

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2008](#) > Sep

UFO UpDates Mailing List Sep 2008

Sep 1:

[Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [94]

[In My Hometown](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [37]

[Re: Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports](#) - Carol Maltby [15]

[SDI #462 20 Questions](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [78]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Greg Sandow [31]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Martin Shough [42]

[Falcon Lake UFO Case?](#) - Roy Hale [12]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Gildas Bourdais [19]

[Re: SDI #462 20 Questions](#) - Rick Nielsen [31]

[Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?](#) - Chris Rutkowski [43]

Sep 2:

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - John Rimmer [17]

[Nova Scotia Village Uses UFO Sighting](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [85]

[Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?](#) - Steven Kaeser [13]

[UFO Debunkers Frazier & Oberg](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [212]

[CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [272]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [36]

[Write To The General](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [57]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Brad Sparks [25]

Sep 3:

[Re: CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs](#) - Kathy Kasten [58]

[The UFOs Of Sussex](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [100]

[Re: Abduction Explanations](#) - Gildas Bourdais [42]

[International UFO Reporter Now On DVD](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [27]

[Pig Mutilation In Victoria Argentina](#) - Scott Corrales [25]

Sep 4:

[Everything Is Broken](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [77]

[Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [68]

[Marley Woods 09-02-08](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [65]

[Still Pressing For Accountability](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]

[The X-Files Economics](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [77]
[Audio Interview With Ann Eller](#) - Sergey Shpakovsky [37]

Sep 5:

[Re: The X-Files Economics](#) - Stanton T Friedman [28]
[Argentine Sheep Mutilation Report](#) - Scott Corrales [68]
[Fighting For Survival](#) - Cathy Reason [97]
[UFO Initiative Could Cost Denver \\$600,000](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [47]
[NASA's Carl Sagan Fellows To Study ET Worlds](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [83]
[Phoenix Mars Mission Extended](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [41]
[A Hum-Related Anecdote](#) - Eleanor White [17]
[UFO Secrecy National Security & FOIA](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [260]
[Santa Rosa Argentina Pig Mutilation](#) - Scott Corrales [42]

Sep 6:

[Re: Fighting For Survival](#) - Eleanor White [9]
[Re: Phoenix Mars Mission Extended](#) - Eleanor White [7]
[Texas Official Demands Answers About Alleged UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [39]
[The UFO Proof Is Out There](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [94]
[Re: Texas Official Demands Answers About UFO](#) - Greg Boone [8]
[Tasmania's UFO Mystery](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [62]
[Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [108]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [50]
[Re: Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures](#) - William Treurniet [10]

Sep 7:

[Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [52]
[Colorado Project Had More Than 50% 'Unexplaineds'!](#) - Brad Sparks [147]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Joachim Koch [23]

Sep 8:

[Quantified Alien Abduction Data?](#) - Rick Nielsen [21]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - Ed Gehrman [51]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [126]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - James Horak [48]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - Carol Maltby [6]
[Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?](#) - John Velez [46]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Don Ledger [92]

Sep 9:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [114]
[Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?](#) - Rick Nielsen [16]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [31]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Chris Rutkowski [90]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [26]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - David Rudiak [93]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Chris Rutkowski [11]

Sep 10:

[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - Don Ledger [13]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [20]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Chris Rutkowski [40]
[Brits Jeering Extradition](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [56]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Don Ledger [45]
[Shag Harbour Funding Grant](#) - Don Ledger [34]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [73]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [24]
[Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [23]
[Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [80]
[Why Would Aliens Visit Stratford?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [101]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - James Horak [13]
[Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter](#) - Dave Haith [12]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [51]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Chris Rutkowski [43]
[Re: Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind](#) - Franklin D. Fields [9]

Sep 11:

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - Don Ledger [15]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [14]
[Photos Pit Trent Family Vs. Newspaper](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [84]
[Second UFO Alert In Derry](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [36]
[Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People](#) - Ed Gehrman [9]
[Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Don Ledger [54]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [117]

Sep 12:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Jerome Clark [15]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Ray Dickenson [13]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [39]

Sep 13:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [14]
[Cattle Mute In Missouri](#) - Brian Adams [13]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [22]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Bruce Hutchinson [22]
[ABC Examines Evidence For UFOs & Aliens](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [73]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Brad Sparks [74]
[Cattle Mute Interview With Raul Oscar Chaves](#) - Scott Corrales [7]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Glubik [18]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - James Horak [16]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [35]

Sep 14:

[Was Stephenville UFO National Security Threat?](#) - Franklin D. Fields [77]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Jerome Clark [25]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [71]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Brad Sparks [31]

[RAF Radar Chief Saw UFO Fleet](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [79]

[Re: Destiny Lies With The Stars?](#) - Nick Balaskas [42]

Sep 15:

[Shag Harbour UFO Festival In Review](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [53]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [36]

[9/11's Potemkin Village](#) - Franklin D. Fields [65]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas bourdais [25]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Don Ledger [13]

Sep 16:

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Chris Rutkowski [27]

[PRG Update - September 15, 2008](#) - Paradigm Research Group [121]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Ed Gehrman [26]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Ray Dickenson [24]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Dick Hall [15]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Stanton T Friedman [9]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [47]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Kevin Randle [80]

[On The Eve of Disclosure](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [210]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [35]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [19]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Bruce Hutchinson [45]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Steven Kaeser [23]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Ed Gherman [21]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [63]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Don Ledger [32]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Ray Dickenson [15]

Sep 17:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [55]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [204]

[ABC Seeing UFOs](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]

[ABC News Primetime: Seeing Is Believing](#) - Stephen Bassett [62]

[ABC Crock-Umentary 9-16-8](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [46]

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Dick Hall [28]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Kevin Randle [72]

[Candian UFO Survet \[was: Colorado Project Had More\]](#) - Brad Sparks [107]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [14]

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [36]

[Re: ABC Seeing UFOs](#) - Franklin D. Fields [7]

[Has UFO Fame Changed Stephenville?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [41]

[Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [73]

[Possible UFO During Mexican Military Parade](#) - Scott Corrales [20]

Sep 18:

[Hubble Finds Unidentified Object](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [44]
[Re: Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing](#) - Jerome Clark [15]
[Primetime's UFO Special](#) - Greg Boone <Evolbaby@aol.com> [32]
[Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [26]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [200]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Ray Dickenson [19]

Sep 19:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Frank Warren [17]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [98]
[Re: Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings](#) - Kentaro Mori [8]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [18]
[Re: Canadian UFO Survey](#) - Chris Rutkowski [128]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [125]
[Maryland UFO Conference](#) - Peter Resta [13]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [84]
[Guardian Angels Are Here Say Most Americans](#) - Greg Boone [47]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Steve Sawyer [14]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [17]

Sep 20:

[Re: Canadian UFO Survey](#) - Brad Sparks [139]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Stanton T Friedman [8]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Neil Morris [41]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [13]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Joachim Koch [21]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Franklin D. Fields [64]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [24]
[The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Joachim Koch [98]
[Canadian Farmer Remembers His Close Encounter](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [110]
[They Don't Teach This In J-School](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [53]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Greg Boone [31]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Kevin Randle [42]
[Disclosure Abduction & History \[was: Blanchard\]](#) - Don Ledger [48]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Jerome Clark [21]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Viktor Golubik [27]

Sep 21:

[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Greg Boone [14]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Stanton T Friedman [18]
[Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff](#) - Joe McGonagle [16]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Brad Sparks [49]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Stanton T Friedman [9]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [176]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Joachim Koch [40]
[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Dick Hall [15]

Sep 22:

[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - Viktor Golubik [29]
[Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff](#) - Don Ledger [14]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Steven Kaeser [28]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [253]
[Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures](#) - John Rimmer [7]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [31]
[Two Blackvault Websites](#) - John Greenewald, Jr. [26]
[Jesse Marcel Jr. On Black Vault Radio](#) - John Greenewald Jnr. [19]
[UFO Photos Examined With New Process](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [49]
[Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process](#) - Martin Shough [34]

Sep 23:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [61]
[Commemorative Edition Of Mack's Passport To The](#) - Will Bueche [54]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Franklin D. Fields [30]
[E-Mails To New York Times](#) - Franklin D. Fields [84]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [175]
[Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process](#) - Brad Sparks [10]

Sep 24:

[Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%](#) - Steve Sawyer [103]
['Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Greg Boone [21]
[UFO Sighting Over Australian Ranch](#) - Sheryl Gottschall [35]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Diverge247@aol.com [165]

Sep 25:

[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Rick Nielsen [11]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Franklin D. Fields [40]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Eleanor White [19]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Kevin Randle [25]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - David Rudiak [553]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Brad Sparks [74]
[Google News & UFOs](#) - Franklin D. Fields [161]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Greg Boone [33]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Katharina Wilson [19]

Sep 26:

[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Kathy Kasten [9]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [16]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Greg Boone [8]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Eleanor White [41]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Dick Hall [11]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Rick Nielsen [11]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [77]
[Bo & Peep Again](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [64]

Sep 27:

[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Greg Boone [30]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Franklin D. Fields [28]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Ray Dickenson [20]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [8]
[Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process](#) - Alejandro T. Rojas [12]
[The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [74]
[PRG Update - September 26, 2008](#) - Stephen Bassett [69]
[Why Miss The Witness?](#) - Greg Boone [59]
[Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?](#) - Greg Boone [11]
[UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?](#) - Scott Corrales [62]

Sep 28:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [27]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Steve Bass [16]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Eleanor White [11]
[1985 FT Over Utrecht Holland](#) - Bert Reijersen van Buuren [53]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Eleanor White [10]
[SDI #463 Twenty Questions](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [60]
[Re: UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?](#) - Carol Maltby [7]
[Re: Why Miss The Witness?](#) - Eleanor White [23]
[Swiatek Speaks](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [72]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Jerome Clark [13]
[Something Is Here](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [115]

Sep 29:

[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Gildas Bourdais [13]
[Re: Google News & UFOs](#) - Carol Maltby [17]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Franklin D. Fields [10]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Don Ledger [49]
[Re: Politician And Pilot Spot UFO](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [72]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Jerome Clark [24]

Sep 30:

[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Ray Dickenson [19]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Don Ledger [11]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Viktor Golubik [146]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Jerome Clark [11]
[Have You Seen A UFO In Bolton?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [40]
[UFO Affects Welsh Woman's TV Reception](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [63]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Brad Sparks M [30]
[Re: The Economy's Tanking But...](#) - Martin Shough [194]
[Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell](#) - Don Ledger [78]

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 07:45:19 -0400
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 07:45:19 -0400
Subject: Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports

Source: The Pittsburg Tribune-Review - Pennsylvania

http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/s_585863.html

Monday, September 1, 2008

Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports Of UFO Sightings
By Rich Cholodofsky
Tribune-Review

It's not a matter of if, but when, for UFO tracker John Ventre.

And if you believe his stats, the little green men - or whatever
- will be here soon.

Here could even be Western Pennsylvania.

"It's an intervention that will take place. They're going to make contact. We weren't ready in the '50s and '60s, but we're ready now," said Ventre, who serves as Pennsylvania coordinator for the Mutual UFO Network, in addition to working as director of security at the UPS depot in New Stanton.

The Colorado-based network with its 300 members, also known as MUFON, keeps track of UFO sightings. According to Ventre, Pennsylvanians led the way this summer in spotting unidentified flying objects.

Since June, there have been about 100 sightings of UFOs above the Keystone State. Ventre said there have been about 25 sightings over the Pittsburgh region, including eight above Westmoreland County.

Close encounters have more than tripled over previous years' tallies.

Ventre's statistics show there have been twice as many sightings this summer in Pennsylvania as any other state.

On June 29, Ventre was with his dogs in the front yard of his Greensburg home when he saw what dozens of others have been talking about.

Looking south, Ventre gazed upwards and high in the sky saw a fast moving, lighted object that seemingly reflected the moonlight as it sped off into the summer night.

"It was moving really fast. It had to be like 3,000 mph," Ventre said.

Ventre keeps track of everything, from the time, date and location of a sighting to its shape and color. Those statistics appear on MUFON's Web site.

One recent UFO sighting came from an Export woman who saw a

triangular object with multicolored lights.

