranormal enthusiasts, visit www.psychicinvestigators.net

laura.wright.nul

[Thanks to Greg Boone for the lead]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 13:54:06 -0700
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:59:46 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding
>the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence
>(entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the
>hypothesis, or course).

>The reference is:

>Lineweaver, Charles. 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like
>Intelligence?' in 'Australasian Science', Vol. 29, No. 1,
>(Jan./Feb. 2008), pp. 38-9.

<snip>

>I have been unable to find any public link to the full text, but
>have found a paper from which the article is derived - a .pdf
>at:

><http://au.arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0711/0711.1751.pdf>

James,

An interesting read. While I agree with his essential point,
namely that there is no evidence here on Earth for evolutionary
convergence toward human-like intelligence, one cannot conclude
on that basis that it will not be found among ETs.

It is often an implicit premise from the biologists' point of
view that intelligence is an 'artifact' of a strictly biological
process. Besides not conceding that, I submit that the 'origin'
of intelligence, human-like or not, is immaterial here.

It is sufficient that at least one example, if not several
examples, arose here in a relatively short time.

In conjunction with the principle of mediocrity and the age of
our planet relative to the universe as a whole, the reasonable
and compelling conclusion is that this phenomenon is by no means
unique to our planet, and is probably widespread, even if
relatively uncommon among the cosmic ensemble of organisms.

Mike

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:57:57 -0600 (CST)
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:06:10 -0500
Subject: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

I have received some curious reports in December, a few of which may be very significant.

First, I spoke with the witness of the UFO case in Prince Edward Island that has been on the news the past few days.

On December 26, 2007, at about 5:30 pm, he and his wife saw a dark object spiraling towards the ground near the horizon. They grabbed their video camera and began filming, and what was caught on film is remarkable. A blackish object giving of "smoke" was seen, which the witnesses likened to a "plane in trouble." The actual object was difficult to see, but the witness thought it was shaped like a ball. It was descending at a shallow angle, in a corkscrew motion, moving away from the witnesses, towards the west. Eventually, a long, black contrail was formed. The witnesses lost sight of the actual object, and it did not seem to actually reach the ground before it became too dark to observe it, lasting more than half an hour in total.

The link to the video is at:

<http://www.journalpioneer.com/index.cfm?main=broadcast&bcid=751>

The other Maritime case is from December 21, 2007, at 6:05 pm local. A helicopter pilot was flying near Halifax when he saw a bright white light flying at a much higher altitude. It was in sight for about five minutes.

What's most intriguing about this case is that when the helicopter pilot notified the nearby control tower, they contacted NORAD, who confirmed that they painted the helicopter as well as a "possible UFO" at the location and direction indicated by the pilot, but at 6:18 pm local and fading from radar at 6:22 pm.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

From: Richard Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 17:39:21 -0500
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:12:57 -0500
Subject: Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 14:43:03 -0600
>Subject: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

>SDI #452 Twenty Questions

>20 Questions regarding the omnipresent, including a kindling
>representative of the mainstream, and more: addressed by the
>always incisive Dave Furlotte, the pugnacious Michael J. Woods,
>a thoroughly promising Billy Cox, and finally, award winning
>loose cannon Alfred Lehmborg. Lashing this querulous team across
>the stark ufological Iditarod is one Errol Bruce-Knapp - Mush!

<snip>

>15. Why is Billy Cox all alone in Mainstream "Journalistia" to have
>a studied appreciation for a real history involving UFOs, and how is
>it that Mr. Cox doesn't entirely know himself?

<snip>

Billy Cox, worthy as he may be, is not even in 'Mainstream
journalissm'. Leslie Kean is. She is doing excellent work. Let's
stop ignoring her and instead support and recognize her.

- Dick

[Leslie Kean is interviewed in SDI 451 along with yourself
and Stuart Miller - a strong, triple-hit combo for both
trained and un-trained ears --ebk]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 17:50:22 EST
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:17:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 23:10:10 -0600
>Subject: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

>Another Seeming Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham
>Statements

>Although I know we're not supposed to question the credibility
>of anyone involved in the Rendlesham incidents except the
>witnesses who claim that something extraordinary occurred, I've
>already had the temerity to comment on the seemingly odd use of
>an identical phrase concerning the time of the incident in the
>official statements of J. D. Chandler and Fred Buran. So I might
>as well stick my neck out a bit further at the risk of getting
>my head bitten off by Mr. Shough and comment on something else I
>find rather odd about these two statements:

>The identical boilerplate legalese at the beginning of both
>their statements. Apparently photocopied onto the top of the
>blank statement form used by both men is the following sentence:

>"I do hereby voluntarily and of my own free will make the
>following statement without having been subjected to coercion,
>unlawful influence, or unlawful inducement."

It isn't "photocopied onto the top of the blank statement form"
as if it is some intrusive insertion or an extraneous
"boilerplate [that] was especially added to these two witnesses'
statements." It was not "highly suspicious[ly]" inserted into
Chandler's and Buran's statements. It is part of the official
USAF form AF 1170, printed by the US Government Printing Office
as form 1977-241-130/1323.

>Perhaps someone with knowledge of Air Force procedures can say
>whether adding such boilerplate to incident reports is routine?

It is part of the printed USGPO form! It wasn't "added" to the
form! It is the same typeface used throughout the form with the
same size, spacing, and print density. It is apparently printed
using an IBM Selectric typewriter print text so it would like
look like the entire statement was typewritten when new material
was typed on it using an IBM Selectric. You can say that was a
bit deceptive or misleading on the part of the form's designers
in 1977 but you can't claim that it was invented on the spot and
inserted into the Rendlesham witnesses' statements in 1980.

>If so, it is just plain silly and pointless. Clearly, if the
>testimony had been coerced or induced by bribery, the signatory
>would as willingly have lied about the lack of coercion or
>bribery as he would about the substance of his statement. This
>may just indicate the hand of an Air Force lawyer, and lawyers
>have been known to write things that seem silly and
>incomprehensible to mere mortals.

It is just standard legalese found in many places in the legal
world! It is apparently used by interrogators to 'prove' they
did not beat the confession out of a suspect, etc., because the
suspect states of his own 'free will' (skipping theological and

philosophical arguments over whether free will exists) that he was not coerced, unlawfully induced or influenced, etc.

These were AF Military Police and these were obviously the standard AF forms they used every day and had lying around in some quantities so they used them to write up their UFO incident narratives. I don't see what the big deal is here.

I have already proven in other posts that false statements had been made about a fruitless "2 mile lighthouse chase" - not physically possible for 1.9 miles of any 2-mile trek hence are outright lies - most probably inserted or 'influenced' or coerced into the Cabansag and Burroughs statements. This was proven on the basis of absolutely conclusive physical facts, not subjective opinions.

>But if, on the other hand, this boilerplate was especially
>added to these two witnesses' statements and not in accordance
>with any required Air Force procedure, then it would be a
>highly suspicious indication of "protesting too much" on the
>part of whoever added it.

See previous comments.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 00:49:07 -0000
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:22:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 20:47:16 -0600
>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2007 00:07:26 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>>>From: Lan Fleming <lfleming5.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 10:13:38 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Penniston NP Conference & King

>><snip>

Much of your response reiterates moribund points or evades live ones. There's no point labouring over and over the same arguments in different ways. For the sake of brevity, and sanity, I cite Errol's archive and press on.

<snip>

>>You can cite Penniston's notebook containing triangular drawings >>as "contemporaneous" evidence, but then you need to explain why >>it also bears the same wrong Dec 27 date as appeared in Halt's >>memo.

>The explanation might be that the incorrect date in Halt's memo >was taken from Penniston's notebook and that Penniston wrote >down the wrong date at the time of the incident.

I see. So Halt took the time (0300) from what you believe to be the phony date-time groups ("suspiciously coordinated") in the witness statements, perpetuating this imposture in order to obfuscate the correct 0020 time shown at the top of page-one of Penniston's private notebook entry. Yet when it came to the date he took what he believed to be the correct date from Penniston's private notebook, in preference to the phony dates on the witness statements; all this even though (you argue below) Halt had no contact with Penniston and didn't know him. And then, irony of ironies, it turns out that the "correct" Penniston date, which Halt mystifyingly cited in preference to the intended false date, turns out actually to have been wrong all along! How Byzantine.

>If he were >faking his notebook entry somewhere around 2003 for the >documentary in which the notebook appeared, he had 22 years to >find out that it had been generally agreed upon years ago that >the date in the Halt memo was wrong.

In 2003 this had indeed been generally agreed. But Penniston's notebook first appears publicly in the A J S Rayle interview, where Penniston reads from it, either late 1996 or early 1997. It was published in OMNI and can be found referenced and quoted on UpDates in August 1997 here

<http://www.hyper.net/ufo/vs/m30-034.html>

I dare say plenty of other people got to know the contents of this remarkable notebook fairly soon, though I can't cite sources and don't at this moment recall the dates of various articles and documentaries. But it doesn't matter, the notebook was in existence and being quoted (in exactly the words we recognise today) as contemporaneous evidence in early 1997. We all now know that its header at the top of the first page gives the date Dec 27. The point is that the true date was not generally agreed upon at this time. There was a deal of uncertainty, with arguments on either side, and Penniston himself nods towards the controversy in his interview. But at that time the Halt memo seemed the authoritative documentary source, giving Dec 27. It was not until well after the Penniston interview was done and published that James Easton requested a bundle of papers from the CAUS archive (received September 24 1997) and to his complete astonishment found therein the original witness statements dated Dec 26.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210083709/www.ufoworld.co.uk/v15.txt>

This discovery is what resolved the uncertainty in favour of the now-accepted date of Dec 26. It isn't the case that Penniston had 22 years to realise that the correct date was Dec 26 (from 2003 that would obviously take us right back to the date of the event so makes no sense anyway). He didn't even have a minute. He outed the notebook before the discovery of the true date was made.

>That seems more plausible
>than the notion that Penniston just mindlessly copied the date
>from the Halt memo just so that his "fraudulent" notebook would
>match it, but didn't bother to parrot the description of the
>object as "metallic" in the Halt memo and instead said it was
>composed of a bizarre translucent glassy material.

Does it? Only the truth is required to be perfectly consistent. Fabrications typically are not. And your apologia for one inconsistency introduces another, as is wont to happen:

The word "metallic" was at the core of your previous claim (addressed with tedious repetition in previous posts) that Halt's memo contain's material that was not in the allegedly-denatured witness statements and therefore must have come direct from Penniston's sensational true story. That chain of reasoning places responsibility for the description "metallic" back at Penniston's door, and of course implies that it was a "significant" fact censored from the toned-down statements yet disclosed in Halt's memo, thus revealing the early existence of a more "sensational" secret story consistent with the one Penniston tells today (this also you explicitly claimed). So why indeed, if the truth too sensitive for Penniston to sign up to in 1981 was that the object was "metallic", would he now tell us it was black and glassy or like onyx? Never mind that he also said it was off-white and dirty in 1983. How many onion-layers of innocent white-lies are we suppose to believe in? Is there another layer yet to be revealed I wonder?

>As for the time discrepancy, you apparently are too intent on
>discrediting Penniston to notice the odd similarity between the
>statements Chandler and Buran. They both use the exact same
>phrase: "at approximately 0300 hrs, 26 December 1980". Saying
>exactly the same thing might be an indication that their
>stories
>were coordinated.

Your conspiracy theory is noted. Burroughs however says "On the night of 25-26 Dec at around 0300", which is not the exact same phrase is it? Well, I suppose there are circumstances where a consistency rate of 66% is suspicious evidence of conspiracy - like 66 sixes in a hundred dice throws maybe. But two out of three instances of a date-time group? Possibly that is the least likely to vary of all standard forms of words that one might expect to find introducing such a statement by military men.

Note that Buran and Chandler were the Central Security Control Shift Commander and Security Flight Chief respectively, whose experience and seniority make them more likely perhaps than Airman 1C Burroughs to be habituated to a formal "house style" in such matters, and that does not even take account of the

unconscious "polishing" of such a phrase that might well be done by a typist in the CSC office (Burroughs' statement is handwritten of course).

Making this into evidence of forgery is a bit like arguing that three letters must have been written by the same person because two of them end with "yours faithfully" and one ends with "your truly". And in almost every other respect I find that the statements are only somewhat alike in narrative structure and differ quite convincingly in detail and expression. Again this has been talked to death already.

>Stories told by different people in which some
>elements seem too similar may be more cause for suspicion than
>stories freely told that have discrepancies that may be due to
>faulty memory or discomfort about what is being described.

Quite.

>Penniston was the eye witness to what was obviously a remarkable
>event, and he might be expected to notice the time more
>accurately than Buran and Chandler, who saw nothing and who gave
>their own statements seven days later.

Er, right. Expected to notice the time more accurately than Buran and Chandler, but not expected to notice the date more accurately than Burroughs and Cabansag.

>>Consider also that, according to the above writers, Penniston
>>(as Jim Archer) told them in 1983 that he had not touched the
>>object, that he did not try to touch the object, that he
>>thought Burroughs was going to try to touch it when they got
>>close at one point, but that the object jumped away from them
>>before he could do so.

>>Consider that this is an anonymous "deep-throat" account given
>>not to AF superiors, to whom Penniston's might have had reason
>>to play down a 45-minute tactile inspection, but to highly
>>receptive ufologists.

>>He told them in 1983 that the object was "off-white" in colour,
>>and "dirty" looking - not a "black, smooth, glasslike surface"
>>as he has told us and shown in his notebook.

>Even under a pseudonym, he might still have been too
>uncomfortable talking about it to give all the details.

Giving two quite different descriptions of the object's surface colour and texture is qualitatively different from "not giving all the details" (not even to mention Halt's "metallic" which you have argued also came from Penniston).

>Not
>having read that It's interesting that the subject of touching
>the object came up at this early date. To me, that anyone would
>actually want ot touch such a thing is what seemed most
>suspicious.