Retired U.S. Army First Sgt. James Everett saw a similar object last month over his Jefferson Hills home. He snapped three pictures that are being analyzed.

"I'm not sure what it is but I know it wasn't an airplane. I spent 20 years in the military and I know the difference between stars and things that aren't supposed to be there," Everett said.

Could all this activity, which seems to follow a path from Ohio and across Pennsylvania over the turnpike corridor, be a precursor to some "X-Files" encounter somewhere close to home?

Ventre and Everett think so.

"There would be a lot of things in our region they would be interested in, power plants and steel plants. If I was from another world coming to our planet I'd look at our production of things," Everett said.

The potential of alien contact has apparently caught local officials flat-footed.

Dwayne Pickels, spokesman for the Arnold Palmer Regional Airport near Latrobe, said local air travel has not been affected due to any increase in radar traffic from flying objects of unknown origins.

And county public safety officials have not devised any sort of first-contact strategy.

"We have not received any intelligence this is going to occur. But if this is going to occur we know they will come in peace," said department spokesman Dan Stevens.

If Ventre and Everett aren't convincing enough, listen to someone who knows more about space travel than most earthlings.

Edgar Mitchell, who walked on the moon as part of the Apollo 14 mission in 1971, told an interviewer last month that aliens have visited earth for six decades. It's a fact being covered up by NASA, according to Mitchell.

NASA has denied Mitchell's claims. It declined to comment about any UFO sightings or theories of impending alien contact.

"NASA does not track or collect data on such reports," said NASA spokesman Stephen Cole.

The U.S. Air Force, which once did track UFO sightings, does so no more.

It's the Air Force that debunked the region's biggest suspected alien encounter, the 1965 incident in Kecksburg.

Locals to this day insist a spaceship crashed in the rural Westmoreland County hamlet. The government said it was a meteor while others have theorized the object that flamed across the sky and plunged to the earth in Kecksburg was a secret Soviet satellite.

Ventre said the mystery might someday be revealed and history will show that Kecksburg was the appetizer for a full course of alien activity.

"I think people can handle the truth, as long as they're not hostile," Ventre said.

Rich Cholodofsky can be reached at rcholodofsky.nul or 724-830-6293.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

In My Hometown

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 07:53:37 -0400
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 07:53:37 -0400
Subject: In My Hometown

Source: The Grand Forks Herald - North Dakota, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/5mcxtq>

Monday, September 01, 2008

In My Hometown
Compiled by Kevin Bonham

<snip>

Warren, Minn.

UFO phenomenon to be revisited: People in the Warren, Minn., area are talking about UFOs again.

The interest was sparked recently when producers for The History Channel's UFO Hunters television program visited the region to talk about a 30-year-old case that has become known as the 'UFO Car'.

They interviewed former Marshall County Sheriff's Deputy Greg Winskowski, who took them on a journey to recall the events.

According to files, it occurred on Aug. 27, 1979. At about 1:40 a.m., Deputy Sheriff Val Johnson reported seeing a bright light in a grove of trees in rural Marshall County. He drove south on Minnesota Highway 220 to investigate, thinking that perhaps a small plane had landed or crashed.

"The next thing Johnson knew," according to a report in the Stephen Messenger, "the light was shooting directly toward him, moving so fast that its passage seemed almost instantaneous. The last thing he heard was the sound of breaking glass."

Johnson apparently lost consciousness. When he awoke at 2:19 a.m., he radioed for help. Deputy Winskowski arrived to find the car had been damaged, with a cracked windshield, bent antenna, broken lights and other damage. Both the car's clock and Johnson's wristwatch were found to be running 14 minutes slow.

After the incident, Johnson was treated for what a doctor said looked to be from welding burns.

The episode of UFO Hunters is expected to be aired in late October.

<snip>

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports

From: Carol Maltby <carolmaltby.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 08:03:53 -0400
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:30:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Greensburg Man Documents Surging Reports

>Source: The Pittsburg Tribune-Review - Pennsylvania

>http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/s_585863.html

>Monday, September 1, 2008

>Since June, there have been about 100 sightings of UFOs above the
>Keystone State. Ventre said there have been about 25 sightings
>over the Pittsburgh region, including eight above Westmoreland
>County.

<snip>

>Ventre keeps track of everything, from the time, date and
>location of a sighting to its shape and color. Those statistics
>appear on MUFON's Web site.

What's the protocol for reporting sightings that are not
definitively identified, but are more likely meteors?

My daughter called this summer from Philadelphia, scared and
concerned that she'd seen a UFO going fast through the sky. From
her description there was no aspect that would rule out a
fireball, and nothing that would positively point to it being
something structured. While a bit early in the cycle, it was
within the time frame for a major meteor shower.

Should she report this to MUFON and NUFORC? Or does something
like that just clutter up the database and dilute it?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

SDI #462 20 Questions

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 08:07:56 -0500
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:32:24 -0400
Subject: SDI #462 20 Questions

SDI #462

20 Questions addressed in a program of singular significance by Dave Furlotte, Don Ledger, Michael J Woods, and Alfred Lehmborg. Chilling observations by Furlotte with regard to the alien abductions play out, still, on UFO UpDates. Interesting observations are revealed by Don Ledger with regard to recent named conferences and the Stephenville kerfuffle. Michael Woods explores the solar system and puts us right there, then offers to step outside with anyone impugning Moonwalker Edgar Mitchell's reputation:

1. If Alien Abductions are a result of mass hypnosis, who or what performs same?
2. Is humanity too advanced to be molested, or is humanity too primitive to be bothered with?
3. Should aliens show respect when it is so arguable that humans do not?
4. If a superior intelligence would show respect, of needs, and a "humanity" does not, what does that say of the intelligence of human beings?
5. If a superior intelligence won't waste billions studying an inferior intelligence why do humans spend billions doing just that?
6. How is denial the only option available to the "spring-butt" denialist?
7. Is humanity an abductor of inferior species?
8. Does the skeptic try to have the preceding argument both ways?
9. Was it a fluke that the Canadian Federal Government provided cash to conduct the recent Shag Harbor Conference?
10. Regarding the Shag Harbor conference, does a significant draw from outside the community show that society is becoming more conscious of UFOs?
11. When are we going to be able to see Mike McDonald's fine documentary on Unidentified Submerged Objects (USOs)?
12. With the proposed museum at Shag Harbor, and St Albans, WV ...are UFO Museums beginning to pop up like toadstools?
13. How did the San Jose conference manage to keep the "woo-woo at low hum"?
14. Why were there a lot of "academic types" showing up at the San Jose Conference?
15. At the aforementioned San Jose conference, what was the impact of Belgian Major General Wilford DeBrauer and his investigation of the famous "Belgian Triangle"?

16. How is it significant to the UFO researcher that Military radar is superior to Civil radar?
17. With regard to the stillborn "Condign Report," how is it the report is completed by one man who is not allowed to interview any pertinent witnesses?
18. With regard to the "O'Hare Incident" how is Larry Lemke able to demonstrate a genuine anomaly?
19. With 400 to 500 pilots busted for impinging on GWB's restricted airspace over his reclaimed pig farm in Crawford Texas, who was finally busted for impinging on same during the "Stephenville Affair"?
20. With regard to data storage capability, anymore, why would officialdom lose data that was going to come back later and bite them on the ass, but that is was going to come back later and bite them on the ass?

Stars and sputniks, saints preserve, and suffering ZOT but that 45 minutes remain of the neo-druid Michael Woods stewarding us around the moon, neighboring planets, and the moons of distant planets sporting waveless oceans of hydrocarbons smooth as the glass of black-based mirrors. Breathtaking. Alfred Lehmborg behaves himself... to a degree.

Too, badmouth Edgar Mitchell as a "loopy old coot driven space crazy" at your peril. There's a whole covey of us over here at Virtually Strange Network ready to stomp a new mud-hole in your flaccid ass, eh? Posted!

Know. The. Toad. The toad you know is the known toad knowing! Trifle not, the toad.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:09:11 -0400
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:37:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2008 00:30:30 +0100
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 10:54:09 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 09:16:59 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>I sure wish I could have sat next to Betty Hill at examinations
>>>and been able to read her paper. Her amazing photographic memory,
>>>demonstrated by her ability to see a random pattern of dots for a
>>>few moments, remember their sizes and positions exactly for
>>>years, and then recall them in such detail that the
>>>multi-talented Marjorie Fish was able to reconstruct them
>>>exactly, must be totally unprecedented.

>>Not at all. The conductor Dmitri Mitropoulos was going to
>>premiere a new piece by an American composer. When the composer
>>gave him the score, he browsed through it, looking for a few
>>moments at each page. Then he put the manuscript aside, and began
>>discussing the score with the composer, making specific
>>references to tiny details. "On the first page, the oboe part in
>>measure 13- you've marked it to be played softly, but it seems to
>>me that the sound won't cut through the other instruments." And
>>so on through the entire piece, page after page. (I'm making the
>>oboe example up, because the composer - the source of this
>>anecdote - didn't give specific examples of what Mitropoulos
>>asked him about. But this is the kind of thing, as I know from my
>>own experience as a composer, that conductors ask about.)

<snip>

>I am well aware of the phenomenal feats of memory of orchestral
>conductors. I recently read a letter in a British newspaper from
>the widow of a famous conductor (I'm sorry but my fallible memory
>cannot now recall his name) telling how her late husband would
>give a student the full orchestral score of a symphonic work,
>then, when the student had studied it, ask him to 'conduct' the
>piece from memory in an empty room. The conductor would from time
>to time stop the 'performance' asking his student exactly why he
>had made a particular instrumental introduction in the way he
>had, or had adopted a particular tempo at a certain point.

>Incredible memory, but all involving intense study and
>understanding of the material under review. Is there any other
>evidence that Betty Hill possessed such memory, or studied the
>'Star Map' in such detail?

>I think not. The Fish 'Star Map' is a desperate attempt to provide
>some sort of 'physical evidence' for a case that relies entirely
>on the fallible recall of two distressed people.

John,

You seem to be shifting your ground here. First you appeared to say that the kind of memory you think Betty needed to have isn't a known human attribute. Now you're saying that, yes, this kind of memory exists, but we don't know that Betty had it.

You also think you can define the situations in which this kind of memory shows up. I think you have no ground for that. I'm not aware that this subject has been studied in any detail, or if it has, that you know anything about what the study or studies might say. You're just making assumptions.

I'm speculating, too, but you might at least respond to my speculations. I'm guessing that this kind of indelible memory shows up in various circumstances, in various people - and that it might easily come and go, depending on the situation. Do you know for a fact that this isn't so?

I'm not defending the accuracy of Betty's memory, by the way, or - even less - the use of the starmap as evidence. I'm just refuting your original statement, that the kind of memory Betty would have needed isn't known to exist. The starmap may or may not show that the abduction might really have happened, but you can't argue against it by saying that no one could have remembered the map with the accuracy that Betty claimed.

(Martin Shough, by the way, is right to suggest that Dr. Simon might have encouraged Betty to make the map up, when he told her she might remember it. Doesn't mean the map can't be accurate, but it's a fault in his hypnotic technique.)

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](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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 16:00:48 +0100
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 11:06:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:09:11 -0400
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>(Martin Shough, by the way, is right to suggest that Dr. Simon
>might have encouraged Betty to make the map up, when he told her
>she might remember it. Doesn't mean the map can't be accurate,
>but it's a fault in his hypnotic technique.)

Hi Greg

Can you point out where I appeared to suggest that? I certainly didn't intend to. If I've been widely misunderstood then I need to clarify what I did intend.

As regards phenomenally accurate recall of the type that has been attributed to Betty, yes, I agree with you that it could exist. As I pointed out in a Hill-case thread some while back, extraordinary savants such as the young Stephen Wiltshire prove that even in what (for Stephen) is "ordinary consciousness" visual patterns can be recalled and reproduced in detail that would be very hard to credit if we weren't able to watch him doing it. Arguably, "ordinary consciousness" has been redefined in unknown ways in someone whose mind and body has been through an "alien abduction", and with hypnosis layered on top of that we can reasonably say that Betty (ex hypothesi) perceived, stored and reproduced the image in variously abnormal states of mind which might in principle have permitted exceptional fidelity.