That point was raised with me by one researcher off-List. Wouldn't you worry about radiation etc? I agree it's an objection, but not a very strong one inasmuch as a person's motivations in such circumstances might not be wholly normal and practical. At least Penniston did say that he finally backed off when the object got brighter.

>This description suggests an object constructed of a
>more conventional material than the glassy material he first
>described in the OMNI interview.

It suggests an object constructed of a different material, more to the point. I think you're implying that he first said it was off-white and dirty because this was more ordinary-sounding and therefore would be more believable than his later revelation that it was really black and glassy. Hmmm. But of course according to this way of looking at things Penniston is forever inoculated against any accusation of embroidery, because any less-embroidered claim is merely evidence of an earlier conspiracy to suppress a truth we were not ready for.

>>He also said that the first alert about the lights coming down
>>was at 2:00AM. That at least does not follow Halt. But it also

>>doesn't follow his own notebook, where he has the time as 20
>>minutes past midnight - "I remember that distinctly" he remarked
>>in his 1996 OMNI interview, although everyone else's original
>>statement says 0300.

>>Note that in his recent press conference statement he now says
>>that the incident happened on Dec 26, apparently deferring to
>>this date in preference to the date of Dec 27 written in his
>>contemporaneous notebook.

>>(In 1996 he wasn't sure which date it was: "There is some
>>confusion about the date. There are two duty rosters, both of
>>which are dated December 26th, but it was either that night, the
>>26th, or the 27th." I don't understand the reference to duty
>>rosters when he is quoting during this interview from his own
>>real-time notes, which begin: "27 Dec 80. 12:20. Response notes.
>>A/C crash".

>>(BTW, re the photos: I just noticed that in this recent NP
>>conference statement he said, "The photos we retrieved from the
>>base lab were apparently over exposed." But in 1996 he said he'd
>>did_not_retrieve his photos from the lab: "I never got them
>>back. I never saw them. I was just told that they didn't turn
>>out. I didn't understand that but was not in a position to push
>>the issue.")

>>>therefore giving some support to their claim that they were
>>>being reticent with their interrogators.

>>The story is that these statements were collected by Halt
>>personally for his own use and were considered by him to be
>>private papers. They were not made for those interrogators.

>I don't know what story you're talking about here, since you
>give no source or quotations.

Oh, pardon me, I'm sure. I have peppered my posts with
references and links for just about every point raised, most of
which you have snipped and ignored. I'm doing my best here. So
far I believe you have offered just one link to support a
quotation, on 17 Dec, when retracting a misrepresentation of
Burroughs' evidence. Mind you, if you'd checked before posting
in the first place, I suppose we'd still have no useable
references from you at all. Every cloud, as they say . . .

>You seem to be jumping to the
>conclusion that kind old Col. Halt was interviewing his pal
>Penniston directly, but I've seen no indication that any of the
>witnesses talked directly with Halt at the time or that they
>even Penniston knew Halt.

No, I'm jumping to nothing except to attention. Thus stuff has
been available on and off-line for many years, as I was quite
soon able to discover when taking an interest in it just a
couple of weeks ago (though it already seems like years!). Check
out Bruni (book, or old compuserve mailing lists), or Easton
(Voyager Newsletter archives) etc. I'm telling you that it is in
the literature, relayed by proponents from Halt's mouth - Halt
had these statements collected at his personal instigation,
after the official reports and debriefings, and he did not
regard them as AF property. That's why he kept them. Look into
it yourself, and find your own references this time

>In the OMNI interview, Penniston did
>not say he told anyone about touching the object at the time
>andsaid he only discussed the incident with Halt "much later."

>>Penniston's own story is true then they do constitute evidence
>>of disingenuousness. But this cannot be not merely "reticence",
>>and not merely a sin of omission either. It has to be a
>>coordinated sin of commission, ...

>The Pope, perhaps should be left to judge of the gravity of
>these "sins." It seems to me that Penniston may have just
>attributed more conventional features to the object rather than
>the bizarre things he later says he witnessed later because he
>was uncomfortable talking about it regardless of whether the
>interrogator was a UFO researcher or an Air Force officer.

The Pope. Give it a rest Lan. Am I now to be accused of bible-
bashing as well as (in your lurid imagination) portraying you as

one of history's great mass murderers? These are perfectly ordinary and very well-understood turns of phrase, as everybody knows.

And as you well know the paragraph you pretend to be commenting on here, but which you snipped away, really concerned not the 1983 Penniston story to UFO researchers but the implication of his later story (45-minute 360-degree note- and photo-taking tactile inspection of a black glass UFO soon after 0020 on Dec 27) that the 1981 witness statements collectively must be fabricated - in particular, in respect of the times and available duration locked into the accounts of Buran, Chandler, Burroughs, Halt, which is what you are yourself suggesting by claiming that the date-time groups are "suspiciously coordinated".

>>There are serious holes in this one.

>That's your conclusion. There are explanations for the "holes"
>that are equally or more plausible than the theory that
>Penniston, Cabansag, Burroughs, and Halt were all delusion
>and/or lying.

Now isn't it fascinating to see how this repeatedly happens. You ambush me with such outrageous nonsense and can't see that you're standing there with the gun pointed at your own head. You are the one claiming that all of the witness statements, old and new - yes, including Burroughs' detailed account - are, with the exception of anything Penniston says post-1997, part of a fraud and/or delusion, not me. There is no point in revisiting any of these issues yet again to illustrate what I mean because you're never going to get it. Again, it's all there in the archive.

>It was you who dragged the discussion down into the toilet with
>your assinine attack on my "credibility," just because I
>correctly pointed out that the spin you were giving the
>incident did not jibe with the details of the Halt memo.
>McGonagle apparently wanted to play follow the leader, after
>his nonsensical Greek chorus praising unspecified merits of your
>arguments, by comparing the persistence of dissent from your
>revealed wisdom with the fanaticism of Osama Bin Laden. You make
>yourself look ridiculous and dishonest by pretending this would
>not be deeply offensive (kind of like using the word "twit").
>Only a seriously disturbed sociopath could honestly claim that
>such a slur was not offensive.

Good grief, just listen to yourself.

Martin Shough

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

From: Paul Scott Anderson <paulscottanderson.nul>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 21:29:55 -0800
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:24:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2007 19:29:46 -0800
>Subject: Re: Why Not Full Disclosure On UFO Sighting

>What "exhaustive research"? There are signs of life: UFO and the
>creatures who fly them. Mars and Venus may now be poor
>candidates for existing life but both could have had periods
>when life flourished.

What about Europa, with its (likely) sub-surface ocean, and
Enceladus, with its huge plumes of water ice particles, water
vapour and organics, as confirmed by Cassini, which are thought
by many of the scientists involved to be emanating from
sub-surface pools of liquid water?

Both environments could possibly support current life, even if
just microbes? Even Titan, although very cold, has its liquid
methane lakes (some the size of small seas on Earth), with a
complete methane-based hydrological cycle (including rain and
rivers, etc.), as well as complex organics in the atmosphere,
even more complex than previously thought possible, according to
the most recent reports a few weeks ago.

Paul

The Meridiani Journal
web.mac.com/meridianijournal

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

UFO Reported On Waikato NZ Farm

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:39:56 -0500
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:39:56 -0500
Subject: UFO Reported On Waikato NZ Farm

Source: The Waikato Times - Waikato, New Zealand

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/waikatotimes/4339074a19807.html>

Saturday, 29 December 2007

UFO Reported On Waikato Farm
Geoff Taylor

A new Waikato UFO sighting was unveiled at an international conference in Rotorua in September.

UfocusNZ, featured by the Waikato Times in July, is an organisation which catalogues and researches UFO sightings.

Founder Suzanne Hansen of Tauranga and Hamilton air traffic controller Graeme Opie both spoke at the Future Perspectives conference, attended by about 200 delegates. They presented examples of their research including a new sighting at Waitetuna Valley, east of Raglan, on March 26.

A couple said they saw a UFO moving up a valley on their farm, at 8 a.m. on a fine morning. Interviewed separately, both described the craft as about 30m long, cylindrical with pointed ends, a bright metallic silver with evenly spaced oval-shaped windows. The object had horizontal wings.

According to UfocusNZ's notes "they commented on how shiny it looked in the morning sun as it moved slowly and silently up the valley before disappearing behind hills".

The description was very similar to a report from three witnesses in Whitianga in 2003 and other sightings around the same time at Thames, Coroglen, Coromandel Peninsula and Mercury Bay.

Hansen says there were some brilliant speakers at the conference.

Most controversial was American podiatrist Roger Leir who claims to have removed alien implants from humans.

News media reports from Rotorua suggested some delegates were sceptical about the presentation, particularly a video which didn't show much detail.

Leir, who has written four books on alien implants and claims to have removed 13 extra-terrestrial implants from humans, refused to speak to the news media.

Hansen described the reporting as "negative" and says she warned Leir New Zealand audiences were very sceptical.

"He's a very genuine person and he's made a very big step to come out publicly."

Hansen says there is a New Zealand woman who believes she has a similar implant and may be flown to the US to see Leir.

Another speaker was Mary Rodwell, principal of the Australian Close Encounter Resource Network, who suggests humans are being genetically upgraded.

She has researched "star children" or "indigo kids" with extraordinary abilities. The suggestion is that aliens have manipulated their genes.

Another speaker, Nick Begich, talked of a joint US Navy and Airforce project in Alaska to manipulate weather patterns for military purposes.

Hansen says as a result of the conference, reputable international organisations will link in more with UfocusNZ.

The organisation now has more awareness overseas and an interview she recently gave for an international UFO research website received 480,000 internet hits.

Hansen says the organisation wants to visit the South Island to spread word about its work.

She says there is far less reporting of UFO research in the New Zealand news media than overseas.

"I don't know why we don't see more of this in the news media. This is something that concerns us all. If there's something in the sky, shouldn't we be looking at who it is?"

"I think New Zealanders seem to feel quite threatened by it. But when you do a bit of digging you find an enormous amount of people who want to talk to you quietly about it."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release

From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:30:29 EST
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:46:43 -0500
Subject: What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release

The world's media has trumpeted the pending UK MoD release of 160 UFO files widely. This has been seen by many as a new day of openness and evidence that there is no grand cover up or conspiracy to conceal the reality concerning this decades long mystery.

The individual who chaired The UK UFO desk 91- 94, who constituted the supposed genuine collection, reporting and documenting of UFO activity in UK skies states that no "smoking guns" or "saucer in a hangar" will be found. That this release is for purposes of fostering "open government". Most significantly, that no real understanding of UFOs has emerged from decades of effort.

Say again?

If the pending file release, does indeed reflect, the previous claims, then one may conclude that this release is another cynical ploy, a temporizing gambit, and that like the US now closed Project Blue Book, the UK UFO desk that Nick Pope held 1991-1994, was also a mere public relations facade. That sensitive UFO matters and incidents never reached that desk. Any exceptions, for cynical pragmatic purposes, where wide publicity has already occurred, being for illusory effect.

That the truly status quo threatening events, paradigm heresies, or especially crash/retrieval events will not be included in the file release. The Berwyn mountain crash, in Wales, retrieval event in 1974 will likely not be included, neither one may predict will be the Aer Lingus 747 Dublin bound, that was almost "cooked" by a harassing UFO, with paint blistered, needing emergency landing. Will the additional cases similar be included? Will the instance where jet fighters were called to escort a wide body in from the US after lengthy harassment by a black triangle?

Will there be any history of hostile engagements, planes and pilots lost?

Will the files include, even the synopsis conclusions of a classified analysis of the pattern, purpose, or taxonomic break down of visiting groups? Will the files include what new physics, technology, or engineering we have learned from visitation? Is the speed of light a sacrosanct limit? Can UFOs streak past light speed, as smoothly as the current lot of US presidential primary would be leaders avoid ever tangling with this subject.

Will there be explanation of silence on joint UFO policy agreements with the US or NATO or any reference to multilateral agreements on extreme secrecy that has not briefed any G-8 leader or has effectively convinced every single leader, to never substantively address the regular traffic flowing around our planet from a big busy galaxy?

Will the files include evidence of many alien bases underneath deserts and oceans, on mountain tops? Do we not deserve to know we are monitored, observed, by many races, in virtual cities, scattered under New Mexico desert, mountainous peaks in Puerto

Rico, and possibly shared space in the vast underground facility in the Tehachapi's complex near Palmdale.

These claims cannot in few words be substantiated or evidenced in this context, but it is a measure of the high effectiveness of the long "dumb down" infantile information formula that the public in many nations has been fed for so long, that these quite large confirmable set of congruent facts, are not even agreed to in a Ufological formal "Estimate of the Situation".

Will the 160 files include hard data on abductions, their number, their purpose, their product, an in between race of hybrids, and what is brewed in vast sky borne incubatory? The measure of the information infant formula is the shrunken timid avoidance or denial of these realities, in spite of a database large and global enough to convince any reasonable scholar. No president or western leader has ever dealt with this, nor will, predictably the pending UK files do so.

The release of files by France and UK is welcome certainly, as a starving individual welcomes a morsel of food. But it is not the information meal that will nurture the strength and understanding that will have to occur someday to prepare the world for the;disruptive, chaotic, revolutionary, sea change, shocking, full facts and hidden history, that will unleash an era of financial turmoil, technological chaotic transition, collapse of oil prices, and religions, and political turnover that will be part of the planetary housekeeping.

This reform will be built on a an informed process and fulsome honesty that will go far beyond what will be included in the pending UK file release in 2008. If it does include what I have mentioned in a mere light brush stroke of depiction, is included, I will abjectly apologize..

I will be impressed that something truly significant is occurring, when I SEE actual footage of mile long galactic cruise ships, aliens moving with inhuman speed as they are gathering samples or meeting with our leaders, or even all the gun camera footage that has accumulated by now.

Will that be in the pending release?