I don't know if anyone has tested how perishable Stephen Wiltshire's pictorial memories are over time - usually his drawings are executed in a matter of hours or days I think. But I think this talent is accessing a facility that most people latently possess in varying degrees. An example: I happen to play some musical instruments and I know that note patterns can be encoded dormant in muscle-memory for years and then spontaneously reproduced without much effort, even though you can't consciously "remember" ever having played them at all. The trigger is not a mental recollection, but an accidental fragment of a phrase or a title or an association. This is a commonplace ability. So it's easily possible in principle that Betty could have done something similar in visual memory.

The question of whether she in fact did so is more difficult, of course, as you imply. The only evidence that she must have done so is the claim that what she drew fits some objective star pattern that she could not reasonably have been exposed to except during her abduction experience. As there are (at a recent count) some six different claimed objective matches, and as the most popular candidate (the Fish model) has serious problems, I'm somewhat sceptical.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Falcon Lake UFO Case?

From: Roy Hale <roy.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 16:13:33 +0100
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 16:21:45 -0400
Subject: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

List,

Your opinion on this case is sought after.

Part 1: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xlbyLxctJcE&feature=related>

Part 2: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6hizYrzd-WA&feature=related>

Thanks,

Roy

[See List Archive:

<http://tinyurl.com/6dbfa7>

--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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 17:41:33 +0200
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 16:23:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2008 08:25:17 EDT
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2008 15:19:33 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 15:48:00 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>My "extreme scepticism of Leir's motives" as you say, is well
>>>founded my friend. Allow me cite just two of the reasons I am
>>>of such a mind about Dr. Lier.

>>>1. He's never published any of his findings in a peer review
>>>journal. Not in 15 years!!!

>>Apparently, it does not occur to you that no peer reviewed
>>journal would have accepted such an article.

>The Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE) published by SSE,
>and the Journal of UFO Studies (JUFOS) published by CUFOS,
>are both peer-reviewed journals that are friendly to UFOs.
>They would surely have published a scientifically well-founded
>article on lab analyses of alleged alien implants if it had
>ever been submitted.

Brad,

For my part, I am not so sure.

NIDS had promised such an article but never did it.

Why? Nobody knows, I am afraid.

>>Just imagine: an article on the retrieval of alien implants in
>>a medical Journal!

>It is quite possible that the late John Mack at Harvard Medical
>School could have helped secure publication even in a medical
>journal had a scientifically substantial article been
>submitted.

I am not sure either. John Mack had a very hard time, just to
maintain his position at Harvard.

>>>2. He refused to allow physicians and others at Columbia
>>>University Hospital (in New York) to examine or analyze any
>>>of the objects!

>>Seing how you treat him here again, I am not surprised that he
>>did not want to work with you.

>Columbia staff made direct contacts which were rebuffed,
>according to John. No one had to "work with" John regardless of
>attitude, which developed after this promising interest at
>Columbia was persistently if not rudely brushed off.

How did you get this information?

I am going to inform Roger Leir of your reservations. BTW, I transmitted to him the first comments made here on his work. He has written to me that he is taking some time to study them because he has been very busy.

I myself had a collapse of ym computer last week and I am just reading my mail today with a new one.

So, sorry for the slow reaction. Roger may make some comments later.

Gidas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: SDI #462 20 Questions

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 11:48:57 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 16:25:36 -0400
Subject: Re: SDI #462 20 Questions

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 08:07:56 -0500
>Subject: SDI #462 20 Questions

>SDI #462

<snip>

>1. If Alien Abductions are a result of mass hypnosis, who or what
>performs same?

Mass hypnosis "...requires influencing crowds through common longings and yearnings... Many forms of music and dance can be used to create religious trance.

"Due to stage hypnotists' showmanship, many people believe hypnosis is caused by the hypnotist's power. However, the real power of hypnosis comes from the trust the hypnotist can instill in his subjects. They have to willingly grant him the ability to take over their critical thinking."

From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass_hypnosis

Something akin to hypnosis appears to be happening during alien abductions. Reference David Jacobs "mind scan".

>2. Is humanity too advanced to be molested, or is humanity too
>primitive to be bothered with?

Apparently neither. Please refer to:

<http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/default.asp>

<http://www.intrudersfoundation.org/inside.html>

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

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net/aic/default.html>

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

>3. Should aliens show respect when it is so arguable that humans
>do not?

Yes. And so should we.

>4. If a superior intelligence would show respect, of needs, and a
>"humanity" does not, what does that say of the intelligence of
>human beings?

I dislike answering a question with a question. However, outside of sacred texts, when have so-called superior beings shown respect to human beings?

>5. If a superior intelligence won't waste billions studying an
>inferior intelligence why do humans spend billions doing just
>that?

Who says superior beings won't spend their resources studying inferior intelligences? How can we know?

>6. How is denial the only option available to the "spring-butt" >denialist?

Flip-flopping is not the exclusive domain of politicians. But neither are doors forever closed. They are doors after all.

>7. Is humanity an abductor of inferior species?

We are meat eaters by declared dominion.

>8. Does the skeptic try to have the preceding argument both ways?

Please refer to question 6 above.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 1](#)

Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 17:57:14 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 20:10:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

>From: Roy Hale <roy.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 16:13:33 +0100
>Subject: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

>List,

>Your opinion on this case is sought after.

>Part 1: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xlbyLxctJcE&feature=related>

>Part 2: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6hizYrzd-WA&feature=related>

My reaction?

It's about time that this case is getting a bit more attention and the Unsolved Mysteries segment is finally available on Youtube.

This case is generally acknowledged by most experienced ufologists as one of the best on record and is included in many Top Ten lists. It involves physical traces, physiological effects, government investigation, military investigation, document retrieval and in-depth investigation files. It's included in the Condon Report, too (as Case 22). In fact, in the Condon index it's listed as "unexplained".

I knew Michalak personally and maintain contact with his remaining family. He never spoke in terms of aliens or space creatures but thought the craft was some kind of military vehicle. One UFO book concludes this explicitly (Campagna). Roy Craig, on the other hand, dismissed it as a hoax. Investigators who took the time to look at all the evidence and talk with the family in detail came to the conclusion that Michalak did encounter a landed (or nearly landed) aerial craft in a remote area in Canada in 1967.

Coincidentally (or not), I and my colleague Geoff Dittman and a few others visited the Michalak site just yesterday(!). It takes about an hour on horseback, guided by a person familiar with the area, through swamps, up rocky ridges, etc. Our purpose this trip was to allow Dittman (a geocacher) to locate the site accurately with GPS and virtually cache it for others to find. I think he's even posted photos on his Facebook page already. (Mine will follow soon.)

For the Unsolved Mysteries segment, NBC flew myself and the Michalak family to a set in the USA (back then filming wasn't done often in Canada). Gosh, was that 20 years ago? More? A very young version of me appears a few times in the second half of the segment.

A recent treatment of the case was recently aired on a History Channel UFO special, titled UFOs: The Secret History, produced by David Cherniack, and broadcast just a few months ago in July 2008. It was during the filming of this segment two years ago that I visited the site last, also on horseback with a pack horse for Cherniack's camera gear.

Chris Rutkowski

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 23:43:13 +0100
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 07:49:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:09:11 -0400
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2008 00:30:30 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 10:54:09 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>John,

>You seem to be shifting your ground here. First you appeared to
>say that the kind of memory you think Betty needed to have isn't
>a known human attribute. Now you're saying that, yes, this kind
>of memory exists, but we don't know that Betty had it.

>You also think you can define the situations in which this kind
>of memory shows up. I think you have no ground for that. I'm not
>aware that this subject has been studied in any detail, or if it
>has, that you know anything about what the study or studies might
>say. You're just making assumptions.

>I'm speculating, too, but you might at least respond to my
>speculations. I'm guessing that this kind of indelible memory
>shows up in various circumstances, in various people - and that
>it might easily come and go, depending on the situation. Do you
>know for a fact that this isn't so?

>I'm not defending the accuracy of Betty's memory, by the way, or
>- even less - the use of the starmap as evidence. I'm just
>refuting your original statement, that the kind of memory Betty
>>would have needed isn't known to exist. The starmap may or may
>not show that the abduction might really have happened, but you
>can't argue against it by saying that no one could have
>remembered the map with the accuracy that Betty claimed.

A lot of ifs, buts and maybes here, Greg. I'm not changing my
position at all. I'm well aware of some of the prodigious feats
of human memory, and have never denied such extraordinary
abilities exist (our sorely missed late colleague on Magonia
magazine, Roger Sandell, could quote huge chunks of text word
perfectly after reading a book once). But do we have any evidence
at all that Betty Hill was such a prodigy, or did her
extraordinary memory manifest itself only on this occasion? I
think we need a little more than ifs and buts and maybes before
accepting that!

BTW, I think it might have been Dimitri Mitropoulis, but I could be
mistake - must get those memory cells renewed!

--

John Rimmer

<j.rimmer.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Nova Scotia Village Uses UFO Sighting

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 07:55:04 -0400
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 07:55:04 -0400
Subject: Nova Scotia Village Uses UFO Sighting

Source: The National Post - Toronto, Ontario, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/5cngee>

Mon, 01 Sep 2008

Travel

Nova Scotia Village Uses UFO Sighting To Lure Tourists

Allison Hanes
National Post
ahanes.nul

SHAG HARBOUR, N.S. -- Like all the picturesque fishing villages strung along Nova Scotia's breathtaking south shore, Shag Harbour is a place of weathered cottages perched atop rocky cliffs offering vistas of the Atlantic.

But what sets it apart from other seaside hamlets (other than its frequent inclusion on lists of funny place names) are the little green men.

There is a little green man standing guard outside the post office named Alvin. And there is a three-foot-tall green man at the side of the highway - a plywood cut-out that beckons travellers to stop in at the Shag Harbour Incident Museum and Research Centre.

"The Incident" as it is referred to in these parts, is the strange occurrence of Oct. 4, 1967, when locals witnessed strange lights hovering in the sky before a dark object appeared to plunge into the ocean.

Shag Harbour residents were convinced a plane had crashed and they jumped into their fishing boats to search for survivors.

But all the fishermen found was a strange fluorescent foam floating on the water that evaporated when they tried to collect it.

The navy, air force, Coast Guard and RCMP continued the search in the morning and for days to come before calling it off, saying they came up empty-handed.

"At least that was their story," said Cindy Nickerson, chairwoman of Shag Harbour Incident Society, chuckling.

Today the mystery of the Unidentified Flying Object endures - in both the literal and mythological sense - as Canada's Roswell.

With the dwindling fishing industry, some Shag Harbour residents are eager to trade on the currency of that legacy to attract visitors to their hamlet and boost tourism.

Museum and Research Centre is a fancy title for the kitschy display set up in the backyard shed of a director of the Incident Society.

There are laminated newspaper articles dating from the strange event, copies of original government, police and Coast Guard documents, television screens broadcasting interviews with witnesses, but also an array of alien-themed

For more in our Best of Summer series, including previous instalments, highlights from last year and cartoons by Gary Clement, visit nationalpost.com/bestofsummer

memorabilia, from key chains with little green Martian heads to artistic paintings imagining what happened.

Courtney Banks, a university student hired to staff the museum for the summer, rattled off the yarn to a pair of intrigued passersby on a sunny summer day, but said many visitors know far more about UFO sighting than she does.

"They tell me the story," she said.

The Incident Society has grand plans to erect a facility dedicated to the infamous event on the crest overlooking the watery crash site.

Ms. Nickerson said the group is hoping to raise at least \$150,000 for the new building.

In the meantime they hosted the first Shag Harbour Incident Festival on Aug. 8 and 9, with help from a \$2,000 grant from the federal Department of Heritage that will feature such renowned ufology speakers as Stanton Friedman and Carl Feindt from the United States.

Don Ledger, a Nova Scotia writer who co-authored a book about The Incident a number of years ago, said two things set the Shag Harbour event apart from many other UFO reports.

"First, it was the RCAF [Royal Canadian Air Force] documents that had margin notes designating the incident as a UFO sighting - underlined three times. In other words, it was a reversal of the normal process of the civilian witnesses reporting a UFO and the authorities claiming a prosaic explanation," Mr. Ledger said. "Secondly, unlike all other UFO cases I've come in contact with, this case was heavily government documented."