Vince White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

What Did Reagan Know About UFOs?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:03:44 -0500
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:03:44 -0500
Subject: What Did Reagan Know About UFOs?

Source: content4reprint.com - Rome, Italy

<http://tinyurl.com/3dufck>

December 28, 2007

What Did Reagan Know About UFOs?

Reagan seemed more enthralled with UFOs than all the U.S. Presidents, including Nixon. Reporter Billy Cox noted the many mentions of extraterrestrials in Reagan 's speeches and commented, "Ronald Reagan 's abiding fascination with extraterrestrials." One of Reagan 's daughters also commented on her father 's obsession with UFOs and life on other planets. The source of his fascination is often thought to be the "few" sightings he claimed to have had.

In September 1981, Reagan received a letter from an UFO research group director, Major Ret. Colman VonKeviczky. This man had made a second career of sending plaintiff pleas to not only the Presidents of the United States but to the U.N. Secretary Generals. When a new president was elected or a new Secretary General came on the scene they all heard from Major Ret. Colman VonKeviczky.

What VonKeviczky wanted was to get the figures of power and authority in governments to recognize that UFOs , "...represented an intergalactic task force that will destroy earth unless world leaders band together to end their hostile actions against UFOs."

http://www.presidentialufo.com/reagan_ufo_story.htm

He was relentless. As a true believer of what he said he sent letter and packages with materials outlining the dangers and with demands than plans be drawn up for a defense against the alien threat. In the September 1981 letter, more than 17 documents were sent to Reagan outlining the immediate threat to the world from the aliens. This was his third letter to Reagan.

While his previous letters were not answered, his third one was. A distinguished Army officer who gathered many high ranking positions and metals including Director of Strategy, Plans and Policy; Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans; National Security Defense Group Director; and the Chief of the Policy Branch of SHAPE in Belgium, Major General Robert Schweitzer, answered it. Schweitzer was the Chief Military Advisor of the White House and National Security Council.

Part of Schweitzer 's answer to VonKeviczky read as so:

"The President is well aware of the threat you document so clearly and is doing all in his power to restore the national defense margin of safety as quickly and prudently as possible."
[Ibid]

What Did Reagan Know About UFOs?

Well, VonKeviczky didn't need a flying saucer to fly like the wind to the Associated Press with "an admission" of the alien threat by the Reagan administration. The AP almost put it out on the wire but didn't once they called and talked with Schweitzer. Had Schweitzer put the word "UFO" in between "the" and "threat" they would have run with the story. You've just got to ask what Schweitzer was really thinking? Was his song and dance he offered to the AP the real deal, was it a stupid slip, or did he really mean "the UFO threat" in the context of VonKeviczky 's persistent screed?

The Chief Military Advisor of the White House and National Security Council, Major General Robert Schweitzer, was let go on 10/26/81.

Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program

Though Reagan was credited with this program and its "possible use" against space invaders, it was concept decades in the making and one has to ask the question, how come? Generals Douglas MacArthur and John A. McDavid both made comments for public consumption of the possible invasion of interplanetary beings. McDavid said an Air Force approved speech at Milliken University, Decatur, Illinois:

"Before long, people may be forced to realize and accept as a fact that this earth is only an infinitesimal grain of sand in an infinite universe," declared McDavid. "The human is one of many forms of life with which God is concerned and others are superior to us. And if this is true, our meeting with other types of existence in other places in the universe quite likely will increase the potential element of conflict rather than reduce it." [Ibid]

Why would a brigadier general have to have an Air Force approved speech unless he was treading on Top-Secret grounds and had to walk a very thin line in what he said? And, why if UFOs don't exist, they are just balloons and swamp gas, would he have to walk a very thin line and get Air Force approval?

A career State Department diplomat, Michael Michaud, wrote of Nixon 's worry about an alien invasion:

"Aliens from other solar systems are a potential threat to us, and we are a potential threat to them. Scientists and others have often postulated that extraterrestrial societies more advanced than ours would be less warlike. Regrettably, the stereotypes of the benevolent, super intelligent alien may be as unrealistic as the stereotype of the bug-eyed monster carrying off shapely human females. Even if a species had achieved true peace within its own ranks, it would still be worried about us, and would take the measures it felt were necessary to protect itself. This includes the possibility (not the inevitability) of military action . . . Our basic interest will be to protect ourselves from any possible threat to Earth 's security..." [Ibid]

There is some speculation that "Reagan 's " SDI had a two-fold purpose: To defend against the Soviets and extraterrestrials. Here are some of the sources:

In a June 1995 Bay Area Lecture Dr. Steven Greer announces information leaked to him from the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado shows that the Air Force tracks an average of 500 "fastwalkers" (term used for UFOs) entering the earth atmosphere every year.

New York Times Pulitzer prize winning author Howard Blum reports that NORAD deep-space radars track many UFOs.

Two Aerospace engineers working on the AeroJet 's DSP spy satellite claim UFOs are detected coming from deep space two or three times a month.

Author Whitley Strieber, in his book Breakthrough, stated that he had seen part of a document which revealed that the EG&G Corporation is involved in developing defense weapons against extraterrestrials.

Two further sources have told Greer that rogue units within Unacknowledged Special Access Programs, have directed black

budget funds to develop SDI weapons to down UFOs. Further the sources have stated that they have been successful in shoot downs.

It must be said that there are other Ufologists who do not agree with these sources.

A Close Encounter of the Spielberg Kind

When Steven Spielberg 's movie, ET, came out, Spielberg did a private showing for Ronald and Nancy Reagan in the White House. There were guests invited for this private screening totally about 35 other persons. Apparently, the Reagan 's loved the movie indicated by Nancy 's tears and Ronald 's enthusiasm.

After the movie ended, the President leaned over to Spielberg and in a hushed tone said,

"You know, there aren't six people in this room who know how true this really is."

http://www.presidentialufo.com/reagan_spielberg.htm

Spielberg told a TV producer of Reagan 's comment while being interviewed for a documentary.

About the Author:

Douglas Bower - I Was Abducted By Aliens But They Threw Me Back

[Lead thanks to Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Active SETI And The Public

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:10:06 -0500
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:10:06 -0500
Subject: Active SETI And The Public

Source: Centauri Dreams The News Forum Of The Tau Zero Foundation

<http://www.centauri-dreams.org/?p=1646>

Thursday, December 27th, 2007

Active SETI And The Public

When it comes to understanding possible extraterrestrial civilizations, I'm with Freeman Dyson, who had this to say:

"Our business as scientists is to search the universe and find out what is there. What is there may conform to our moral sense or it may not...It is just as unscientific to impute to remote intelligences wisdom and serenity as it is to impute to them irrational and murderous impulses. We must be prepared for either possibility and conduct our searches accordingly."

As quoted in a 2005 essay by Michael Michaud, Dyson saw two alternatives: Intelligent races may rule their domains with benign intelligence, occasionally passing along the knowledge they have accumulated to a universe eager to listen. Or intelligence may be purely exploitative, consuming what it encounters. We don't know which of these alternatives prevails, if either, and that's one reason that Michaud, a former diplomat who became deputy assistant secretary of state for science and technology, resigned from the International Academy of Astronautics' Permanent Study Group dedicated to SETI in September. The issue: Active SETI, not just listening but beaming signals at will to other stars.

M31 galaxy

If you want to have a good look at the controversy, read David Grinspoon's article "Who Speaks for Earth," as comprehensive a look at the issue as I've seen. Grinspoon is a scientist at the Southwest Research Institute (Boulder, CO) as well as the author of *Lonely Planets: The Natural Philosophy of Alien Life* (Harper, 2004). Two years ago we looked at his provocative ideas about life on Titan in a Centauri Dreams posting.

Image: M31, the Andromeda Galaxy. Are 'cities of stars' like these home to benign species exchanging information, or are there threats we know nothing of that make silence a better choice? Credit: NASA.

Running in SEED Magazine, Grinspoon's latest article should receive plenty of attention, a good thing given the fact that most people either don't know that signals have already been sent (not just from Arecibo but to nearby stars from the Eupatoria planetary radar site in the Crimea), or else think that sending signals is a harmless exercise, because surely extraterrestrial civilizations are, though entertaining, pure science fiction.

And perhaps they are - people like me think they're vanishingly

rare - but the point is that we have nothing more than speculation to work with. Meanwhile, what would we do if we ever did receive an actual SETI signal? The First SETI Protocol was drawn up in the 1980s to address the issue, laying down procedures that begin with notifying the worldwide SETI community, verifying the potential alien signal, then announcing it to the public. No reply would be sent without first establishing a global consensus.

That latter, of course, is the sticking point. As Grinspoon explains, a Second SETI Protocol should have tuned up our policy for sending messages from Earth, but arguments over whether it should only affect responses to received messages - or messages sent before any extraterrestrial signal was detected - have complicated the picture. Language calling for international consultations before we make further deliberate transmissions was deleted from Michaud's draft of the Protocol when the Permanent Study Group of the SETI subcommittee of the IAA met last year in Valencia.

Grinspoon's article is a calm assessment of the current situation, and I recommend it to you. He discusses the work of Alexander Zaitsev at Eupatoria, whose team has sent a series of messages toward nearby stars. Remember that Frank Drake's Arecibo message of 1974, the first active SETI attempt I know of, was aimed at the globular cluster M13, some 25,000 light years away, and was thus something of a scientific exercise rather than a active attempt to open a communications channel. But the stars reached by the Eupatoria messages are between 45 and 70 light years from Earth, more or less in our back yard.

Discussions between the two camps continue. But two Grinspoon points merit special attention. One is that the kind of facilities that can make active SETI broadcasts are today largely in the hands of national governments or large organizations answerable to public opinion. Will it always be so? Grinspoon says no:

"...seemingly inevitable trends are placing increasingly powerful technologies in the hands of small groups or eager individuals with their own agendas and no oversight. Today, on the entire planet, there are only a few mavericks like Zaitsev who are able and willing to unilaterally represent humanity and effectively reveal our presence. In the future, there could be one in every neighborhood."

Which is one reason why public indifference to the question of broadcasting to the stars may not last much longer. In fact, the Grinspoon article may be a watershed event in changing awareness. The issues are clearly large. As David Brin has been pointing out since the 1980s, one possible answer to our failure to detect other civilizations is that there may be a reason why such civilizations would want to remain silent. Is there a threat to emerging intelligence that could make our attempt to draw attention to ourselves a dangerous mistake? We can't know at this juncture, which makes deliberate broadcasts something of a shot in the dark. And that dark is quite impenetrable at present.

Grinspoon also makes the point that the entire discussion on active SETI may in itself be a good thing for our own understanding. Let me quote him again:

"...even if no one else is out there and we are ultimately alone, the idea of communicating with truly alien cultures forces us to consider ourselves from an entirely new, and perhaps timely, perspective. Even if we never make contact, any attempt to act and speak as one planet is not a misguided endeavor: Our impulsive industrial transformation of our home planet is starting to catch up to us, and the nations of the world are struggling with existential threats like anthropogenic climate change and weapons of mass destruction. Whether or not we develop a mechanism for anticipating, discussing, and acting on long-term planetary dangers such as these before they become catastrophes remains to be seen. But the unified global outlook required to face them would certainly be a welcome development."

These are welcome words, highlighting the fact that the issues we confront as we look for extraterrestrial civilizations are just as significant for our own dealings here on Earth, where other cultures can sometimes seem as inscrutably alien as

anything we might find through a radio telescope search. And Grinspoon is surely right about the proliferation of technologies expanding active SETI in the future. We need to be raising public consciousness on this issue and getting the entire active SETI question into broader forums, where people from a wide range of backgrounds, in and out of the sciences, can address it. We need to do that so we act not as individuals but as a species, looking out into a universe that may or may not welcome us as friends.

[Lead thanks to Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:19:05 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:12:11 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:12:42 -0800
>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>Hi James,

>I think the mistake here is regarding 'intelligence' as the
>benchmark when 'tool-making' is the what sets humans apart from
>our fellow creatures. Tool-making is convergent. Once that niche
>is occupied by a species, certain physical and mental traits
>will follow.

>I realize that convergence is a complicated concept, but it's a
>fact and should be considered when trying to understand our
>visitors.

Ed, your splendid thoughts are always appreciated but I must
take issue with yours this time. It is not tool-making per se
that is viewed convergent (since some non-primates, even some
insects, are observed employing tools,) it is the powerful
prehensil thumb.

Then there is your dogmatic insistance on the absolute that star
travel is an impossibility. Why would someone of intelligence
be so committed to minimize a possibility being more and more
upheld by evidence?

It is far more of a leap to equate the beginnings of intelligence
with environment and the convenience to adapt to it than to
profess a limitation based on the physics of a science
confounded constantly by anomaly.

Of course, I would welcome your argument on why you believe
this.

JCH

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:59:42 -0400
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 11:17:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:57:57 -0600 (CST)
>Subject: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>I have received some curious reports in December, a few of which
>may be very significant.

>First, I spoke with the witness of the UFO case in Prince Edward
>Island that has been on the news the past few days.

<snip>

>The other Maritime case is from December 21, 2007, at 6:05 pm
>local. A helicopter pilot was flying near Halifax when he saw a
>bright white light flying at a much higher altitude. It was in
>sight for about five minutes.

>What's most intriguing about this case is that when the
>helicopter pilot notified the nearby control tower, they
>contacted NORAD, who confirmed that they painted the helicopter
>as well as a "possible UFO" at the location and direction
>indicated by the pilot, but at 6:18 pm local and fading from
>radar at 6:22 pm.

Chris kindly forwarded this case to me yesterday after phoning
me. I did some poking around the Air Traffic Control sector to
get more information.

Though this sighting is supposed to have been reported to
Stanfield Halifax International Tower they have nor record of it
in their logbook.

It was suggested that I contact the shift manager when he gets
back from his Christmas holidays on Wednesday, which I will do.