Among locals - both those who saw the lights in the sky that night and those who have heard the tale, Ms. Nickerson said opinion about the incident varies. But perhaps all the little green men about town offer a hint.

"I guess it's kind of something that you have to make your own mind up about," 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2008 08:34:54 -0400
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 08:50:07 -0400
Subject: Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 17:57:14 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

>>From: Roy Hale <roy.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 16:13:33 +0100
>>Subject: Falcon Lake UFO Case?

>>List,

>>Your opinion on this case is sought after.

>>Part 1: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xlbyLxctJcE&feature=related>

>>Part 2: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6hizYrzd-WA&feature=related>

>My reaction?

>It's about time that this case is getting a bit more attention
>and the Unsolved Mysteries segment is finally available on
>Youtube.

>This case is generally acknowledged by most experienced
>ufologists as one of the best on record and is included in many
>Top Ten lists. It involves physical traces, physiological
>effects, government investigation, military investigation,
>document retrieval and in-depth investigation files. It's
>included in the Condon Report, too (as Case 22). In fact, in the
>Condon index it's listed as "unexplained".

<snip>

Hi Chris,

This is one of the few good cases where we have physical injuries, by cause unknown, that is documented with medical records. I would agree that this case deserves greater understanding, and there is a very good write up of it in Clarke's The UFO Encyclopedia.

The problem is that this is not a new case and it won't ignite any scientific interest at this point, IMO.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

UFO Debunkers Frazier & Oberg

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:00:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:00:00 -0400
Subject: UFO Debunkers Frazier & Oberg

Source - UFO Magazine Blogs

<http://tinyurl.com/5ez5nt>

August 31, 2008

[Posted by Alfred Lehmborg]

CSICOP, Now CSI: UFO Debunkers Kendrick Frazier And James Oberg

=46rom Robert Hastings' new book

UFOs And Nukes: Extraordinary Encounters At Nuclear Weapons Sites

(This is Part 2 of an earlier posting, titled, Reporter Duped By UFO Debunkers, in which I described how Albuquerque Journal reporter John Fleck was badly misled about the reality of UFO activity at nuclear weapons sites, by two of the leading UFO debunkers affiliated with the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry, who dismissed my own well-documented findings.)

Over the years, I have found that a great many of the debunkers in my UFO lecture audiences had one thing in common: they had read one or more of the supposedly objective articles on UFOs which routinely appear in Skeptical Inquirer magazine, published by the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP) - which has recently renamed itself the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI).

Although most of the debunkers I encounter tout Skeptical Inquirer as a source of credible, scientific information on UFOs - which it is not - when I question them, I find that virtually none of these UFO critics know anything about those responsible for publishing this "skeptical" magazine. I, on the other hand, made it my business long ago to find out exactly who was so intent on fervently debunking UFOs, year after year, decade after decade. I must say, what I discovered surprised me. At the same time, I was not at all surprised.

As noted in an earlier posting, the Executive Editor of Skeptical Inquirer is Kendrick C. Frazier. Many years ago, I discovered that Frazier was in fact employed - beginning in the early 1980s - as a Public Relations Specialist at Sandia National Laboratories, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Yes, the same Sandia Labs that has been instrumental to the success of America's nuclear weapons program since the late 1940s, through its "ordnance engineering" of components for bomb and missile warhead systems.

In my opinion, Frazier's affiliation with Sandia Labs - he recently retired after working there for over two decades - is highly significant, given the hundreds of references in declassified government documents, and in the many statements by former military personnel, which address ongoing UFO activity at nuclear weapons sites over the past six decades.

Considering these disclosures - which clearly establish a link

between UFOs and nuclear weapons - I find it interesting, to say the least, that the longtime editor of the leading debunking magazine - whose pages routinely feature articles discrediting UFOs and those who report them - worked for over 20 years as a public relations spokesman for one of the leading nuclear weapons labs in the United States.

Interestingly, Skeptical Inquirer's publisher's statement, or "masthead", which appears at the beginning of each issue, never once mentioned Frazier's employment at the highly-secretive, government-funded laboratory. Instead, the magazine merely listed, and continues to list, his profession as "science writer" - a reference to his having written several books and articles on various scientific subjects. Also curious is the fact that various online biographies on Frazier - including one written by himself - also fail to mention his two-decade tenure at Sandia Labs. An odd omission indeed.

Over the years, Frazier has been quick to dismiss the astonishing revelations about UFOs contained in government documents declassified via the Freedom of Information Act. He claims that researchers who have accessed thousands of U.S. Air Force, CIA, and FBI files have consistently misrepresented their contents. In one interview he stated, "The UFO believers don't give you a clear and true idea of what these government documents reveal. They exaggerate the idea that there is a big UFO cover-up."

Just as Frazier strives to minimize the significance of the declassified revelations about UFOs, it is likely he will also attempt to downplay the relevancy of his former employment with one of the U.S. government's top nuclear weapons labs, as it pertained to his magazine's relentless debunking of UFOs. He will presumably assert that his skeptical views on the subject are personal and sincere, and were in no way related to, or influenced by, his public relations position at Sandia National Laboratories.

However, regardless of his response, I believe that Frazier's long-term employment at Sandia is very relevant, and raises questions about his impartiality, if nothing else, given his long track-record of publishing stridently anti-UFO articles in Skeptical Inquirer.

One such article, an attempted debunking of the Big Sur UFO Incident, was earlier discussed at length. As noted, two former U.S. Air Force officers have unequivocally stated that, during a 1964 weapon systems test, a UFO disabled an experimental dummy nuclear warhead in mid-flight as it raced downrange toward its intended target. My own well-documented investigation of the dramatic incident has now thoroughly discredited the factually-inaccurate article by Kingston A. George featured earlier in Skeptical Inquirer. If one compares the first-person accounts provided by the two former Air Force officers with the badly-flawed, highly-misleading synopsis of the incident published by Sandia Labs PR Specialist Frazier, one might reasonably ask whether a cover-up of sorts - a disinformation scheme - was behind the debunking article. But the reader may judge for him- or herself.

Furthermore, the CSICOP-Nukes Connection does not end with Kendrick Frazier. James Oberg, one of CSICOP's leading UFO debunkers, once did classified work relating to nuclear weapons at the Air Force Weapons Laboratory, located on Kirtland AFB, less than a mile from Sandia Labs. From 1970-72, Oberg was an Air Force officer whose assignments with the Battle Environments Branch at the weapons lab involved the development and utilization of computer codes related to the modeling of laser and nuclear weapons - according to one of Oberg's own online resumes.

Oberg had also been a "Security Officer" while at the weapons lab, meaning that he was responsible for monitoring the security procedures used to safeguard the classified documents generated by his group. As I discuss in my chapter on the Big Sur UFO Incident, Oberg once privately chastised Dr. Bob Jacobs - one of the former Air Force officers who leaked the amazing story - for releasing "top secret" information relating to the case. Once a security officer, always a security officer, I guess.

After Bob Jacobs went public with the UFO shoot-down story, Oberg wrote to him, chastising Jacobs for revealing "top secret"

information. In his MUFON UFO Journal article, Jacobs wrote that after he broke his silence, "I was contacted by a variety of investigators, buffs, cranks, proponents and detractors alike. James Oberg, a frequent 'mouthpiece' for certain NASA projects and self-styled UFO Debunker wrote to disparage my story and to ask provocatively, 'Since you obviously feel free to discuss top secret UFO data, what would you be willing to say about other top secret aspects of the Atlas warhead which you alluded to briefly...?' I told Mr. Oberg where to put his misplaced cynicism."

Despite Oberg's charge, Jacobs has correctly pointed out that because Major Mansmann had told him that the UFO encounter "never happened", he had no personal knowledge of the classification level attached to the incident.

In any event, it is almost certain that Oberg would not have criticized Jacobs for exposing "top secret UFO data", had he known that Jacobs would subsequently publish his remark. So, here we have one of CSICOP's leading UFO debunkers - whose public stance is that UFOs don't even exist - angrily asking Jacobs in a private letter whether he would also openly discuss "other" top secret aspects of the missile test=85

I first became aware of Oberg's "skeptical" stance on UFOs after he wrote an article for the December 1978 issue of OMNI magazine, in a column called "UFO Update". A superficial review of Oberg's comments in that article might lend the impression that he was even-handedly covering the UFO controversy. Far from it. A closer examination reveals Oberg's subtle but persistent use of anti-UFO propaganda, not to mention his failure to identify himself to OMNI's readers as an active-duty Air Force officer.

Fortunately, these tactics and omissions did not go unnoticed. In the following issue of OMNI, in a letter to the editor, Robert Barrow wrote, "C'mon James Oberg. If you plan to continue writing your skeptical UFO articles under the guise of proper scientific literature, please be fair. First, the OMNI readership should be aware that not only are you working with NASA but you are a U.S. Air Force officer in fine standing as well. In fact, while I knew you as Captain Oberg, I shouldn't doubt you are now Major Oberg. As a former USAF staff sergeant, I can appreciate that and wish to congratulate you if you have achieved a higher rank...Your consistently skeptical articles are probably making some of your superiors far happier than anything you might write to the contrary..."

Not surprisingly, Oberg's published response to Barrow's letter rejected the inference that he was writing skeptical articles about UFOs to please his superiors. He wrote, "...I don't have any idea what my Air Force superiors think about my UFO activity, since I have never had any directives, one way or another. It's easy to reject any unwelcome opinions as part of a 'government plot', and you're welcomed to that paranoia if it suits you. It also is a direct smear on my honesty and motives=85"

Well, first, Barrow did not say that Oberg was a part of any government plot. He was merely pointing out that, given the longstanding controversy over the U.S. Air Force's handling of the UFO problem, Oberg should have candidly acknowledged his affiliation with the Air Force in his OMNI article - in which he debunked UFOs, exactly as the Air Force had for decades. As such, Barrow's comment was a perfectly valid criticism.

I might also note here that Oberg's failure to inform OMNI's readers about his active-duty military status - until after it had been exposed by Barrow - is reminiscent of Kendrick Frazer's own failure to inform Skeptical Inquirer's readers of his two-decade-long affiliation with the U.S. government's nuclear weapons program - in the magazine's masthead, which appears in each issue - at the same time he was publishing article after article debunking UFOs, including at least one highly important sighting directly related to nuclear weapons.

Moreover, Oberg's indignation over being "smeared" by Barrow is laughable, given his own countless public attacks on UFO proponents over the years, in which he frequently questions the sincerity and motives of those who report or investigate UFOs.

In another letter responding to Oberg's article, journalist Terry Hansen, wrote, "How sad to see such a poor article on UFOs in

OMNI's first issue. James Oberg is certainly [not an objective] authority on the subject. His article tries to come across as unbiased, but even someone with a superficial knowledge of the issue can see that it is laced with distortion and innuendo...If 'UFO Update' is representative of the type of coverage controversial issues will receive in the future, then OMNI has little to offer a questioning mind."

Years later, Hansen later went on to write an excellent book titled, *The Missing Times: News Media Complicity in the UFO Cover-up*, which I highly recommend to anyone wishing to better understand how the type of information contained in my own book could have been successfully kept from the American people - scientists and laypersons alike - for so long. In fact, I put Hansen's book on my short list of "must-reads" as far as the official government cover-up of UFOs is concerned.

Part 3 of my examination of CSICOP/CSI will be posted in the near future.

--Robert Hastings
ufohastings.com
Hastings444.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:01:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:01:00 -0400
Subject: CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs

Source - UFO Magazine Blogs

<http://tinyurl.com/68sgme>

August 31, 2008

[Posted by Alfred Lehmborg]

CSICOP, Now CSI:

CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs: Thanks, But No Thanks!

Another excerpt from Robert Hastings' book UFOs and Nukes:
Extraordinary Encounters at Nuclear Weapons Sites

(This is Part 3 of an earlier posting, titled, Reporter Duped By UFO Debunkers in which I described how Albuquerque Journal reporter John Fleck was badly misled about the reality of UFO activity at nuclear weapons sites, by two of the leading UFO debunkers affiliated with the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI), who dismissed my own well-documented findings.)

I earlier mentioned journalist Terry Hansen's excellent book, The Missing Times: News Media Complicity in the UFO Cover-up, which I highly recommend to anyone wishing to better understand how the type of information contained in my own book could have been successfully kept from the American people=97scientists and laypersons alike=97for so long.

Regarding CSICOP [now CSI], Hansen examines the possibility that the skeptical organization was infiltrated early on by a small but determined group of U.S. government-affiliated operatives, whose true motives have far more to do with disinformation than skepticism. He writes, "[The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal] is an organization of people who oppose what they contend is pseudo-science...CSICOP, contrary to its impressive-sounding title, does not sponsor scientific research. On the contrary, it's main function has been to oppose scientific research, especially in areas such as psychic phenomena and UFOs, two topics that, coincidentally or not, have been of demonstrated interest to the U.S. intelligence community over the decades. Instead, CSICOP devotes nearly all of its resources to influencing the American public via the mass media."

Hansen continues, "CSICOP can accurately be described as a propaganda organization because it does not take anything approaching an objective position regarding UFOs. The organization's stance is militantly anti-UFO research and it works hard to see that the news media broadcast its views whenever possible. When the subject of UFOs surfaces, either in the news media or any other public forum, CSICOP members turn out rapidly to add their own spin to whatever is being said. Through its "Council for Media Integrity" CSICOP maintains close ties with the editorial staffs of such influential science publications as Scientific American, Nature, and New Scientist.

Consequently, it's not too hard to understand why balanced UFO articles seldom appear in those [magazines]."

Hansen further notes, "CSICOP's public stance on UFOs is best personified by [the late] Philip J. Klass, head of the organization's UFO Subcommittee. Klass isn't a scientist. In fact, his education is in electrical engineering. After graduation from Iowa State University in 1941, he went to work for the avionics division of General Electric, one of the nation's largest weapons and nuclear energy contractors. In 1952, Klass joined the aerospace trade publication Aviation Week & Space Technology, where he has often written about =91black budget' military projects such as those covertly funded by the CIA...Over the decades, Klass has made a name for himself publicly sparring with UFO researchers and injecting his particular spin on UFOs into the mass media at every opportunity, not always accurately or with much scientific merit...Despite his lack of scientific credentials, Klass has enjoyed remarkable popularity with the news media."

Hansen might have added that Klass' long-time employer, Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine, has a remarkable track-record of scooping its competition by publishing articles based, in part, on information provided by government insiders. Indeed, Aviation Week may be considered as a conduit to the public for information originating from many of the key players in the aptly-named military/industrial complex.

To illustrate the rather cozy relationship between the magazine and the intelligence community, in particular, I earlier noted that Klass once boasted in a private letter that he could cite as character references both Admiral Bobby R. Inman (USN Ret.)=97the former Director of the National Security Agency, who also held Deputy Director positions at both the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency=97and Lt. General Daniel O. Graham (USA Ret.), the former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In the letter, Klass stated that "Both men have worked with me and gotten to know me [through] my efforts for Aviation Week."

Hansen, whose diligent journalistic investigation of CSICOP goes well beyond that conducted by any UFO researcher, observes, "If the [CIA's] Robertson Panel had wanted to set up a front organization to debunk the UFO phenomenon, it could have hardly done a better job than to infiltrate CSICOP and encourage its media management activities. Perhaps its not surprising, then, that Philip Klass has occasionally been charged with being a covert government agent, a charge he has vigorously denied..."

Hansen goes on to note that during a 1994 confrontation with Klass, at a CSICOP meeting in Seattle, the UFO debunker first said that an official UFO cover-up would not be possible because the U.S. government could not keep such an important secret. When Hansen challenged that assertion, and cited examples of other important secrets which the government had successfully kept from public view=97such as decades-old cryptographic-related programs=97Klass apparently reversed himself and admitted that some secrets could indeed be kept long-term. Then, in what was arguably a very telling comment, Klass told Hansen that some secrets should be kept, for reasons relating to national security. He went on to mention that his employer, Aviation Week, had once agreed to keep secret its knowledge of the SR-71 spy plane, at the government's request. If nothing else, this admission by Klass only further illustrates the magazine's cooperative, mutually-beneficial relationship with the various agencies and departments of the U.S. government=97in which one hand washes the other, so to speak.

"So," Hansen summarized, "under cross-examination, Klass had gone from claiming the government can't keep secrets to saying that it can, it must, and even that his own publication had been complicit in keeping government secrets. Klass did not appear very happy about the course this conversation had taken and he soon reverted back to his [initial] claim that UFOs did not exist...A charitable view of Klass is that he is simply a zealot, another of those for whom scientific dogma supplies the reassuring psychological bedrock that others find in religious fundamentalism. When confronted with evidence that calls into question his core beliefs, Klass responds=97as any fundamentalist would=97by rejecting the evidence. Thus, his duplicity can be

accounted for by human nature. One does not need to resort to more conspiratorial explanations."

"On the other hand," Hanson continued, "Klass also has many of the qualifications one would expect in a deep-cover propagandist. He has a history of working for the secretive military-industrial complex, a demonstrated aptitude for duplicity, a District of Columbia address, remarkable mass-media savvy and success, an evident belief in the necessity of government secrecy and, of course, cover as a journalist with Aviation Week."

Hanson has much more to say in his book regarding the U.S. government's routine use of the mass media to spin or suppress information it wishes to keep from the public. The Missing Times is a remarkably well-documented exposé and should be read by UFO proponents, skeptics and debunkers alike, not to mention any American citizen who has ever suspected that the news offered by the national media—the "free press"—is not always what it appears to be.

My own opinion regarding CSICOP (or, now, CSI) is that if one is going to accept at face-value the many unfounded and dismissive claims about UFOs made by some of the key members of this "skeptical" organization, one should at least be aware of those persons' longstanding professional affiliations with the U.S. government or government-influenced publications. To summarize:

Kendrick Frazier: Employed as a Public Relations Specialist, for more than two decades, at Sandia National Laboratories, one of the U.S. government's leading nuclear weapons labs. During the same period, Frazier served as Executive Editor for Skeptical Inquirer magazine, a position he continues to hold today.

James Oberg: A former U.S. Air Force officer who once did classified work related to nuclear weapons, and a long-time employee of NASA. Before his retirement, Oberg worked on the Space Shuttle program (1975-97); he currently serves as a space science consultant for NBC News and continues to promote his anti-UFO position.

Philip Klass: Now deceased, Klass was employed, for over two decades, at a U.S. intelligence community-friendly aerospace publication. By his own admission, Klass had developed close professional ties with at least two top-level intelligence officers—U.S. Navy Admiral Bobby Inman and U.S. Army General Daniel Graham—both of whom held, at various times, high-ranking positions with the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and/or the National Security Agency.

Well, call me paranoid, but I think I see a pattern here. For an organization ostensibly created to scientifically investigate paranormal subjects, including UFOs, CSICOP—especially its UFO Subcommittee—seems to be completely lacking in UFO experts with truly scientific credentials, but is conspicuously top-heavy with individuals having U.S. government connections, of one kind or another. The reader may draw his or her own conclusions but, personally, I believe that one would be well-advised to assiduously avoid the highly-suspect spin regularly offered up by the UFO "experts" at CSICOP/CSI and, instead, consult other, genuine sources of scientifically-credible information on UFOs.

Let me be clear: I am not accusing the leading UFO debunkers affiliated with CSICOP/CSI and its publication Skeptical Inquirer of being government-sanctioned covert agents, or even UFO cover-up sympathizers—"assets" in intelligence parlance—who have engaged in a disinformation campaign designed to discredit UFOs, as well as those who report or investigate them. The reason I am not accusing them is because I have no proof to back up my personal mistrust of their motives.

However, having said that, I do make the observation that most of CSICOP's leading UFO debunkers—that is, those who have served as members of the organization's staff—share a very interesting and, I would argue, rather suspicious camaraderie relating to their professional backgrounds.

For whatever reason, these individuals are intent on claiming that there are no UFOs and, therefore, no U.S. government cover-up of them. In view of their rather interesting affiliations, I merely ask: Wouldn't Kendrick Frazier's statements be more credible had he not spent his career doing public relations work

for the U.S. government's nuclear weapons program? Shouldn't Philip Klass=97having worked for more than two decades as a journalist for one of the U.S. intelligence community's most valued media conduits=97been more carefully scrutinized by the media, for a conflict of interest, when he tirelessly insisted that there is no government UFO cover-up? Even James Oberg's own classified nuclear weapons-related work while with the Air Force, as well as his later involvement with the U.S. government's space program, seems to fit this pattern of direct or indirect governmental ties on the part of those who ostensibly dismiss UFOs on purely scientific grounds, but who seem arguably more intent on dismissing the notion that there is an official UFO cover-up.

(Yes, admittedly, almost all of my own sources have military backgrounds too. Importantly, however, unlike the highly-vocal UFO debunkers at CSICOP, most of them have divulged their UFO-related secrets only reluctantly, when pressed by myself or other researchers to do so. Therefore, as a rule, they have very cautiously presented their insiders' perspective on national security-related UFO activity. This is, of course, entirely dissimilar in approach to the relentless, high-profile, anti-UFO public relations campaign undertaken by CSICOP's debunkers over the years. I might also add that my own ex-military sources present their accounts in a simple, straightforward manner=97and rarely insist that anyone believe them=97whereas, in my view, the ongoing UFO-debunking pronouncements by the CSI-COPs are routinely jam-packed with classic propaganda devices, obviously designed to influence public opinion.)

In any event, the question being asked here is whether or not CSICOP/CSI has had within its ranks a few persons who have a hidden agenda on UFOs, which has nothing to do with genuine scientific skepticism. While I don't know the answer to this question, given the extreme, unscientific anti-UFO track-record of the organization, I think it needs to be asked. Regardless, whatever these debunkers' affiliations and motives may be, the reader doesn't need what they have to offer unless, of course, you actually enjoy being misled by pseudoscientific propaganda, government-inspired or not.

It goes without saying that the statements above do not apply to the CSICOP/CSI membership in general. It's only natural and to be expected that an organization which bills itself as "skeptical" in orientation will attract persons with a similar philosophical outlook. CSICOP/CSI counts among its membership many world-renowned scientists and other respected intellectuals. There is no question that a great many of these persons share a sincerely incredulous outlook on various subjects classified as "paranormal", including UFOs.

Therefore, the fact that many of CSICOP's members have rejected the validity of the UFO phenomenon=97a subject about which they know little or nothing, and are not qualified to discuss authoritatively=97certainly does not mean that they are secretly working for the CIA. Bias and presumption, rather than ulterior motives, account for these self-appointed UFO experts' flawed perspective on the phenomenon. Consequently, if they have been misled by CSICOP's top UFO debunkers, they have no one to blame but themselves.

I'll conclude this chapter by simply saying that if one is sincerely seeking an objective, unbiased scientific assessment of the UFO phenomenon, one should bypass the sometimes subtle, sometimes obvious misinformation foisted on us all by Klass, Oberg, Frazier, and other debunkers affiliated with CSICOP/CSI. Instead, one would do well to read anything ever written on the subject by Dr. James McDonald or Dr. J. Allen Hynek=97at least, anything written by Hynek during his post-Project Blue Book period, when his scientific investigation of UFOs was not hampered by the official restrictions under which he labored while affiliated with the U.S. Air Force.

Perhaps I am being overly optimistic but, who knows, once acquainted with some legitimate data on the UFO phenomenon=97including that gathered decades ago by McDonald and Hynek=97a few of the daring scientific skeptics reading this book [UFOs and Nukes] might actually begin practicing their profession, when addressing the subject of UFOs, instead of just offering lip service to that practice.

--Robert Hastings
ufohastings.com
Hastings444.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2008 08:02:11 -0500
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:02:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 23:43:13 +0100
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 01 Sep 2008 09:09:11 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

<snip>

>A lot of ifs, buts and maybes here, Greg. I'm not changing my
>position at all.

Not "at all"? Astonishment there does reflect the
underwhelming.