It was more likely reported to Terminal Control Unit [TCU] and
they contacted NORAD.

The detail surrounding this report is sketchy, for example there
is no mention of speed of the object which was tracked on radar
nor is the helicopter type and owner mentioned.

Circumstances of time and day and direction of flight point to
it being a Canadian Navy Sea King out of CFB Shearwater, the
only chopper likely to be out over the water travelling westward
- probably on an exercise. Its position - verified Lat and Long
- was at about 18nm south of the fishing village of Tangier,
Nova Scotia.

There were no NOTAMS issued re scientific balloons as being the
culprit. I mention this only because at that time of the day and
at that altitude the last rays of the Sun could have illuminated
some floating object at the helicopter pilot's guessed altitude
of 30-40,000 feet.

NORAD has the UFO's position out over the Atlantic at 15.5 nm
due South [magnetic] from a small island called Long Island
which is far out in the mouth of Clam Bay, NS which is on the

southeast coast of East Jeddore about 64nm southeast of Halifax International.

The 'UFO's' course is not typical of airline routes but would take the thing over Sable Island if it stayed on that course. Sikorsky S-61s - looks like a stretched Sea King - fly regularly out of Halifax International to the oil rigs near Sable Island but they are on flight plans and would have been handled by the controllers at Halifax Tower.

One final note: The controller asked me if this was on the same date as that Spy Satellite that blew up. I said no but were they allowed to talk about that now? He said no.

Interesting that this is the third official mention of the launched Centaur having blown up rather than the debris that dropped into the waters of South Western Nova Scotia being a decaying booster.

My apologies for interrupting the flow of regular traffic for a UFO report update.

Back to regular business.

Don Ledger

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 08:50:48 -0800
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 08:37:47 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:19:05 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:12:42 -0800
>>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>Hi James,

>>I think the mistake here is regarding 'intelligence' as the
>>benchmark when 'tool-making' is the what sets humans apart from
>>our fellow creatures. Tool-making is convergent. Once that niche
>>is occupied by a species, certain physical and mental traits
>>will follow.

>>I realize that convergence is a complicated concept, but it's a
>>fact and should be considered when trying to understand our
>>visitors.

>Ed, your splendid thoughts are always appreciated but I must
>take issue with yours this time. It is not tool-making per se
>that is viewed convergent (since some non-primates, even some
>insects, are observed employing tools,) it is the powerful
>prehensil thumb.

James,

The niche is tool-making, not tool use. Tool use does imply
intelligence, but tool making takes us to another evolutionary
step. Chimps use tools, but are not dependent on them, humans
are. The prehensile thumb allows efficient use of tools and
probably evolved to accommodate tool making. Convergent
evolution makes us look at how we came to be in a different
light. There's more purpose and less random chance.

>Then there is your dogmatic insistance on the absolute that star
>travel is an impossibility. Why would someone of intelligence
>be so committed to minimalize a possiblity being more and more
>upheld by evidence?

Because I believe Einstein and nothing that I know of has
changed his insistance that as speed increases, so does mass.
While some individual scientists see room for hope, science
still insists that speed of light travel is impossible.

>It is far more of a leap to equate the beginnings of intelligence
>with environment and the convenience to adapt to it than to
>profess a limitation based on the physics of a science
>confounded constantly by anomaly.

I don't see it that way. We are tool users. That's the end of it.
We have been able to make better tools and these have allowed
accelerated learning and knowledge but if we didn't have tools,
we couldn't survive. God is not on our side. We are all handymen,
but lately we've received some help from our friends

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>Of course, I would welcome your argument on why you believe
>this.

I believe it because our science says it's so, and there's no
evidence that our visitors are from other star systems.

Ed

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 18:05:50 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 08:55:42 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:10:29 -0000
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

<snip>

>It's a mixed bag. Some cases will have been investigated
>thoroughly, but with other cases the details provided by
>witnesses were so vague that little or no meaningful
>investigation was possible. With the investigations, sometimes
>an assessment is given as to the likely explanation, but in
>other instances the sightings remained unexplained. Practices
>have varied over the years, but I gave some information about
>MoD's investigative methodology in this interview:

><http://www.officialdisclosure.com/lead-story1.htm>

<snip>

Hello Nick,

At the link above, you are quoted as saying:

"The second thing that's happening is that the MoD has decided to release its entire archive of UFO files, not least because of the increasing burden of responding to FOI requests (the MoD get more FOI requests in relation to UFOs than on any other subject, including the war in Iraq). This is a massive job and may take months, if not years, as personal details of witnesses have to be removed, along with any information that would genuinely compromise national security - e.g. information on the capability of military radar systems."

Given that this interview is dated May 27, 2007, what led you to believe that the decision to release the DAS files had already been taken?

I ask this because in an email from DAS to me dated 26th June 2007, I was informed in relation to the release of the DAS files:

"...To date no decision on the matter has been made. When a decision is made regarding their status (i.e. whether to release them or not), I will inform you."

Do you have any source for your differing information?

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See :

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: **Gerald O'Connell** <gac.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 18:19:15 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:00:06 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 18:30:26 +0000
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>From: Gerald O'Connell <gac.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 12:53:29 +0000
>>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 13:29:20 +0000
>>>Subject: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>>>I've been watching the 'Faux Disclosure In The Works?' thread,
>>>and it occurred to me, how will conspiracy theorists know when
>>>effective disclosure has really been made?

>Thanks to all the respondents so far. I think I need to clarify
>what I mean by 'conspiracy theorist' - my intended meaning was
>anyone that is convinced that the authorities have positive
>evidence of alien visitation and are covering that fact up. I do
>think however, that the answers would be relevant to other
>conspiracies.

>>The answer to that one is pretty straightforward, and comes in
>>two parts:

>>1. Conspiracy theorists will know at the same time that
>>everybody else will know.

>I disagree with this. I am personally satisfied that the pending
>release of the MoD files amounts to effective disclosure here in
>the UK.

Fair enough Joe, but as a sceptic I find that difficult to
swallow. Somebody needs to do some exhaustive work to correlate
the released files with related activity - on the part of UFOs,
those who report them through official channels, and
government/official investigative records - before I could be
satisfied on the point.

Such work is not done - and I don't even know if it could be
done - and so it remains, as I said originally, a grey area for
those who feel they ought to base their view on a rational,
even-handed assessment of the facts.

Self-styled sceptics who are selective in their application of
scepticism are not sceptics at all - they are as much victims of
bias as any zealot, or, for that matter, 'conspiracy theorist':
whether you want to describe it as 'convinced' or 'personally
satisfied' makes no difference. In the absence of sufficient
convincing evidence, it is just another belief. Beliefs are not
the same as knowledge.

At a slight tangent to this I cannot avoid, or suppress, the
following observation.

In general, when UK government records are released it almost always emerges that what the public were told at the time of important events turns out to have been either false or greatly diluted. If those important events remain current or relevant, then the tendency is for the records not to be released. If the currency or relevance goes away, then, eventually, the records are released.

Now, we may decide for ourselves whether UFO-related material is 'important' as I have characterised it - I'm sure there's a better term, but I hope you get my drift - or current, but it would be naive to ignore this altogether when assessing the 'effectiveness' or completeness of any disclosure process.

-- Gerald O'Connell

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 21:56:47 -0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:02:45 -0500
Subject: Re: What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release

>From: Vince White <Vinceomni.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 09:30:29 EST
>Subject: What Won't Be In UK UFO File Release

<snip>

>If the pending file release, does indeed reflect, the previous
>claims, then one may conclude that this release is another
>cynical ploy, a temporizing gambit, and that like the US now
>closed Project Blue Book, the UK UFO desk that Nick Pope held
>1991-1994, was also a mere public relations facade. That
>sensitive UFO matters and incidents never reached that desk. Any
>exceptions, for cynical pragmatic purposes, where wide publicity
>has already occurred, being for illusory effect.

There seem to be two versions of this particular conspiracy theory.

In the first, some sort of super-secret UFO research effort was going on at the MoD, behind the backs of the secretariat lead division - a sort of Second Foundation, if there any Asimov fans out there. They got all the good cases; we were just a 'shop window'; we were out of the loop, yada, yada. Some people suggested DI55c were this 'Second Foundation'. But then some of the documents got released under FOI and showed that - at least during my tour of duty - the secretariat and the Defence Intelligence Staff worked seamlessly on the UFO issue. Enter the second version of this conspiracy theory.

In this second version, I'm no longer a dupe, unaware of the mysterious 'Second Foundation': I'm the bad guy; I still work for the MoD; I never really left and here I am, complicit in a disinformation operation, promoting the MoD's party line on open government and breaking the story for them in the media. We falsified the files and/or will leave out all the 'good stuff' on aliens.

What you've done very well in your posts is to answer the question "how will conspiracy theorists know when effective disclosure has really been made?", which was asked a couple of days ago. The answer, it seems to me, is that until and unless revelations are made that exactly match their belief systems, conspiracy theorists will dismiss official revelations as lies and disinformation. Your posts give the perfect illustration of this mindset.

Finally - and forgive me if I missed this - but have you yet explained what you meant in your original post when you referred to "super secret space fleet activity"? I'm intrigued, as are many others on this List, I'm sure.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Giant ETs?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 17:10:46 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:03:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Giant ETs?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:45:58 EST
>Subject: Giant ETs?

>Over the years there've been some startling claims regarding UFO
>reports and giant occupants.

>Also of past civilizations where inhabitants were of enormous
>stature. Of course our most familiar story is that of Goliath
>the Philistine in the Old Testament.

>People reaching amazing heights of 8 or 9 feet seem very likely
>but past that is improbable. My own family we can average 6-7
>feet tall easily.

>On occasion guests will appear on the radio shows claiming such
>things as people being of heights in the 18 ft range and more
>but I've yet to see any solid proof of this such as a femur or
>skull.

>Like UFOs the data is fuzzy or blurry at the last second.

>Anyone have links to such data?

You might have a look at what Steve Quayle has on-line:

<http://www.stevequayle.com>

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Pope Condign And UAP

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 22:22:13 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:05:42 -0500
Subject: Pope Condign And UAP

The US UFO Magazine have made issue #141 available on-line at:

<http://www.ufomag.com/sample/UFO22.12.pdf>

On page 39 of the file (page 37 of the magazine) is part of a lengthy article about Nick Pope. Within the article is the following editorial remark:

"Nick revealed that because of the complex issue of justifiable military secrecy with respect to certain weapon capabilities, to this day he still cannot discuss some material that is still classified.

For example, Project Condign, a highly classified study into UFOs undertaken by a defense contractor but sponsored by defense intelligence, remained classified to the public for years. Pope originally helped set up study, but couldn't discuss it or even acknowledge its existence publicly until MoD declassified it and then released it."

This would seem to indicate that Nick had knowledge of the production of the Condign Report prior to it's release under FoIA in May 2006. Is that correct, Nick, or is it an error by the author?

In the same section, reference is made to the term 'UAP', suggesting that it was coined exclusively for the production of the Condign report. I have seen similar claims by Nick elsewhere, but I have come across the term sporadically in much earlier documents from the MoD, the earliest which I have come across was dated 27th November 1964 and can be viewed at:

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/downloads/1964%20UAP.gif>

I am sure that as the wholesale release of DAS and DI55 files progresses, many more examples of the use of the term 'UAP' will emerge. Would you care to expand on that, Nick?

There are a number of other items in the article which could merit comment, but they have mostly been raised before, or are too trivial to spend bandwidth on.

Regards,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 17:22:48 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:07:44 -0500
Subject: Re: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 14:43:03 -0600
>Subject: SDI #452 Twenty Questions

<snip>

>5. Does the listener appreciate Errol's use of 'bumper-music'
>decidedly bereft of the woo-woo and illustrative of a point at
>the same time?

This listener appreciates every bit of audio or video material
(or web page) about UFOs that avoids 'woo woo' stuff!

<snip>

>8. Is John Lenard Walson the inventor of this proprietary process
>allowing for regular telescopes to be used beyond their means?

Remember the example I posted of the International Space Station
photographed through an 8-inch telescope?

<http://tinyurl.com/ytb65p>

Well that looks to me like an un-cropped image, and it looks to
me as if more magnification might be capable of a more detailed
image.

I have no background in optics, but I can't help wondering if an
8-inch telescope like that one couldn't simply use a higher
magnification to get more detail, without any 'proprietary
process', for large objects like the ISS.

Does anyone know if better detail would be possible just using
something like an 8-inch telescope with higher magnification?

If so, I'd think amateur astronomers might well be able to
corroborate the Walson images.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

MoD To Publish 2007 Reports On-Line

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.nul-ufo.org>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 22:50:39 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:10:44 -0500
Subject: MoD To Publish 2007 Reports On-Line

Credit to the recently-formed Birmingham [UK] UFO Group:

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

The British MoD responded a recent FoIA request by them with the following:

"With regard to your request asking for information detailing UFO sightings or reports for the dates 16 June and 3 November 2007, the MOD has a website,

<http://tinyurl.com/2y8vns>

on which reports for this current year will be placed on in January 2008. Therefore, as provided by exemption s.22 (information intended for future publication) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the MOD is not obliged to comply with your request."

There are a few wrinkles here. Do the MoD mean a list of reports, or do they actually mean the reports themselves?

Also, we are likely to see extended use of exemption S.22 of the FoIA to turn away (delay) responses to requests. This is a potential downside to the wholesale scheduled release.

Cheers,

Joe

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: MoD To Open British UFO X-Files

From: Nick Pope <contact.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 00:06:20 -0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:14:06 -0500
Subject: Re: MoD To Open British UFO X-Files

>Source: The Daily Telegraph - London, UK

><http://tinyurl.com/292ht2>

>24/12/2007

>MoD To Open British UFO X-Files
>By Aislinn Simpson

>Top-secret details about hundreds of sightings of Unidentified
>Flying Objects are to be released for public viewing in response
>to the nation's continuing fascination with the subject.