See? Real life, as must be practiced by persons aspiring to a
rational humility about themselves and their real place in an
accelerating experientiality, provokes an understanding that
'experientiality' is a pervasive and all inclusive fabric of
"ifs" and "buts" and "maybes". 'Black or white' is a betraying
myth of misunderstood ideals. They don't exist. Relativity
demands a 'little' more latitude than that.

Too, I suspect that all of your personal frustration, your sweaty
anxiousness, and your insouciant disjunct, Sir, comes as a result
of a ludicrous desire to perceive experientiality in absolutes
entirely devoid of 'flavor' and 'nuance' and 'color' and
'shadow'. This perceivable flavor, nuance, color, and shadow is
relative to the other variables, perceived and unperceived,
attendant in a reality 'set' rich with inputs and
actualities... comprised entirely of "ifs", "buts", and "maybes"!

Moreover, these inputs and actualities are very poorly understood
vis a vis five underused senses commanded generally by fatuous
arrogance and blithering ignorance... or you haven't seen "Bill
Nye the Science Guy" strut, smirk, and preen that particular
brand of same.

Hold fast, Mr. Rimmer, only to discover, I suspect, that
'reality' slips through your dismayed fingers, or you attempt to
further answer questions which can only be addressed because they
can have no 'answers'.

That said, these answers won't be 'found' or 'discovered'. They
will be faced.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Write To The General

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:03:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 10:03:00 -0400
Subject: Write To The General

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/66evar>

August 26, 2008

Write To The General
By Billy Cox

It's reassuring to know the U.S. Air Force is keeping tabs on everything. Take today's in-house stories compiled online by the USAF News Agency.

There's a nice feature on a member of the Peterson AFB family who helped Iraqis in Basra with contract paperwork to rebuild that city's infrastructure. Randolph AFB is extending an Air Force scholarship to a Ukranian-born American teenager to attend medical college. There's an update on Georgia relief efforts, about how Air Force and Navy transports are running tons of humanitarian supplies to that East European island of democracy.

Oh, and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Norton A. Schwartz spoke about leadership values at a conference in San Antonio yesterday. "We are Americans", Schwartz said, "and we're going to prove that our team is worthy of the trust that the American people, the joint team, the Congress and most of all our airmen and their families have placed in us".

You name it, these guys are all over it - unless, of course, you're asking about why they won't release records concerning its F-16 sorties over the Stephenville-Dublin area of Texas on the evening of Jan. 8.

This is sounding like a broken record - sorry - but it's been 16 days now since De Void first attempted to get a formal statement from the USAF on that event. No reason to belabor the details again here, you can scroll down for the history in previous posts.

One might think, given the Mutual UFO Network's July release of FAA radar records indicating the USAF failed to react to a non-responsive bogey pressing down on President Bush's Crawford ranch, Gen. Schwartz himself would be happy to refute that study and set the record straight. That would really - how'd he put it? - "prove that our team is worthy of the trust of the American people".

The 301st Fighter Wing at the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base at Carswell Field isn't even bothering to return phone calls about it anymore. It's easy to stonewall when the rest of the moribund MSM isn't curious about unidentified intruders preparing to violate restricted air space in this post-9/11 age.

So here's a suggestion: Forget Carswell, it's not their call. If you're seriously interested in transparency, take a whopping seven minutes out of your busy day and write a note to Gen.

Schwartz at the Pentagon. Snail mail makes a better impression than e-mail. Send it to Air Force Chief of Staff, 1670 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1670.

Gen. Schwartz began thinking on his feet during the white-knuckle evacuation of Saigon in 1975. He's the first cargo pilot ever appointed as USAF Secretary and the first non-fighter pilot to occupy that office since 1982. He'll get to the bottom of this Stephenville thing if you're motivated enough to buy stamps.

[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 2](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2008 16:55:03 EDT
Archived: Tue, 02 Sep 2008 19:48:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 17:41:33 +0200
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2008 08:25:17 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2008 15:19:33 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 15:48:00 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>>My "extreme scepticism of Leir's motives" as you say, is well
>>>>founded my friend. Allow me cite just two of the reasons I am
>>>>of such a mind about Dr. Lier.

>>>>1. He's never published any of his findings in a peer review
>>>>journal. Not in 15 years!!!

>>>Apparently, it does not occur to you that no peer reviewed
>>>journal would have accepted such an article.

>>The Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE) published by SSE,
>>and the Journal of UFO Studies (JUFOS) published by CUFOS,
>>are both peer-reviewed journals that are friendly to UFOs.
>>They would surely have published a scientifically well-founded
>>article on lab analyses of alleged alien implants if it had
>>ever been submitted.

>Brad,

>For my part, I am not so sure.

Gildas,

Your uncertainty is not pertinent here unless you have tried
submitting peer-reviewed articles on implant studies and got
rejected or you know someone else's history of such efforts.

What we are not hearing is:

"Article on laboratory studies of implants was submitted to peer-
reviewed Journal of XYZ and rejected on Month-Day-1999 [or
whatever date]."

Do you know of any such submissions and rejections?

JUFOS and JSE are peer-reviewed and UFO-friendly, but I am not
hearing of any rejections by them of articles submitted on lab
analyses of alleged alien implants. Do you know if they have?

>NIDS had promised such an article but never did it.

>Why? Nobody knows, I am afraid.

Were you involved? How would you know one way or another?

>>>Just imagine: an article on the retrieval of alien implants in
>>>a medical Journal!

>>It is quite possible that the late John Mack at Harvard Medical
>>School could have helped secure publication even in a medical
>>journal had a scientifically substantial article been
>>submitted.

>I am not sure either. John Mack had a very hard time, just to
>maintain his position at Harvard.

That's irrelevant. After Harvard backed Mack, why didn't anyone
seek Mack's help in getting peer-reviewed publication of studies
of alleged alien implants in medical journals? If there were such
efforts through Mack let's hear all about it.

>>>>2. He refused to allow physicians and others at Columbia
>>>>University Hospital (in New York) to examine or analyze any
>>>>of the objects!

>>>Seing how you treat him here again, I am not surprised that he
>>>did not want to work with you.

>>Columbia staff made direct contacts which were rebuffed,
>>according to John. No one had to "work with" John regardless of
>>attitude, which developed after this promising interest at
>>Columbia was persistently if not rudely brushed off.

>How did you get this information?

Did you read what I wrote, or read John Velez's post? I said it
was "according to John" (Velez). "Columbia staff" etc. etc.
"according to John."

Regards,

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.3](#)

Re: CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2008 00:50:57 +0000
Archived: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:12:51 -0400
Subject: Re: CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs

>From: ufoupdates.nul
>To: UFO-UpDates.nul
>Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2008 10:01:00 -0400
>Subject: CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs

>Source - UFO Magazine Blogs
><http://tinyurl.com/68sgme>
>August 31, 2008
>[Posted by Alfred Lehmborg]

>CSICOP, Now CSI:

>CSI's 'Scientific' Analysis Of UFOs: Thanks, But No Thanks!

>Another excerpt from Robert Hastings' book UFOs and Nukes:
>Extraordinary Encounters at Nuclear Weapons Sites

<snip>

>I'll conclude this chapter by simply saying that if one is
>sincerely seeking an objective, unbiased scientific assessment of
>the UFO phenomenon, one should bypass the sometimes subtle,
>sometimes obvious misinformation foisted on us all by Klass,
>Oberg, Frazier, and other debunkers affiliated with CSICOP/CSI.
>Instead, one would do well to read anything ever written on the
>subject by Dr. James McDonald or Dr. J. Allen Hynek=97at least,
>anything written by Hynek during his post-Project Blue Book
>period, when his scientific investigation of UFOs was not
>hampered by the official restrictions under which he labored
>while affiliated with the U.S. Air Force.

>Perhaps I am being overly optimistic but, who knows, once
>acquainted with some legitimate data on the UFO
>phenomenon=97including that gathered decades ago by McDonald and
>Hynek=97a few of the daring scientific skeptics reading this book
>[UFOs and Nukes] might actually begin practicing their
>profession, when addressing the subject of UFOs, instead of just
>offering lip service to that practice.

>--Robert Hastings
>ufohastings.com
>Hastings444.nul

I would like to add my discovery of how members of CSICOP/CSI
operate.

What follows is a citation from my book:

Dave Thomas is a Fellow of CSICOP and a frequent contributor to
the Skeptical Inquirer. Before asking Doleman to speak at the
NMSR March meeting, Thomas had written a negative review of the
Roswell Dig Diaries for the Skeptical Inquirer which was
published in the March/April 2003 issue Bait And Switch On
=91Roswell: The Smoking Gun'. (Special Report). (Television
documentary The Roswell Crash: Startling New Evidence).

It criticized SciFi's
block buster special, but quoted liberally from another critic's,

John Fleck of the Albuquerque Journal (Albuquerque Journal, November 23, 2002), opinion piece of the special.

Implying that perhaps that Mr. Thomas had not watched the TV special, let alone read the book (Roswell Dig Diaries).

What is incredible is Thomas claimed he followed the Roswell Incident closely and therefore is a credible commentator on all things regarding the Roswell incident.

The fact was that Thomas had made up his mind about the contents of SciFi's special before he saw it.

After reading the the Test Plan on the SciFi's website long before the special, Thomas claimed: "I started worrying that show would be a hopeless disaster when I got a look at the Test Plan for the dig."

His biggest worry about the dig and what was recovered?

It had nothing to do with the dig. It was over the fact that Schmitt, Randle and Carey would be consultants and choosing the impact site for testing.

Thomas was especially "disturbed" over Schmitt. Why? Because Don Schmitt worked for the U.S. Post Office. Even more than that, Thomas claimed that Schmitt had lied to his partner Kevin Randle about his employment.

Isn't that a problem between the partners, not one involving Thomas? What has Schmitt's consulting to SciFi's contract archaeologist got to do with his employment by the U.S. Post Office?

The point: Schmitt was one of the investigators who walked the Foster Ranch with people claiming to be eyewitnesses to the crash site. Isn't that exactly the most logical source person?

I can't seem to worked up over the same concerns as Thomas. And, if Thomas' article is an example of Skeptical Inquirer's level of scientific standards, no wonder I never found myself drawn to reading it. Snarky comments do not - to my mind - equal high level, straight forward scientific debate. I think I will pass on reading the Skeptical Inquirer.

Even more incredible is that someone claiming to be an expert and of a scientific bent did not read Dr. Doleman's archaeological report which was published in the Roswell Dig Diaries.

Absolutely astonishing.

There is nothing scientific about Skeptical Inquirer or CSI.

Yeah, I am willing to throw out the baby with the water in this case.

KK

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.3](#)

The UFOs Of Sussex

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:21:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:21:00 -0400
Subject: The UFOs Of Sussex

Source: The Argus - Brighton, Sussex, UK

http://www.theargus.co.uk/news/3642159.The_UFOs_of_Sussex/

Wednesday 3rd September 2008

[Photos]

The UFOs Of Sussex

Sussex is a hotbed of UFO sightings. According to the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA), there is about one sighting in the county a week. So is the truth out there? Miles Godfrey investigates.

It is easy to dismiss tales about little green men and flying saucers.

But there remains a constant stream of UFO reports from across Sussex, from wildly varying sources, suggesting there must be at least some substance in the claims.

Whether you believe in aliens or not - and some of the country's most prominent scientists do - there is no denying that unusual objects are continually being spotted in our skies.

And whether they are actually beings from outer space, experimental aircraft or simply honest mistakes remains open to debate.

But UFOs are still a fascinating subject, especially given that it is estimated at least one sighting is being made every week in this county alone.

A spokesman for the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA) said: "Sussex is a real hotbed of sightings, one of the biggest in the country. At the moment there is around one sighting made and reported to us a week. It varies but that is an average.

One reason for the number could be the mix of rural locations and views over the sea."

Indeed there are regular sightings made over the coast, suggesting either that is where aliens like to fly or that people are easily mistaken by objects they see - or both.

Mistakes are, of course, regularly made.

Chinese lanterns let off by revellers are often thought to be UFOs and reported as such.

There have been numerous reports made to The Argus during the past year that turn out to be the floating paper lights.

But for every ten sightings that are explained there is at least one which turns out to be inexplicable.

The most recent example was one made by Jo Wilcox at her home in Cedar Close, Worthing.