>The Ministry of Defence will release a total of 160 files dating
>back to that time to the National Archives in Kew.

>The first files will be made available in Spring 2008 and the
>process is expected to take three years.

>The MoD has received reports of over 10,000 UFO sightings since
>the UFO project was set up in 1950.

>After investigation, around 5 per cent remain unexplained.

>According to Nick Pope, who ran the Ministry of Defence UFO
>project from 1991 to 1994, some of the sightings are "highly
>credible".

<snip>

I seem to have upset both sides of the belief spectrum with
this.

Some background:

I regularly commentate on UFOs and the unexplained in the media.
I've stayed alongside the story of the MoD's UFO files.

Earlier this month the MoD confirmed to me the details of their
file release: what would be released, what were the timescales,
etc. Several ufologists had been sent this information too, but
I thought this was newsworthy and broke the story in the media.

In doing so, I've upset true believers, who see the MoD's
initiative as lies and who believe I'm still working for the
MoD, peddling disinformation.

I've also upset a small clique of three or four UK skeptics who
dishonestly portray themselves as the only people who have used
FOI to push for the disclosure of the MoD's UFO files.

What's interesting is how the same information from the MoD
files is being misused by two very different factions.

Conspiracy theorists falsely suggest that the files show I'm a
disinformation operative. A handful of skeptics dishonestly
twist the information to downplay my role and denigrate my
official research and investigations.

With respect to those on this List who don't automatically demonize me because of my government background, I hope you understand why I have little dealings with ufologists these days.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope

<http://www.nickpope.net>

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 18:49:47 -0600
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:19:41 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:37:26 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>I've come across a very interesting magazine article regarding
>>the likelihood of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence
>>(entirely without any reference to any claimed evidence for the
>>hypothesis, or course).

>>The reference is:

>>Lineweaver, Charles. 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like
>>Intelligence?' in 'Australasian Science', Vol. 29, No. 1,
>>(Jan./Feb. 2008), pp. 38-9.

>>The magazine link:

><http://www.australasianscience.com.au/>

>>I have been unable to find any public link to the full text, but
>>have found a a paper from which the article is derived - a .pdf
>>at:

><http://au.arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0711/0711.1751.pdf>

>My grattitude to you, Mr. Molesworth, for referencing this
>article to our attention. Although I have no access to the
>periodical in which it appears, I just read the paper from which
>it is drawn, Paleontological Tests: Human-Like Intelligence is
>Not a Convergent Feature of Evolution, by Charles H. Lineweaver.

>Mr. Lineweaver draws his conclusions on fossil evidence and on
>his firm rooting in the conventional view of that record. A
>record, I dare say, that is oblivious to many, both
>paleontological and archeological finds not viewed as
>conventional.

That was a very interesting and insightful article. Lineweaver
makes a very good case that the evolution towards an intelligent
species is not a "given" and uses the development of life on
Earth as evidence of why evolution is not predisposed to the
emergence of an intelligent species.

>However, based on his firm footing in what he views as
>absolutes, he still has the courage to broach the topic and to
>begin discussion on what might very well become increasingly
>significant to earth-based humanity in the years ahead.

>It is understandable that this scientist would come slowly to
>the mix. It is also, that he would take a stance that invited
>reaction. I for one am going to respond and I suggest some
>others might as well, not informally but in kind, with the same
>regard for presentation he has shown.

>We are not dealing with slight issue here. We are dealing with
>something more even than the expanse of space; we are dealing
>with the expanse of mind.

>Can we approach this firmly rooted in absolutes or must we take
>some leaps?

>I would like to take the position we can't and have another take
>its counter. Or others.

Your point that we are dealing with something more than just the expanse of space, but the expanse of mind, is very valid. Is intelligence unique to this planet or is it a common feature in natural development. While Lineweaver has made a very good argument, my instinct is to shy away from a view whose end result leaves us with the notion that the development of human intelligence on this planet is a unique event. Historically, our theories of uniqueness have usually fallen. Whether it was that the earth or sun was the center of the universe, or that we were the only creature on earth with awareness or tool making ability, or that we were more than just that little blue dot, we have come to realize that we are not as unique as we have thought.

From a Big Picture viewpoint, life does trend towards higher intelligence. Lineweaver saw no continual increase in brain to body weight ratio across the many vertebrates on earth, except for homo sapiens. This was based on a snapshot of the last 200 million years of life. But if you look at the development of life across the last 2 billion years, you see life progressing from single celled organisms to primitive multi-celled organisms to rudimentary nervous systems acting as a brain to the development of small brained animals such as the dinosaurs and finally to the development of larger brained animals such as mammals. So a legitimate argument could be made that life does develop towards higher intelligence.

It is now know that the chemicals that gave birth to life are not unique to our solar system. Ammonia, cyanides, water, and complex hydrocarbons have been found in other star systems. This is common, not rare. Planetary systems appear to be the norm, not the exception. Life would be expected to develop on a planet that circles a star within a liquid water life zone. So why would we not expect that life on such a world to ultimately evolve a species that is intelligent? Do we believe that the dice rolled favorably for us and no one else? Will this be the issue where we finally try to hang our hat of "uniqueness"? I think not.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham

From: **Lan Fleming** <lflaming5.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 18:51:54 -0600
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:21:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 17:50:22 EST
>Subject: Re: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

>>From: Lan Fleming <lflaming5.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 23:10:10 -0600
>>Subject: Oddity In Chandler & Buran's Rendlesham Statements

<snip>

>It is just standard legalese found in many places in the legal
>world! It is apparently used by interrogators to 'prove' they
>did not beat the confession out of a suspect, etc., because the
>suspect states of his own 'free will' (skipping theological and
>philosophical arguments over whether free will exists) that he
>was not coerced, unlawfully induced or influenced, etc.

Thanks, Brad. I kind of thought that something like that was the case but it seemed worth asking about. The "legal world" is indeed an alien planet.

>These were AF Military Police and these were obviously the
>standard AF forms they used every day and had lying around in
>some quantities so they used them to write up their UFO incident
>narratives. I don't see what the big deal is here.

>I have already proven in other posts that false statements had
>been made about a fruitless "2 mile lighthouse chase" - not
>physically possible for 1.9 miles of any 2-mile trek hence are
>outright lies - most probably inserted or 'influenced' or coerced
>into the Cabansag and Burroughs statements. This was proven on
>the basis of absolutely conclusive physical facts, not
>subjective opinions.

That's certainly more important than all the back and forth about trying to get into the witnesses' heads to discern whether they were lying in their later statements to acquire fame & fortune!

Is it true that these written statements were taken at Halt's request? If they did lie about the 2-mile lighthouse chase, it would seem very strange if Halt or his subordinates were responsible for coercing them into lying about it!

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 21:17:54 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:10:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:57:57 -0600 (CST)
>Subject: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>I have received some curious reports in December, a few of which
>may be very significant.

>First, I spoke with the witness of the UFO case in Prince Edward
>Island that has been on the news the past few days.

>On December 26, 2007, at about 5:30 pm, he and his wife saw a
>dark object spiraling towards the ground near the horizon. They
>grabbed their video camera and began filming, and what was
>caught on film is remarkable. A blackish object giving of
>"smoke" was seen, which the witnesses likened to a "plane in
>trouble." The actual object was difficult to see, but the
>witness thought it was shaped like a ball. It was descending at
>a shallow angle, in a corkscrew motion, moving away from the
>witnesses, towards the west. Eventually, a long, black contrail
>was formed. The witnesses lost sight of the actual object, and
>it did not seem to actually reach the ground before it became
>too dark to observe it, lasting more than half an hour in total.

>The link to the video is at:

><http://www.journalpioneer.com/index.cfm?main=broadcast&bcid=751>

<snip>

Hi Chris,

With Don Ledger having provided a possible explanation for the second UFO report you shared with us, I would like to give a possible explanation for the first UFO report, which although sounding very strange as interpreted by the witnesses, did not live up to the billing on the video.

Having carefully watched the entire video clip, unless the two witnesses, Tony and his wife Marie, rushed at superhuman speed they must have had their video camera closeby and ready to use in order to capture this trail of "smoke" so close to the start. I wonder if they were admiring and video recording the sunset and other bright jet contrails before they first noticed this tiny dark and slowly growing streak in the sky?

As an amateur astronomer like Chris and also having been employed as a climatologist for Environment Canada (with formal training in atmospheric sciences and having working many years as an observer/technician on various meteorological projects throughout Canada and abroad, I can say with much confidence that this trail of smoke is a jet contrail.

Although the witnesses could not make out the shape of the dark object (very likely a commercial airliner on its way to Montreal or Toronto), it certainly was not falling "towards the ground" since all distant objects moving away from you will appear to be falling towards the horizon.

Since the dark object was observed after sunset "for more that half an hour" before it was eventually lost in the the night sky, this further confirms that it was jet contrail and not a fireball or a crashing plane on fire.

Jet contrails will form - and persist - only when an aircraft reaches an altitude where the temperature drops low enough for the humidity in the air to condense into artificial clouds or contrails.

Like clouds, jet contrails appear white when seen in daylight. After sunset distant high altitude jet contrails can still appear white since would still be reflecting the last direct rays of the Sun. During twilight, distant jet contrails along the western horizon will appear like short nearly stationary firey orange or red fireballs - the same colour as the surrounding clouds at the same altitude, if any.

Since this UFO sighting was made after sunset, this explains why the dark contrail was interpreted as dark smoke. The tight corkscrew appearance of the slowly widening trail is something that is not unusual for jet contrails produced by aircraft wingtip vortices (something I have experienced while flying in a Cessna 172 right behind a "heavy" on final approach to Toronto's Pearson International Airport).

Chris, when very reasonable and highly probable explanations are provided for these and other UFO reports, do you still include them in the totals for the 2007 annual Canadian UFO survey?

Nick Balaskas

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

UFO Awareness Group Really Isn't So Far Out

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:15:16 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:15:16 -0500
Subject: UFO Awareness Group Really Isn't So Far Out

Source: The Dallas Morning News - Texas, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/2sudso>

Sunday, December 30, 2007

UFO Awareness Group Really Isn't So Far Out

By Jeffrey Weiss
The Dallas Morning News
jweiss.nul

Anyone who takes the topic seriously knows about what they call the "giggle factor."

So when Democratic presidential candidate Dennis Kucinich was asked in a recent debate about his belief in unidentified flying objects, the North Texas members of Mutual UFO Network weren't surprised when it turned into a political punch line.

On the other hand, New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson has also addressed UFOs =96 seriously =96 on the campaign trail. And last month, a group of highly credentialed aviation experts from around the world called for more official investigations of UFOs.

Getting their cause into the news =96 and not just as a joke =96 is welcome to people who have felt pushed to the fringes for a long time.

"There is a growing awareness and willingness on the part of the public to take this seriously," said Ken Cherry, the Texas MUFON director.

Is the secret that the ufologists of MUFON have been chasing for decades about to come out?

We don't think it's a secret. Just some people don't believe it," said Terry Groff, webmaster for the local MUFON group and a trained UFO investigator.

He was one of about two dozen members who assembled for a regular meeting this month at an Irving public library. Organizers say they've filled a hall with more than 100 people for meetings where a particularly popular speaker appears.

Outsiders often misunderstand the purpose of the organization, Mr. Cherry said.

"People want us to confirm their claims," he said. "That is not our job."

Most UFO sightings quickly become IFOs after a little investigation, he said. Airplanes, satellites, model rockets, helicopters =96 all of these can fool an untrained eye. But all of those valid explanations still leave a few unexplainables.

Those few are what the ufologists say make them think there's more to know =96 but they aren't necessarily sure what the "more" is.

"I really haven't made my mind up," said MUFON regional director James Shatley. "The preponderance of evidence is that either we have discovered incredible technology, or there are some other races that have conquered time and space and figured out how to get here."

For all the scientific aspirations of MUFON, it's a mash-up of a serious amateur investigation club and a support group for people who say there is Something =96 or Someone =96 Out There.

"We have had people come to our meetings who literally wear a protective hat to protect themselves from aliens invading their thoughts," Mr. Cherry said.

The members of his group try to be welcoming and not dismissive of them, he said. After all, they all know what it's like to be ridiculed for their ideas.

"I don't think we've ever had a bad experience where someone that everyone thought was off-the-wall came and they didn't go away feeling good," Mr. Cherry said.

On this afternoon, nobody was wearing an odd hat. After a bit of business, they settled in to watch a decade-old video of a speech made at a previous meeting. The speaker was Jim Marrs, the Texan author of *Crossfire*, a book Oliver Stone drew on for the conspiracy-filled plot of his movie *JFK*, and *Alien Agenda*, Mr. Marrs' account of a government suppression of information about UFOs.

It's safe to say that Mr. Marrs' views about UFOs are as accepted by most scientists as his ideas about the Kennedy assassination are by most historians. But this was his home crowd, and they listened attentively as he recounted tales of the supposed UFO crash at Roswell, N.M., the odd crop circles and other stories ufologists say have never been explained.

After the video, Mr. Marrs "appeared" live via a cellphone held up to a microphone and took questions.

"There may be more breathtaking discoveries coming out in the coming months," he said.

The recent mainstream news about UFOs did not seem likely to produce a new revelation anytime soon.

Mr. Kucinich said he saw a UFO 25 years ago while visiting Shirley MacLaine's home in Washington. Mr. Richardson pledged to reopen the famous case of aliens reportedly crashing at Roswell in 1947.

The aviation experts calling for more investigation included a deputy chief of staff from the Belgian Air Force, the retired chief of Accidents and Investigations for the Federal Aviation Administration, a pilot with the Chilean Aviation Army, an Air France captain, a general in the Iranian Air Force and a representative from the United Kingdom's Ministry of Defense.

The group spoke in support of a petition that said, in part: "We maintain that a restive, concerned public has the right to be informed of the facts about UFO incidents that are well-documented and involve multiple witnesses."