In August she described seeing "several" UFOs hovering over her house.

She reported seeing a bright orange ball, wobbling slightly from side to side.

Mrs Wilcox said: "No stars were visible and it hovered, really bright orange, wobbled from side to side then remained still. I screamed for my neighbour who came out with her 14-year-old son. They saw it too."

You might not think that middle-class Conservatives are prone to making bold claims about UFOs but Lynda Hyde, Tory representative for Rottingdean on Brighton and Hove City Council, certainly believes they were seen in the skies above Saltdean on May 31.

She said: "Two of the reports came from people I know well and I judge them to be sane.

"The UFOs were described as almost square in shape with each one having four red or orange lights.

They made no sound. When they left, two went in a westward direction and the third flew vertically up until it disappeared."

Mother-of-one Michelle Huggett, 31, also spotted a red and orange object hurtling across the skies in Lancing in broad daylight in February.

She said: "I was walking through town when I spotted it.

It was moving very fast east to west but then just suddenly stopped.

There was absolutely no noise at all. It was spooky."

More than 60 glowing orbs were spotted in the skies above Uckfield in October last year.

Resident Jamie Smith said: "It was like something out of Space Invaders."

All of those sightings are among the most intriguing to have been reported in the past year and all remain unexplained.

Other mysterious sightings have been solved as more Earthly flying objects within days or even hours.

The Ministry of Defence (MoD) keeps a list of all the UFOs reported to it.

It does not comment on the validity of such sightings, claiming that it investigates them only to check if British airspace has been compromised.

An MoD spokesman said: "Unless there is evidence of a potential threat, there is no attempt to identify the nature of each sighting reported."

It logged 52 sightings - only a fraction of those actually seen - between 1998 and 2006.

There does not appear to be a particular part of Sussex where more UFOs are spotted than others.

Brighton and Hove is a hotbed but then it has a far denser population than other areas, making sightings more likely.

Of the past ten sightings, nine have been on or very near the coast. Others have occurred inland at Petworth, Polegate and the one at Uckfield.

The BUFORA spokesman added: "People should always report sightings of UFOs because the more they do the bigger the picture is built up.

It is too hard to say what percentage are genuine mysteries or not. But the only way it can be researched is by having them

reported. "

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 3](#)

Re: Abduction Explanations

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2008 12:12:15 +0200
Archived: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:25:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2008 16:55:03 EDT
>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 17:41:33 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2008 08:25:17 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 27 Aug 2008 15:19:33 +0200
>>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>>>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Tue, 26 Aug 2008 15:48:00 -0400
>>>>>Subject: Re: Abduction Explanations

>>>>>My "extreme scepticism of Leir's motives" as you say, is well
>>>>>founded my friend. Allow me cite just two of the reasons I am
>>>>>of such a mind about Dr. Lier.

>>>>>1. He's never published any of his findings in a peer review
>>>>>journal. Not in 15 years!!!

>>>>>Apparently, it does not occur to you that no peer reviewed
>>>>>journal would have accepted such an article.

>>>The Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE) published by SSE,
>>>and the Journal of UFO Studies (JUFOS) published by CUFOS,
>>>are both peer-reviewed journals that are friendly to UFOs.
>>>They would surely have published a scientifically well-founded
>>>article on lab analyses of alleged alien implants if it had
>>>ever been submitted.

>>Brad,

>>For my part, I am not so sure.

>Gildas,

>Your uncertainty is not pertinent here unless you have tried
>submitting peer-reviewed articles on implant studies and got
>rejected or you know someone else's history of such efforts.

>What we are not hearing is:

>"Article on laboratory studies of implants was submitted to
>peer-
>reviewed Journal of XYZ and rejected on Month-Day-1999 [or
>whatever date]."

>Do you know of any such submissions and rejections?

>JUFOS and JSE are peer-reviewed and UFO-friendly, but I am not
>hearing of any rejections by them of articles submitted on lab
>analyses of alleged alien implants. Do you know if they have?

>>NIDS had promised such an article but never did it.

>>Why? Nobody knows, I am afraid.

>Were you involved? How would you know one way or another?

Brad,

In his book *The Aliens And The Scalpel* published in 1998, Roger Leir gave some terms of the agreement passed with NIDS in 1996.

See page 96.

I quote:

"There were certain stipulations to the agreement. The first was that we were forbidden to mention the involvement of their organization in our work (Obviously, that stipulation has since been withdrawn). The next was that a scientific paper would be written and published in a world class journal. (we were only too glad to comply!)"

That being said, I met several time with Roger Leir, on the occasion of UFO congresses, but I did not discuss that specifically. I just gathered that NIDS did not really want to help him to obtain that. It looks like they wanted to study some implants, which they did, at Los Alamos and New Mexico Tech, and then remain very discret about them. But that does not mean they were no longer interested.

BTW, the MUFON UFO Journal has published a series of articles, which may be found of their archive on line, I think

I also have a comment on the JSE. In its issue of April 2001, it published a negative article on the Cometa Reprt, written by the French Skeptic Claude Mauge, presumably translated by Jacques Vallee, who wrote a foreword, also depreciative on the report. Vallee wrote, for instance, that "the name of the primary author had been kept secret from readers".

What I learned, when I met with several coauthors, is that there were indeed some contributors to the study not cited in the report, at their request, but that the statement of Vallee is simply not true. It was a real collective work. So I am not very impressed by criteria of being published, or not, in a journal like the JSA, and I am a little perlexed by he notion of "peer review", at least in that case.

Now, I remain very impressed with the work of Roger Leir, and I think that it is one of the important studies going on in ufology. I also learned some things that have to remain confidential for now.

Cordially,

Gildas

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.3](#)

International UFO Reporter Now On DVD

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:32:37 -0400
Archived: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 09:32:37 -0400
Subject: International UFO Reporter Now On DVD

From: Mary Castner <<m.castner.nul>
To: PROJECT-1947.nul
Date: Mon, 1 Sep 2008 19:32:55 -0500
Subject: International UFO Reporter Now On DVD

To make IUR more broadly available a complete set of IUR issues has been scanned and converted to PDF format and is available on one DVD. This set includes volumes 1 through 30, from 1976 to early 2007. Each volume is contained in one PDF file, and the text is searchable.

Also included, as a bonus, are issues 1 through 24 of the Center Investigator's Quarterly, which was the chief communication about CUFOS investigations and procedures in the early days of CUFOS. These issues have rarely been available before.

You'll find the link to order IUR on DVD from CUFOS home page:

www.cufos.org

or directly

www.cufos.org/iurdvd.html

This outstanding collection can be purchased using paypal. Also added to our website is a PayPal Donation button. All donations are greatly appreciated and goes to support the J. Allen Hynek Center. for UFO Studies.

Regards,

Mary
CUFOS

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 3](#)

Pig Mutilation In Victoria Argentina

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2008 09:56:29 -0400
Archived: Wed, 03 Sep 2008 12:30:28 -0400
Subject: Pig Mutilation In Victoria Argentina

Source: Planeta UFO and Diario Victoria - Entre Rios, Argentina

Argentina: Pig Mutilation in Victoria

It's alive. Chilling photographs.

The animal turned up with half of its face mutilated. There are no signs of violence in its pen, nor any bloodstains. The animal is alive. This case can be added to the cow mutilation cases discovered this morning in the town of Antelo. UFO researcher Silvia Perez Simondini is analyzing the event.

The Enrique family, residing on Avda. Esteban Lone, Barrio de la Abadia, was startled this morning when they awoke to find their pig had had half of its head mutilated. The animal was in perfect shape last night, according to the family. However, around 7:00 a.m. this morning, when they went to feed the animal, they were startled by its mutilated features.

The 6 month old porker was locked in a small pen, walking around and showing no signs of violence or bloodstains. It did not complain, and half of its jaw was mutilated to reveal its teeth; an ear was also missing. This case is added to reports involving mutilated cows in Antelo. UFO researcher Silvia Perez Simondini is looking into the case.

Translation (c) 2008. S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Guillermo Gimenez, Planeta UFO

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

Everything Is Broken

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:37:42 -0400
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:37:42 -0400
Subject: Everything Is Broken

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/6d8rnh>

Wednesday, September 3, 2008

Everything Is Broken
By Billy Cox

"Broken hands on broken ploughs/Broken treaties, broken
vows,/Broken pipes, broken tools,/People bending broken
rules./Hound dog howling, bull frog croaking,/Everything is
broken."

And that was from 1989. Bob Dylan should try this gig. Nearly a
month after requesting an Air Force response to Mutual UFO
Network's analysis of the mysterious events near Stephenville,
Tex., on Jan. 8:

<http://www.mufon.com/documents/MUFONStephenvilleRadarReport.pdf>

De Void has officially slipped down the rabbit hole.

"You need to contact the FAA." That's the latest and apparently
last word from Maj. Karl Lewis of the 301st Fighter Wing at the
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base at Carswell Field. "I cannot
answer for what the FAA reports."

In August, De Void e'mailed a link to Lewis on the MUFON report,
which used Federal Aviation Administration radar records to chart
the flight patterns of F'16s and a UFO as the latter operated
with impunity near restricted airspace.

While the FAA and the National Weather Service responded to
MUFON's Freedom of Information requests, the military has refused
to release its own radar records, and redacted the flight logs of
10 jet fighters. The civilian data creates a clear timeline of
everything that happened that evening, but Maj. Lewis won't
acknowledge the validity of the charts.

"Anybody can come up with a graph and symbols like that," Lewis
says. "We can't speculate on the MUFON report because that's
speculative. We made our press release in January. You need to
talk to the FAA."

OK, Carswell's January press release stated that it had erred
when Lewis initially said there were zero military planes in the
sky that night. The officially amended number was 10. But that
press release didn't address the UFO seen by civilian
eyewitnesses on the ground. The MUFON report did, with radar
returns that backed them up. It came out in July. How is a USAF
press release issued in January relevant to new data made public
in this summer?

"You need to contact the FAA," Lewis says.

OK, just for the hell of it: Is Carswell Field responsible for policing the airspace around President Bush's ranch in Crawford?

"I can't speculate on our operational capabilities," Lewis replies.

Oh, and by the way, just for the record, MUFON report co-author Robert Powell says he and colleague Glen Schulze ran their analysis past two FAA veterans before they published it. "But," says Powell, "they wanted to remain anonymous because they didn't want their involvement to affect their jobs."

Wonderful!

But wait - De Void's not done yet. Ever heard of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers? Their Web site bills them as "The world's leading professional association for the advancement of technology."

Glen Schulze is a life member of the IEEE. Six weeks ago, he suggested De Void contact the world's leading professional association for the advancement of technology in hopes of finding qualified professionals in the radar field who could independently assess the integrity of the MUFON report.

Six weeks after getting non-responses to e-mails and shrugging indifference from a PR flack at IEEE's headquarters in New Jersey (De Void will not name names; she probably doesn't get paid enough), the problem is obvious:

Everything is broken.

"We've become a society of sound bites," says Powell from his home in Austin. "The media isn't really interested in this story unless you've got people talking about what they saw in the sky and waving their hands around. If you're just dealing with pure numbers and dry facts, you may as well forget it. I guess the best weapon to use against it (the MUFON report) is to ignore it."

Everything is broken. Discount rates for China and Saudi Arabia.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:42:02 -0400
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:42:02 -0400
Subject: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Source: Kevin Randle's Blog

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

Saturday, August 30, 2008

Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Before we start, let me say this. I have known Robert Hastings for nearly twenty years and I have always been impressed with his integrity and his intellect. I knew Chester Lytle for a long time. He was a man of impressive credentials who had no reason to embellish his position and suggest UFO knowledge if he had none. In other words, talking about flying saucers wouldn't have done him much good and certainly could have hurt him.

Now both of these men come together in Hastings' UFOs and Nukes: Extraordinary Encounters at Nuclear Weapons Sites. Hastings had the opportunity to interview Lytle on a number of occasions and Lytle shared an interesting story about the Roswell UFO crash. I will note that Hastings had shared this information with me prior to the publication of his book, so I have known about it for some time, but he asked that I say nothing until his book was available.