Not all the MUFON members claim to have seen UFOs. But some do have their stories.

Lucy Jane Mock, whose husband was in the Air Force, believes she has seen several unexplainable things in the sky.

"I hope you get to see one," she told a visitor to the meeting. "Thrilling!"

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Mystery Over UFO Sighting

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:19:50 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:19:50 -0500
Subject: Mystery Over UFO Sighting

Source: The Flintshire Standard - Wrexham, Wales, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/24watg>

31 December 2007

Mystery Over UFO Sighting

A Flintshire man is looking for answers after seeing five unexplained lights in the sky on Christmas Day.

Harry Hughes, of Grays Road, Mynydd Isa, was returning some extra chairs to the shed after enjoying Christmas dinner with his family at about 7.20pm.

He said: "I looked up and saw what looked like five bright orangey-red fireballs flying through the sky, coming from the Bodfari direction.

"They were travelling quite fast, about 10-12 seconds apart and were revolving. They were travelling too fast to be aircraft and they were completely silent."

Harry called to his wife Pam to look at the strange objects before they disappeared and as she followed him out to the garden, they began to change direction.

Harry said: "They had been travelling west, but then they began to change direction one by one and started heading north. They were travelling at a high speed when they began to go north and were slanting upwards.

"My wife saw the last two and she looked at them through binoculars. The last one, which was bigger than all the rest, stopped momentarily then shot upwards, following the others north.

"The police helicopter travelled past our house about 10 minutes later. If it had been a bit earlier, then I'm sure police would have noticed these objects."

Harry's description of the mysterious fireballs matches that of Leigh and Lynn Williams, of Borrass, Wrexham, who caught sight of several strange orange orbs in the sky in July, and he said he believed they were similar.

The couple also managed to take a video of the strange sighting, which was posted on the Evening Leader website and was the subject of much public debate.

Some posters, and UFO experts who spoke to the Leader, felt the incident merited further investigation, while others dismissed the sighting as being the result of Chinese lanterns.

Speaking at the time, Lynn said: "There were seven lights flying fast over the house. Two of them were flying round each other.

They were flying very close together, closer than planes. They were going so fast we couldn't focus on them.

Leigh added: "There was no noise whatsoever. Surely if they were aircraft there would have been lots of noise. My wife was panicking. We just want to know what it was. When they went over it happened so quick. They moved very smoothly and were glowing."

Harry said: "I have no idea what these lights were, but I am really glad that I have seen something like this and I am glad my wife is able to verify that they were totally unexplained. I'll be looking out for more over the next few days.

"I'm just sorry we weren't able to get a picture or a video of them, but there wasn't enough time."

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

NASA Mars Images Reveals A 'Doorway' Structure

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:26:50 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:26:50 -0500
Subject: NASA Mars Images Reveals A 'Doorway' Structure

Source: The Daily Galaxy.Com - New York, New York, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/yqj6pg>

December 31, 2007

[images @ Site]

Posted by Rebecca Sato

NASA Mars Images Reveals A 'Doorway' Structure

There is a strange door-like structure at the base of the mountain formation from a NASA image of Mars that is causing a stir. The first person to notice it wasn't a NASA scientist, however, but rather a Russian reader of the portal R&D.Cnews, Alexander Novgorodov. Taking a closer look at an image taken by the spacecraft Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter, he noticed an unusual morphology, which looks strikingly like a manmade doorway.

Of course, the object's intriguing form does not denote the presence of a real doorway, nor would it imply that the mountain formation is of artificial origin. That would make an incredible story indeed, but the likely cause is boring old weather erosion. However, the peculiarities are of interest due to their unique morphology.

The unusual teardrop mountain formation, which likely resulted from some sort of weathering, is located amid Mars's frozen ocean region.

A planet of extremes, Mars is home to the largest mountain in the solar system, the largest canyon in the solar system and intensely severe dust storms. It is also home to the only other likely option for humans to live within our Solar System.

According to astrophysicist Charlie Lineweaver of Australian National University, "ever since the first telescope was invented and we learnt that there are other worlds out there, people have dreamed of going to them. Of course we now know that Mars is the only other planet in the solar system you'd want to set foot on."

Physicist Rod Boswell says getting people there isn't the real problem. "There is no doubt you could get people to Mars. Whether you get them back again is a debatable point."

But some argue that Mars could someday be humankind's second home. But if there is ever going to be a real doorway on Mars, we've got to figure out how to make Mars more hospitable. Many believe terraforming is the answer, and introducing plants that would create more oxygen that we humans love, would be a start.

"They've done some experiments and have noticed that some types of plants can grow under the low pressure CO2 atmosphere on

Mars," Lineweaver noted.

Terraforming is the hypothetical process of deliberately modifying another planet or moon's atmosphere, temperature, and/or ecology to be similar to those of Earth in order to make it habitable by humans. Although it would be an enormous challenge=97if possible at all=97many experts believe it is possible. Mars is considered by most to be the most likely candidate for terraformation. Already, a significant amount of study and discussion has gone into the possibility of heating the planet and altering its atmosphere, including NASA hosted debates on the subject.

[Lead thanks to Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Parallel Universes Beguile Science

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:36:00 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:36:00 -0500
Subject: Parallel Universes Beguile Science

Source: PhysOrg.Com - Douglas, Isle Of Man

<http://www.physorg.com/news118241154.html>

December 30, 2007

Stranger That Fiction: Parallel Universes Beguile Science

Philip Pullman screenplay writer of The Golden Compass film arrives for the premiere of the film The Golden Compass November 2007 in Londons Leicester Square Odeon cinema. The specter of shadow worlds has been thrown into relief by the December release of "The Golden Compass," a Hollywood blockbuster adapted from the first volume of Pullman's classic sci-fi trilogy, "His Dark Materials".

A staple of mind-bending science fiction, the possibility of multiple universes has long intrigued hard-nosed physicists, mathematicians and cosmologists too.

We may not be able - as least not yet - to prove they exist, many serious scientists say, but there are plenty of reasons to think that parallel dimensions are more than figments of eggheaded imagination.

The specter of shadow worlds has been thrown into relief by the December release of "The Golden Compass," a Hollywood blockbuster adapted from the first volume of Philip Pullman's classic sci-fi trilogy, "His Dark Materials".

In the film, an orphaned girl living in an alternate universe goes on a quest, accompanied by an animal manifestation of her soul, to rescue kidnapped children and discover the secret of a contaminating dust said to be leaking from a parallel realm.

Talking bears and magic dust aside, the basic premise of Pullman's fantasy is not beyond the scientific pale.

"The idea of multiple universes is more than a fantastic invention - it appears naturally within several scientific theories, and deserves to be taken seriously," said Aurelien Barrau, a French particle physicist at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), hardly a hotbed of flaky science.

"The multiverse is no longer a model, it is a consequence of our models," explained Barrau, who recently published an essay for CERN defending the concept.

There are several competing and overlapping theories about parallel universes, but the most basic is based on the simple, if mind-boggling, idea that if the universe is infinite then logically everything that could possible occur has happened or

will happen.

Try this on for size: a copy of you living on a planet and in a solar system like ours is reading these words just as you are. Your lives have been carbon copies up to now, but maybe he or she will keep reading even if you don't, says Max Tegmark, a cosmologist at MIT in Boston, Massachusetts.

The existence of such a doppleganger "does not even assume speculative modern physics, merely that space is infinite and rather uniformly filled with matter as indicated by recent astronomical observations," Tegmark concluded in a study of parallel universes published by Cambridge University.

"Your alter ego is simply a prediction of the so-called concordance model of cosmology," he said.

Another type of multiverse arises with the theory of chaotic inflation, which tells us that all these parallel worlds are expanding so rapidly - stretching further and further in to space - that they remain out of reach even if one could travel at the speed of light forever.

Things get even stranger when one brings the often counter-intuitive laws of quantum physics into the picture, these experts say.

In a landmark paper published in 1957 while he was still a graduate student at Princeton University, mathematician Hugh Everett showed how quantum theory predicts that a single classical reality should gradually split into separate but simultaneously existing realms.

"This is simply a way of trusting strictly the fundamental equations of quantum mechanics," says Barrau. "The worlds are not spatially separated, but exist as kinds of 'parallel' universes."

The borderline between physics and metaphysics is not defined by whether an entity can be observed, but whether it is testable, pointed out Tegmark.

There are many phenomena - black holes, curved space, the slowing of time at high speeds, even a round and rotating Earth - that were once rejected as scientific heresy before being proven through experimentation, even if some remain beyond the grasp of observation, he said.

He concluded that it was becoming increasingly clear that multiverse models grounded in modern physics could be empirically testable, predictive and disprovable.

c. 2007 AFP

[Lead from Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Seeing Things Is Perception Everything?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:45:58 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:45:58 -0500
Subject: Seeing Things Is Perception Everything?

Source: Common Ground Magazine - Vancouver, British Columbia,
Canada

http://commonground.ca/iss/198/cg198_seeing.shtml

December 31st 2007

Seeing Things
Is Perception Everything?

Geoff Olson
mwisequise.nul

In the kingdom of the blind, the one-eyed man is king.
--Erasmus, 1536

In 2004, a woman in Florida made \$28,000 on eBay selling a cheese sandwich that she said bore the image of the Virgin Mary. In July of 1997, a woman in north England sliced open nine aubergines for a curry and was amazed to discover the Hindu symbol for God on every slice. In 1996, just before the Feast of Ramadan, a farmer in Senegal discovered a watermelon upon which the name of Allah had appeared.

When CNN broadcast the stunning photographs of the Eagle nebula from the Hubble space telescope in 1995, many viewers in the US claimed to see the face of Jesus in the glowing columns of interstellar gas. CNN anchors nodded sagely as viewers called in to express their wonderment at this heavenly high-five from the Lamb of God.

Such are miracles in a time of diminished expectations. If you are a Supreme Being with time on your hands, why go to all the effort of parting bodies of water or speaking from a burning bush when you can wow the flock with decorative techniques straight out of Martha Stewart Living or move mysteriously through the cable news channels?

Whether it's foodstuffs with a blessed-before date, or messiah-marquees in space, most of us find claims of this sort either amusing or appalling. Magical thinking is for the literalists in the megachurches and madrasahs. We, after all, are the educated ones with literate minds that accurately reflect and report on the real world.

If only things were that simple. Even at the best of times, our everyday perception is distorted by temperamental prejudices, unconscious biases and cultural conditioning.

Last year, Ohio Congressman Dennis Kucinich was questioned at a Democratic presidential debate in Philadelphia about a passage in a new book by Shirley MacLaine, who happens to be the godmother of Kucinich's daughter. In Sage-ing While Age-ing, MacLaine claims Kucinich saw a UFO above her home in Washington state. "It hovered, soundless, for 10 minutes or so and sped away with a speed he couldn't comprehend. He said he felt a

connection in his heart and heard directions in his mind." Moderator Tim Russert quoted MacLaine's description of what Kucinich had seen: "=85 a gigantic triangular craft, silent, observing him."

"Now, did you see a UFO, sir?"

"It was an unidentified flying object, OK? It's, like, it's unidentified," Kucinich replied as laughter rippled through the studio audience. "I saw something."

The Democratic presidential candidate tried to salvage some dignity during this exchange, telling Russert that many Americans have had similar experiences and that former president Jimmy Carter had a UFO sighting of his own. But the damage was done. It's one thing to see religious icons in your lunch. There are folks who will buy that, literally, on eBay. But a UFO over the home of Shirley MacLaine? That's a bit much.

By signing on to a no-win acronym, "UFO" Kucinich was redacted into tabloid territory and prepared for a tinfoil hat fitting by Fox News. There was no time available in the 24-hour news cycle to address what the congressman might or might not have actually seen. And although he did not specifically claim he had been taken on a ride on a spacecraft or been anally probed by The Simpsons' drooling, tentacled terrors, Kucinich was now officially the candidate from space.

"UFO" is not a contentless placeholder," noted Jeff Wells, commenting about the Kucinich case in his blog, Rigorous Intuition (<http://rigint.blogspot.com>). "UFO is identified with little green men, ET and Mars Attacks. There is no meaningful way to speak about the subject in the English language without reference to its debased and comic acronym, and if language shapes our view of reality, then it may take an effort of will or a boundary experience of our own to see that there is more to the phenomenon than a punchline."

American citizens have been seeing things in the skies for a long time and some of the weirdest sightings don't involve space creatures at all. One of the most compelling cases dates back to 1905. As a strange object glided above a field in Dayton Ohio, the general manager of Dayton's rail line and his chief engineer ordered the conductor to stop the train while they and all the passengers on board watched in amazement. Piloting the strange object - one of the world's first flying machines - was a man by the name Orville Wright.

Writes Richard Milton in his book Alternative Science: "From December 1903 to September 1908, two young bicycle mechanics from Ohio repeatedly claimed to have built a heavier-than-air flying machine and to have flown it successfully. But despite scores of public demonstrations, affidavits from local dignitaries and photographs of themselves flying, the claims of Wilbur and Orville Wright were derided and dismissed as a hoax by the Scientific American, the New York Herald, the US army and most American scientists."

It's especially odd considering that Dayton bank president Torrance Huffman had allowed the brothers to use a large tract of farmland he owned for conducting their experiments. A main road and a rail line bordered the land and their flying experiments had been witnessed for years by hundreds, if not thousands, of people.

Respectable society looked the other way. Heavier-than-air flight was deemed impossible by scientists, so there was no necessity to investigate the brothers' claims. Two years after the engineer and his conductor witnessed Orville in his spindly craft, President Theodore Roosevelt ordered public trials at Fort Myers in 1908, to settle the claims once and for all. The Wrights were able to prove their claims with finality, with the army and scientific press accepting their flying machine as a reality.

How could eyewitness observations and the official view of reality been at such variance, prior to Roosevelt's tests? According to Milton, "Many of these bewildered witnesses visited or wrote to the newspapers to ask who were the young men that were regularly flying over "Huffman Prairie" and why nothing had appeared about them. Eventually, the enquiries became so

frequent that the papers complained of their becoming a nuisance, but still their editors showed little interest in the story, sending neither a reporter nor photographer."

If that anecdote doesn't say something sobering about the social construction of reality, and the blinkered conservatism of "experts," I don't know what does.

Cut from Kitty Hawk to Chicago's O'Hare Airport a century later, and a sighting so bizarre that the local media sat up and took notice. According to the January 1, 2006, online version of the Chicago Tribune, "A flying saucer-like object hovered low over O'Hare International Airport for several minutes before bolting through thick clouds with such intense energy that it left an eerie hole in overcast skies, said some United Airlines employees who observed the phenomenon."

The witnesses described the object as dark grey and well defined in the overcast skies. Estimates of the object's size ran from six feet to 24 feet in diameter and viewers noted that it did not display any lights. "It definitely was not an [Earth] aircraft," said one mechanic. A United employee appeared emotionally shaken by the sighting and "85 experienced some religious issues" over it, one co-worker said.

The O'Hare report came and went. After a few brief but straightforward reports, the broadcast pundits moved on to the more pressing issues of Paris Hilton and Anna Nicole Smith.

What was seen at O'Hare? In the absence of any scientific data, and any investigative follow-up from the media, we'll likely never know. In any case, it's easy to dismiss an individual report of an aerial anomaly from a congressman or even a president. But it's more difficult to write off a whole group of professionals who see exactly the same disc-shaped object.

Of course, anything from Venus to flocks of geese to temperature inversions are regularly mistaken by intelligent observers for things they are not. Sometimes, mundane objects are magnified into motherships. The bulk of investigated aerial anomalies turn out to have close-to-earth origins. A small percentage are, in the parlance of the air force, "unknowns." It's these reports that give the experts the fits. Toward the end of his tenure as the US air force's official investigator of UFO reports, Cornell astronomer J. Allen Hynek became convinced that a real phenomenon underlay a persistent fraction of "high strangeness" reports from military pilots, airline personnel, air traffic controllers and other professionals.

Once asked where the evidence for genuine UFOs is, Hynek replied, "Where do you want to park the truck?" Yet, to this day, it doesn't matter if nearly two dozen military, intelligence, government, corporate and scientific witnesses come forward at the National Press Club in Washington to present their evidence for UFOs, as they did on Wednesday, May 9, 2001. It doesn't matter if the scientific elite of other nations endorse the existence of UFOs, as France did with the release of the Cometa Report in 1999. It doesn't matter that former Canadian defence minister Paul Hellyer, who has had a UFO sighting of his own, has called for an "85 era of openness, public hearings, publicly funded research, and education about extraterrestrial reality." In the US, the official line is that we're the only advanced intelligence on or around the planet. Respectable authorities find any alternative ideas idiotic, just as their predecessors did a century earlier.

But I'm more interested in what our reluctance to investigate certain phenomenon, from Kitty Hawk to O'Hare, says about us, rather than an alleged "them." What intrigues me is the politics of perception and how we construct the world "out there." Human beings make perceptual mistakes all the time. We don't just see things that aren't there; we sometimes don't see things that are there, editing them out of consciousness entirely. And we do that with remarkably mundane observations.

There is a famous business training film that shows people in black and white shirts passing a basketball back and forth. Viewers gathered to watch the film are instructed to count the number of times the basketball is passed. As the ball goes around, a figure in a gorilla suit walks into the scene. The figure turns to the camera and beats her chest, before walking

off-screen. According to Daniel J. Simons, the psychologist who produced the film, 50 percent of instructed viewers fail to see the figure in the first screening, due to what he calls "inattentional blindness." That's right; half the people viewing the film fail to see a person in a gorilla suit walking across their field of vision.

We often focus on what we're looking for, editing out any anything that doesn't fit in. Through this process, we clever monkeys turn kitchen foodstuffs into religious fetishes or aerial unknowns into locker room jokes. We're all hard-nosed news reporters hunting down a few local stories, while ignoring hundreds of leads for front-page features. In that sense, we're a bit like the newspaper editors in the Wright brothers' time, puffed up with the pride of certainty and refusing to believe we've missed a scoop.

Since we fail to see what's going on, it's no surprise we often fail to hear what's going on as well. On his speaking tours, the late American philosopher Robert Anton Wilson occasionally had his audiences engage in a Sufi listening exercise. After giving out pens and notepads, he asked the people in the auditorium to sit in silence and listen intently, while writing down all the sounds they could hear: distant traffic outside the auditorium, creaking chairs, fabric rustling as people shifted in their seats, etc. When he asked for a show of hands, Wilson found the most sounds heard by any one person came to almost two dozen. He then asked the audience if anyone had heard anything this fellow had not. The author added these sounds to the list, for a total of over forty. Wilson had led this exercise plenty of times before in other talks and this was a consistent score. This proved, he said, that even the most observant person in the room was aware of only half of what was going on.

"Personally, I see two or three UFOs every week," Wilson noted on his website. "This does not astonish me or convince me of the spaceship theory because I also see about two or three UNFOs every week - Unidentified Non-Flying Objects. These remain unidentified (by me) because they go by too fast or look so weird that I never know whether to classify them as hedgehogs, hobgoblins or helicopters, or as stars or satellites or spaceships, or as pizza-trucks or probability waves."

But the world mostly contains mundane things that Wilson could "identify fully and dogmatically with any norm or generalization." After all this intellectual leg-pulling, the self-described "stand-up philosopher" got to his epistemological punchline: "I live in a spectrum of probabilities, uncertainties and wonderments." Wilson refused to settle on one model for reality. He believed the universe continually presents us with quantum "maybes," which our acts of observation collapse into definitive values.

That sounds more appealing to me than the hard-edged certainties offered by religious or materialist dogmatists. Wilson's attitude toward the big questions is one of humility, awe and humour. And given the truly weird picture of reality drawn by contemporary science, that seems like the right attitude to take.

At every moment in space, both inside us and around us, "virtual particles" are popping in and out of existence, according to a variant of Heisenberg's principle. They emerge from the vacuum and return to the vacuum, violating no scientific laws as long as they disappear in a nanosecond. Virtual particles, black holes, pulsars, quarks: collectively, these bizarre objects out-weird the denizens in Star Wars' bar scene, or anything hatched by Disney's "imagineers."

Next to these officially acknowledged oddities, advanced beings visiting us from another world or dimension seem almost redundant. Such things are no more unlikely to me than the subatomic sprites conjured up by particle accelerators. (Not that this gives me any confidence about what Dennis Kucinich saw - especially considering he's not sure what it was himself. On my personal spectrum of believability, the congressman's triangle-shaped object has indeterminate value, although I put it closer to Orville Wright's flying machine than the Virgin Mary's cheese sandwich.)

If science has taught us anything, the essential nature of the

universe is magical - lawful, but magical nonetheless. And although we humans are conscious creatures haunted by our imperfection and mortality, our very existence is drawn from this same ground of being. We're the universe embodied as intention, exploring a boundless capacity to create and confound. And Hamlet's words to Horatio still apply. No matter how much knowledge we accumulate, there will always be more things in the heavens and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy.

In Myth and Meaning, anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss wrote of his initial shock when he discovered that "a particular tribe" of Indians could see the planet Venus in full daylight with the naked eye. He describes it as "85 something that to me would be utterly impossible and incredible." But when he learned from astronomers it was feasible, he concluded, "Today we use less and we use more of our mental capacity than we did in the past."

Most academics would have simply said the Indian tribesmen were "seeing things." In his book Breaking Open the Head, Daniel Pinchbeck commented on Lévi-Strauss' discovery. "We have sacrificed perceptual capabilities for other mental abilities to concentrate on a computer screen while sitting in a cubicle for many hours at a stretch - something those Indians would find 'utterly impossible and incredible' - or to shut off multiple layers of awareness as we drive a car in heavy traffic. In other words, we are brought up within a system that teaches us to postpone, defer and eliminate most incoming sense data in favour of a future reward. We live in a feedback loop of perpetual postponement. For the most part, we are not even aware of what we have lost."

It may be easy to chuckle at a political candidate who admits to witnessing something above a Hollywood actor's home that he couldn't explain. What's harder for us to accept is that we regularly miss much of what's occurring all around us and within us. As the writer George Leonard put it, "Whatever your age, your upbringing or your education, what you are made of is mostly unused potential." What strange talents, what remarkable powers, still lie latent within us all?

"Seeing things" can mean many things, from looking deeply into the heart of nature to outright hallucination. In the end, our survival on this planetary ship of fools may depend on us learning to see things as they are, rather than what we tell each other they should be.

[Lead from Stuart Miller @ <http://www.alienworldsmag.com>]

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 07:33:01 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:48:14 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 08:50:48 -0800
>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:19:05 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 10:12:42 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>>Hi James,

>>>I think the mistake here is regarding 'intelligence' as the
>>>benchmark when 'tool-making' is the what sets humans apart from
>>>our fellow creatures. Tool-making is convergent. Once that niche
>>>is occupied by a species, certain physical and mental traits
>>>will follow.

>>>I realize that convergence is a complicated concept, but it's a
>>>fact and should be considered when trying to understand our
>>>visitors.

>>Ed, your splendid thoughts are always appreciated but I must
>>take issue with yours this time. It is not tool-making per se
>>that is viewed convergent (since some non-primates, even some
>>insects, are observed employing tools,) it is the powerful
>>prehensil thumb.

>James,

>The niche is tool-making, not tool use. Tool use does imply
>intelligence, but tool making takes us to another evolutionary
>step.

I don't see this as any significant distinction, Ed, more an
unintended equivocation made by archeology trying to come
to terms with guideposts. When a chimp picks up a stick to
dip into a termitary and selects one long enough to reach
what's inside, but not too long to be cumbersome (breaking
some length off if it is... all this on videos obliged to us by
The Discover Channel and The Animal Channel) his
intelligent selection and refinements qualify as tool making.

But the larger question is, why doesn't the chimp progress as
has man? Important distinctions in the structure of the thumb
come into play then and we see a vastly greater ability for
articulation and grip of tool in man. To me, however, this still
doesn't determine what causes the evolutionary stream leading to
cognizance.

>Chimps use tools, but are not dependent on them, humans
>are.

There again, Ed, a distinction, in terms of this argument, that

is not relative to any causal factor because we have still not accounted for what prefers man to progress and not chimp.

>The prehensile thumb allows efficient use of tools and
>probably evolved to accommodate tool making. Convergent
>evolution makes us look at how we came to be in a different
>light.

Convergent is just a word, Ed. In itself it shows us nothing. We still have no causal grip on the process.

>There's more purpose and less random chance.

>>Then there is your dogmatic insistence on the absolute that star
>>travel is an impossibility. Why would someone of intelligence
>>be so committed to minimalize a possibility being more and more
>>upheld by evidence?

>Because I believe Einstein and nothing that I know of has
>changed his insistence that as speed increases, so does mass.
>While some individual scientists see room for hope, science
>still insists that speed of light travel is impossible.

Just what I have seen of operating UFOs indicates to me close to inter-stellar capability. I've seen them go from one horizon to another in little more than a second and that's in our atmosphere. What they can do in space might even be more dramatic.

>>It is far more of a leap to equate the beginnings of intelligence
>>with environment and the convenience to adapt to it than to
>>profess a limitation based on the physics of a science
>>confounded constantly by anomaly.

>I don't see it that way. We are tool users. That's the end of it.
>We have been able to make better tools and these have allowed
>accelerated learning and knowledge but if we didn't have tools,
>we couldn't survive. God is not on our side. We are all handymen,
>but lately we've received some help from our friends

Friends you don't believe are from other star systems but that possess technology far in advance of ours. So to hold to this belief you take a stance on debunking star travel out of an idea this bolsters your own theory?

Anybody can say so and so said so. Even Einstein had his limitations and often relied upon others to refine both proofs and theory. Too bad his discourses with Velikhofsky were hampered by the cold war or refinements to this belief might have been made as he approached a working unified field theory.

>>Of course, I would welcome your argument on why you believe
>>this.

>I believe it because our science says it's so, and there's no
>evidence that our visitors are from other star systems.

There is certainly evidence they can get there though.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 08:03:17 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 16:53:29 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 18:49:47 -0600
>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 08:37:26 -0800 (PST)
>>Subject: Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>>From: James Molesworth <jtmoll.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 11:37:27 +1100
>>>Subject: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

>>We are not dealing with slight issue here. We are dealing with
>>something more even than the expanse of space; we are dealing
>>with the expanse of mind.

>Your point that we are dealing with something more than just the
>expanse of space, but the expanse of mind, is very valid. Is
>intelligence unique to this planet or is it a common feature in
>natural development. While Lineweaver has made a very good
>argument, my instinct is to shy away from a view whose end
>result leaves us with the notion that the development of human
>intelligence on this planet is a unique event. Historically, our
>theories of uniqueness have usually fallen. Whether it was that
>the earth or sun was the center of the universe, or that we were
>the only creature on earth with awareness or tool making
>ability, or that we were more than just that little blue dot, we
>have come to realize that we are not as unique as we have
>thought.

Mr. Powel, I have taken the liberty to cut our texts on this
thread regarding the points you make with which I agree. As you
can see it's most.

I vastly appreciate yours and Ed's responses, both were just
what I had hoped would come out of closer examinations of
Lineweaver's paper.

It wasn't long ago that an entire school of archeology viewed
bilateral evolution of human races on this planet, each unique
to their own environment, as plausible. Today we know this is an
absurdity, but only because we enjoy a much larger frame of
reference, not because we even needed to directly refute it.
After all, it was rank racism and ethnocentricity that bred it
in the first place.

I have other suggestions as to how intelligence reaches one part
of the universe from another. For I believe intelligence that is
gifted as ours to be virutally unique to common origin.

Let's be mindful of one thing, we have only the grasp of a
culture in a relatively infant stage of development with which
to approach these questions of a universe and its potentials.

In the most recent of reptrospects we can see stark changes in
our own species as each race copes with physical and cultural

Re: 'Why Would ET Evolve Human-Like Intelligence?'

changes to cope with environment. We can only guess how far these changes can go when environment compels it.

JCH

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 09:35:51 -0800
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 16:56:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 21:17:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:57:57 -0600 (CST)
>>Subject: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>>First, I spoke with the witness of the UFO case in Prince Edward
>>Island that has been on the news the past few days.

>>On December 26, 2007, at about 5:30 pm, he and his wife saw a
>>dark object spiraling towards the ground near the horizon. They
>>grabbed their video camera and began filming, and what was
>>caught on film is remarkable. A blackish object giving of
>>"smoke" was seen, which the witnesses likened to a "plane in
>>trouble." The actual object was difficult to see, but the
>>witness thought it was shaped like a ball. It was descending at
>>a shallow angle, in a corkscrew motion, moving away from the
>>witnesses, towards the west. Eventually, a long, black contrail
>>was formed. The witnesses lost sight of the actual object, and
>>it did not seem to actually reach the ground before it became
>>too dark to observe it, lasting more than half an hour in total.

>>The link to the video is at:

>><http://www.journalpioneer.com/index.cfm?main=broadcast&bcid=751>

>Hi Chris,

>With Don Ledger having provided a possible explanation for the
>second UFO report you shared with us, I would like to give a
>possible explanation for the first UFO report, which although
>sounding very strange as interpreted by the witnesses, did not
>live up to the billing on the video.

>Having carefully watched the entire video clip, unless the two
>witnesses, Tony and his wife Marie, rushed at superhuman speed
>they must have had their video camera closeby and ready to use
>in order to capture this trail of "smoke" so close to the start.
>I wonder if they were admiring and video recording the sunset
>and other bright jet contrails before they first noticed this
>tiny dark and slowly growing streak in the sky?

>As an amateur astronomer like Chris and also having been
>employed as a climatologist for Environment Canada (with formal
>training in atmospheric sciences and having working many years
>as an observer/technician on various meteorological projects
>throughout Canada and abroad, I can say with much confidence
>that this trail of smoke is a jet contrail.

>Although the witnesses could not make out the shape of the dark
>object (very likely a commercial airliner on its way to Montreal
>or Toronto), it certainly was not falling "towards the ground"
>since all distant objects moving away from you will appear to be
>falling towards the horizon.

>Since the dark object was observed after sunset "for more than
>half an hour" before it was eventually lost in the the night
>sky, this further confirms that it was jet contrail and not a
>fireball or a crashing plane on fire.

>Jet contrails will form - and persist - only when an aircraft
>reaches an altitude where the temperature drops low enough for
>the humidity in the air to condense into artificial clouds or
>contrails.

>Like clouds, jet contrails appear white when seen in daylight.
>After sunset distant high altitude jet contrails can still
>appear white since would still be reflecting the last direct
>rays of the Sun. During twilight, distant jet contrails along
>the western horizon will appear like short nearly stationary
>fiery orange or red fireballs - the same colour as the
>surrounding clouds at the same altitude, if any.

>Since this UFO sighting was made after sunset, this explains why
>the dark contrail was interpreted as dark smoke. The tight
>corkscrew appearance of the slowly widening trail is something
>that is not unusual for jet contrails produced by aircraft
>wingtip vortices (something I have experienced while flying in a
>Cessna 172 right behind a "heavy" on final approach to Toronto's
>Pearson International Airport).

>Chris, when very reasonable and highly probable explanations are
>provided for these and other UFO reports, do you still include
>them in the totals for the 2007 annual Canadian UFO survey?

Hi Don, Nick and Chris,

I noticed two or three anomalous aspects to that contrail.
First, the footage labelled "A few minutes later" showed a
definite well formed contrail-like shape that seemed unrelated
to the shape of the prior footage, if both of them together had
formed the same contrail. Yet, the trail seen in both footages
was definitely one and the same, if I interpret the report
right, though I was unable to discern the corkscrew-like motion
of the short "trail" in the prior footage.

In that prior-footage view, the leading edge of the trail seemd
most pronounced and showed no indication of fanning out wider
farther behind, as in the normal case, and seemingly in the
case seen in the later view.

The other anomaly was that in the later footage the rear end of
the "contrail" cut off very abruptly just where it had become
exceptionally wide, which was evidently where it had formed.
(The upper winds seemed to have been toward the observer with
component from the right.) By then the trail was still too short
for enough time to have elapsed for a typical widening contrail
to have widened nearly that much. Such widening usually takes a
half hour or more.

If these possible anomalies are combined with the eye-witness
"corkscrew" report, I find it anomalous. However, the fact that
the lateral widening "fingers" were present on one side (the
right) and not the other made it look more typical.

Jim

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 10:48:33 -0800
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 17:01:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2007 15:59:18 +0000
>Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2007 10:07:58 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Faux Disclosure In The Works?

>>Without speculating on what may or may not be going on now, 160
>>total files for 60 years of investigation does not remotely
>>constitute "disclosure." That's not even 3 cases a year. Give
>>me a break!

><snip>

>I am afraid that you are a victim of exaggerated claims about
>the efficacy of the MoD UFO desk (grandiosely and misleadingly
>described as the 'British UFO Project' and invalidly compared
>to 'Project Blue Book').

>You must also have missed the first paragraph that I wrote
>specifically about the release:

>"1. There are a total of 160 files managed by DAS and DI55 which
>will be released. These cover a period from the late 1970s up to
>2007, including a series of files containing FoIA requests and
>their responses on the subject of UFOs from 2005 to present."

So instead of an anemic 160 cases in 60 years, it's a 'whopping'
160 cases in 30 years, or around 5-6 cases a year. How does this
change anything? By comparison, France's UFO projects (SEBRA,
GEIPAN) have collected and analyzed 40 times that many UFO cases
in the same period of time. Either the British are totally
incompetent in investigating unidentified objects penetrating
their air space, with possible consequences for national
security, or the real serious investigation was being done
elsewhere (not unlike the actual situation with Project Blue
Book). Either way, release of these 160 cases hardly constitutes
"disclosure."

>I think I need to explain a few things here.

>Prior to 1967, UFO files in the UK were routinely destroyed
>after 5 years. Due to the efforts of UK NICAP Committee chairman
>at the time (Julian Hennessey), an undertaking was given to
>Members of Parliament that UFO files would be retained in the
>future. Consequently, there are very few files which have
>survived from before 1962 (5 years before 1967).

>Files are normally released to The National Archives by the
>MoD after 30 years. In fact, some have been released early, and
>files are currently available at TNA from 1962 up to 1978 at
>least.

>The 160 files due to be released mainly cover from 1978-2007,
>though there are some earlier documents within them.

>Contrary to your apparent expectation, a file may contain
>correspondence, multiple reports of UFOs, discussion of UFO
>policy, newsclippings, etc. It is not usually the case that
>details of a specific incident are exclusively housed in an
>individual file, though there are notable exceptions, such as
>the so-called 'Cosford Incident', and the 'Rendlesham file'.

This still sounds like a lot of doubletalk. The number of cases being released seems absolutely pathetic for that period of time.

>Most of the reports comprise a report form (one or two pages),
>often with just handwritten remarks by the UFO desk written on
>them. Occasionally, there is some internal discussion of the
>report (often along the lines of the UFO desk asking DI55 what
>they think, and DI55 responding that it was/wasn't a satellite).
>Less frequently there is more substantial dialogue about a
>particular case, but rarely more than 7 or 8 pages in addition
>to the report.

So, in other words, however you mince words, basically around 160 reports, most of them sounding like little or no investigation was actually done. Again, I ask, how does this constitute "disclosure".

Imagine a city where several thousand murders have taken place over a period of 30 years. However, the police only bother to "investigate" 160, most of which, after only cursory investigation, are written off as "suicides" or "accidental death". Then, after 30 years and much public outcry, the police release those 160 cases and claim they demonstrate that there is little or no murder taking place in the city. Why would anybody think a whitewash was going on?

>Your raised expectations aren't your fault - one could get the
>impression from the 'Head' of the 'UFO Project' that cases were
>regularly investigated in-depth, but in fact this was a very
>rare occurrence. The 'UFO Project' consisted of a single person
>who divided their UFO activities with other duties, typically
>spending in the order of 25 percent of their time on UFOs.
>Allowing for holidays and weekends, that only amounts to 50
>man-days of resource per _year_ and much of that time would be
>spent drafting responses to dignitaries such as MP's on the topic of
>UFOs and responding to enquiries from members of the public.
>There wasn't the time or the resources to _really_ investigate
>reports, just time to assess whether or not they were of Defence
>significance in the vast majority of cases.

So totally inadequate staffing and investigation, like assigning one police detective for only a day to investigate several murders a week.

Again, I ask, if this was really the total extent of UK UFO investigation, how does this constitute true "disclosure"?

>The quality of material will generally be better in the DI55
>files, since the cases had already been filtered to a large
>extent by the public-facing UFO desk (which was it's 'Raison
>d'etre').

Or just like Project Blue Book - mostly a public relations snow job while most of the serious investigation was being done out of the public eye.

>It will be interesting to see how many recorded radar/visual
>cases there are for example, following claims elsewhere that
>there are rather a lot of them. As I wrote at my site:

>"Within the next three years, everyone will be able to see the
>>true level of interest and effectiveness demonstrated by the MoD
>on the topic of UFOs for themselves. This release will be a
>source of disappointment or vindication for some, and
>embarrassment for others. Conspiracy theorists who believe that
>the various governments of the world are hiding secrets about
>the 'reality' of alien visitation will see this move as another
>whitewash effort by the MoD and will probably continue their
>self-sustaining 'campaign for the truth', when the 'truth'
>really will be 'out there' - just that they don't believe it!"

>Will the hype match the goods? We will soon see for ourselves.

So in summary, you yourself have stated in various ways:

1. There are only 160 files for about 30 years of 'investigation' by the British MoD.
2. Most of the files constitute only a few pages.
3. Only one person was assigned to the public UFO Desk, a part-timer.
4. Most of the files out of the UFO Desk have already been written for public consumption.
5. Therefore what we will see will be a relative handful of mostly inadequately investigated cases by an inadequately staffed UFO Desk turning out mostly watered-down versions for the public, with maybe a few interesting, properly investigated cases thrown into the mix.
6. People who complain that this isn't true 'disclosure' are just "conspiracy theorists" who will never accept the 'truth' that there is nothing to disclose.

Thanks for clarifying the U.K.'s 'disclosure' for us Joe.

David Rudiak

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 14:35:25 -0600 (CST)
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 17:06:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2007 21:17:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 14:57:57 -0600 (CST)
>>Subject: Recent Interesting Canadian UFO Reports

>>I have received some curious reports in December, a few of which
>>may be very significant.

>>On December 26, 2007, at about 5:30 pm, he and his wife saw a
>>dark object spiraling towards the ground near the horizon. They
>>grabbed their video camera and began filming, and what was
>>caught on film is remarkable. A blackish object giving of
>>"smoke" was seen, which the witnesses likened to a "plane in
>>trouble." The actual object was difficult to see, bit the
>>witness thought it was shaped like a ball. It was descending at
>>a shallow angle, in a corkscrew motion, moving away from the
>>witnesses, towards the west. Eventually, a long, black contrail
>>was formed. The witnesses lost sight of the actual object, and
>>it did not seem to actually reach the ground before it became
>>too dark to observe it, lasting more than half an hour in total.

>Hi Chris,

>I wonder if they were admiring and video recording the sunset
>and other bright jet contrails before they first noticed this
>tiny dark and slowly growing streak in the sky?

>As an amateur astronomer like Chris and also having been
>employed as a climatologist for Environment Canada (with formal
>training in atmospheric sciences and having working many years
>as an observer/technician on various meteorological projects
>throughout Canada and abroad, I can say with much confidence
>that this trail of smoke is a jet contrail.

I spoke with the witnesses several times and they say they will eventually be sending me the entire video, including the beginning which has not been posted anywhere yet. Supposedly, it shows the object flying in an irregular pattern without making any contrail, which only began later in its flight.

Further, the latest news is that someone found a tubular piece of material with NOAA markings on it, beyond where the contrail was leading. The prevailing opinion in PEI is that what was videoed was a NOAA instrument package that malfunctioned and came down over PEI. Why it produced a dark contrail is unknown.

But yes, I agree that the case likely has an explanation.

>Chris, when very reasonable and highly probable explanations are
>provided for these and other UFO reports, do you still include
>them in the totals for the 2007 annual Canadian UFO survey?

Yes, we make that clear in every UFO Survey. The conclusion in cases like this are either "Explained" or "Probable

Explanation," as the circumstance allows. They're included because they are *reported* as UFOs, but are later converted to IFOs as investigation leads to a solution.

BTW, I've done a rough count of the cases on hand as of Dec. 31, 2007, and we're hovering at about 650 Canadian UFO reports for the year. Of course, we will still likely get a bunch more as people send them in or we find them on websites, so it's too early to say if we'll be higher than last year's 736 or less.

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2007](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 16:13:18 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2007 17:07:42 -0500
Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2007 18:30:26 +0000
>Subject: Re: How Will People Know Disclosure Occurred?

<snip>

>This is my concern. As someone else may have mentioned, the
>conspiracy theories are in a way justified by known examples of
>conspiracies, and popular trust in the authorities has broken
>down. In my mind though there has to come a point where the
>evidence suggests that no conspiracy is in effect, based on the
>documented facts, even if some of those documents are missing.

Have the UK reports been serial numbered? That would
quickly point out of all reports have been released.

Eleanor White

Listen to 'Strange Days... Indeed' - The PodCast

See:

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/ufo/sdi/program/subscribers/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com