According to Hastings, he was interviewing Lytle about his involvement with atomic energy and what he might know about UFO sightings near nuclear plants or facilities. Hastings said that with no prompting from him, Lytle moved on to the Roswell crash and told Hastings that William Blanchard (seen here), who had command of the 509th Bomb Group in Roswell at the time of the crash confirmed the alien nature of the event.

Lytle told Hastings that in February 1953, with Blanchard now a general officer, they were in Alaska while Lytle's wife was in Chicago about to give birth. Lytle was desperate to get home and Blanchard said that they could take an Air Force aircraft to Illinois, land at one of the bases close to Chicago and Lytle could get home from there.

While on the flight, somehow the subject of UFOs came up, maybe because of a couple of sightings at Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage sometime earlier. Blanchard then told Lytle that an alien craft had crashed near Roswell. According to Hastings, Blanchard told Lytle that four bodies had been recovered.

Surprised by this, Hastings asked Lytle, "Blanchard actually told you that the Roswell object was an alien spacecraft."

Lytle said, "Oh, absolutely."

In break with the traditional story, Blanchard said that some of the bodies had gone originally to Muroc Army Air Field (now Edwards Air Force Base), but that they all wound up at Wright Field.

Now, granted, this is second-hand testimony about what Blanchard said, but there is no reason for Lytle to invent it, and it is quite clear that Lytle held many clearances and had been trusted with the secrets of the Manhattan Project. He was a credible man who would not have made up the story.

Of course, it fails on one point and that is that we can't verify it with either Lytle or Blanchard. Both men are dead. The documentation that exists is quite limited and subject to various interpretations. At this point, this is an anecdote that provides a bit of insight into the crash... and it is the first time that Blanchard, through Lytle, put gave us a number of bodies. Blanchard, according to Lytle, said, "Four."

So what do we do? Add this to the list of stories about the UFO crash at Roswell and continue the search. Look for some additional corroboration but note that we had some reliable information that puts Blanchard in the center of this, just where he would have been as the commanding officer at the Roswell Army Air Field in July 1947.

For those interested in more of what Robert Hastings has reported, you can only order UFOs and Nukes: Extraordinary Encounters at Nuclear Weapons Sites at ufohastings.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

Marley Woods 09-02-08

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:49:29 -0400
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:49:29 -0400
Subject: Marley Woods 09-02-08

Source: Ted Phillips CPTR Site - Saint Peters, Missouri, USA

http://ufophysical.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=58

Marley Woods
September 2, 2008 Update

On August 28th Tom and Ted made the very long trip to Marley Woods to test caving equipment for Project Moonshaft and continue our research in the Woods.

We located and explored a large cavern located at the base of a deep sinkhole. The cave was rather extensive with a large room a short distance inside. We tested photographic equipment in preparation for the Slovakian expedition. Ted gathered many thousands of ticks which he carried home on his body for extended study.

We arrived at Marley in the early evening and set up the imaging devices. The Site 1 property owner recently constructed a ten ft high tower for our cameras and equipment and is assisting us in our research. Heavy thunderstorms and high winds ended the imaging project after midnight, nothing observed.

During the storms and the next day we began setting up the project office on the second floor of the observatory building. The indoor office will house the computers and camera monitors for the cold temperatures of the days ahead. September through December have been the peaks months for activity and will be closely monitored.

On or about September 23rd trip, we will have a direct internet connection which will provide streaming video from Marley to the website after working out the many bugs we are sure we'll run into. An alert will be posted when this is available.

Friday evening we went into the area of heavy light ball activity (see "Marley Woods July 1, 2008 update) where the trampoline event took place in 1995.

We talked with the current occupants of the house and the couple told us that just last week they observed the light balls. On August 25 & 26th, they saw three light balls stationary and low to the ground at close range.

I (Ted) asked if they were seen in a row side by side and they stated they were in a triangle. This matches the post trampoline event of three balls of light in a triangle. They indicated the area and it also matches the 1995 sighting. The next evening their sighting was repeated and they stated the light balls were slightly larger than a softball.

The gentleman then told us that he learned of an event that took place on the night of August 28th 2008 on a ranch where he works.

He said a large welded tubular steel corral was destroyed by horses in that corral. They assumed the animals were so frightened by something they bolted causing the destruction of the corral.

This is of great interest as a rancher less than 2 miles away from the horse corral reported to me that several cattle in a welded tubular corral had destroyed the corral and three bulls were killed. A number of cows have died under extremely odd circumstances on this ranch since 1999. We are investigating these events, it is not yet known if any of the horses were injured. A full report will follow.

Tom and Ted set up portable imaging units across the road from the area of light ball activity and over a period of several hours the SIU had two brief observations.

At 11:30 p.m. Tom saw a white light ball just east of the house and seconds later Ted observed two light balls side by side in a field east of the first. In both cases they were seen for 2 to 3 seconds at a distance of some 1,500 ft. In both instances they were bright, circular and larger than a softball.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

Still Pressing For Accountability

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:52:38 -0400
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 10:52:38 -0400
Subject: Still Pressing For Accountability

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/6mtcz7>

September 2, 2008

Still Pressing For Accountability
By Billy Cox

Not all that long ago, Frank Fields was an Army information officer with the 32nd Army Air and Missile Defense Command at Fort Bliss, Tex., when he heard a strange story.

A senior officer at North American Air Defense Command confided that one of their bases had been penetrated by a UFO, and that all eyewitnesses to that event had been sworn to secrecy about it. Having worked with explosive ordnance demolition teams in Iraq during Gulf War I and blown up chemical weapons eventually linked to GI health problems, Fields was long acquainted with military deniability.

But today, as a civilian attorney in the north Florida town of Melrose, Fields is getting a little sick of business as usual. Specifically, he's annoyed that the Air Force will neither a) release its radar records from the evening of Jan. 8 on aerial events in the Stephenville/Dublin, Tex., area, or b) respond to a Mutual UFO Network analysis of FAA data tracking a major-league bogey approaching restricted air space over President Bush's Crawford ranch without drawing a military response.

"You know, we do have a democracy in this country, but it's only as effective as our access to information," Fields said in a phone chat. "This is such an important issue to me, I can't just sit on the sidelines about it."

That's why Fields =97 whose activism extends to groups such as the ACLU and the Florida Wildlife Federation =97 has decided to write Air Force Secretary Gen. Norton Schwartz for a written explanation about what happened that night, since the 301st Fighter Wing at the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base at Carswell Field outside Fort Worth is stonewalling the issue.

"I'm not an expert on this stuff, I'm just a small-town attorney," Fields says. "But people need to wake up to what's going on. The FAA got good data on this, so why is the military withholding so much information?"

Finally =97 citizen journalism in motion. You can read about Fields' defense of the Freedom of Information Act at:

<http://www.frankfields.net/>

Feel free to follow suit. In the event that Gen. Schwartz actually responds to a taxpayer's request for legally entitled information, we'll run it here.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

The X-Files Economics

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 12:00:00 -0400
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 12:00:00 -0400
Subject: The X-Files Economics

Source: livemint.com - New Delhi, India

<http://www.livemint.com/2008/09/03222833/The-Xfiles-economics.html?h=3DB>

Sept 09, 2008

The X-Files Economics
Peter Leeson
Professor, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia

Tourism is an important industry in nearly all major UFO and Bigfoot states

Flying saucers and little green men? The idea that extraterrestrials might be visiting earth became popular in the US at least 60 years ago. But over the last several months, a series of UFO-related events - impressive enough to catch even the most hardened sceptic's attention - have burst onto the scene.

In late July, respected Apollo 14 astronaut Edgar Mitchell publicly announced that Pentagon officials confirmed for him that aliens exist, that they have visited earth, and that a UFO really did crash in the infamous Roswell, New Mexico, incident in 1947. Mitchell's comments came only a few months after the British ministry of defence released its 'X' files to the public, documenting UFO sightings going back to 1978.

Could the tools of economics help us get to the bottom of the UFO phenomenon? That's what fellow economist Claudia Williamson and I are hoping in our latest project that uses economics to analyse the American flying saucer phenomenon.

We're still in the early data collecting stages of our project; but in doing so we've come across an intriguing pattern. States with more UFO sightings also have more Bigfoot sightings. In fact, six of the top 10 UFO and Bigfoot states are the same: Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Alaska, Wyoming and Colorado. Two states, Washington and Oregon, are among both categories' top five.

If you're like many people, you may think it's at least possible, though perhaps very unlikely, that UFOs are real. When it comes to Bigfoot, on the other hand, you're quite certain he's not real. If this is you, how should the pattern in this figure influence your beliefs?

At first blush, I think it should reduce your confidence in the validity of the UFO phenomenon. The data suggest that alien spacecraft and Bigfoot tend to visit the same states with similar relative frequencies. Since you think Bigfoot sightings are bogus, this should raise red flags about UFO sightings too. Whatever more mundane factors may be driving Bigfoot sightings are likely driving UFO sightings as well.

A believer might point out that the top 10 UFO and Bigfoot states are all "great outdoors" states - states with lots of sightseeing, and therefore lots of opportunities to observe UFOs if they're real, and apparently to mistake bears for sasquatches as well. So the pattern in the figure need not increase doubts about the UFO phenomenon's legitimacy.

There's something to this response, but I don't think it saves the UFO phenomenon from additional doubt. First, although sightseeing may be more prominent in some states, this wouldn't explain why UFOs (airborne craft seen against the night sky) tend to be observed in the same places that Bigfoot (a woods-inhabiting creature seen mostly only in daylight) sightings occur - even if both phenomena are "real."

Second, a number of the top 10 UFO and Bigfoot states share more in common than ample sightseeing opportunities. For instance, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and Colorado - both UFO and Bigfoot hot spots - are among the least religious states in the country, which might impact their citizens' likelihood of "seeing" both phenomena.

Finally, and potentially most critically, tourism is an important industry in nearly all major UFO and Bigfoot states. States with more frequent UFO and Bigfoot "visits" attract curious tourists who bring their wallets with their curiosity. This may provide an incentive for locals to "see" UFOs and Bigfoot more often.

I'm curious as to what others think may be responsible for the UFO/Bigfoot relationship. I should point out that, despite nearly all my friends' ridicule, I'm open-minded about the possibility that both Bigfoot and UFOs exist. Sceptics and believers: what say you?

A92008/freakonomics.blogs.nytimes.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 4](#)

Audio Interview With Ann Eller

From: **Sergey Shpakovsky** <sergejsh.nul>
Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2008 20:13:50 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Thu, 04 Sep 2008 11:14:01 -0400
Subject: Audio Interview With Ann Eller

Source: <http://www.projectcamelot.net>

Project Camelot. Sedona, Arizona, August 2006

Audio interview with Ann Eller:

http://www.projectcamelot.net/audio_interviews.html

In 1985-86, the last year of his life, Ann Eller was the personal assistant to the very well known ufologist J. Allen Hynek. Hynek, an astronomer and a physicist, acted as scientific adviser to three consecutive UFO studies undertaken by the US Air Force: Project Sign (1947-49), Project Grudge (1949-52), and the infamous Project Blue Book (1952-69). Starting out as a skeptic, Hynek came to understand that the UFOs and their occupants were very real indeed.

As an experiencer, Ann reveals a fresh approach to what it was like working for Hynek - as well as what Hynek really thought and may have known about UFOs. She relates several anecdotes including a slightly different twist on Hynek's involvement as technical advisor to Steven Spielberg on Close Encounters of the Third Kind.

This 28 minute interview, which we've only just released in August 2008 (having extracted some of the audio from a corrupted video) is an interesting and important new resource to all serious researchers and historians of the subject.

The following is a quote from interview:

"People don't stop to ask themselves this question. Dr. Allen Hynek was the civilian chief astronomer for the United States Air Force for 20 years from 1948 to 1969. He had top level clearance. Secret clearance. So for 20 years, and this was all in the area of Unidentified Flying Objects, for 20 years he was on the front line of what was happening. He has to have seen the alien bodies, the crashed craft. I think even more than that, the other operations that were going on that we've heard about like Serpo... Because if you remember in Close Encounters Of The Third Kind, of which Dr. Hynek was a technical advisor, there was a group of chosen military people who went into the craft that were being exchanged to go to the planet..."

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 5](#)

Re: The X-Files Economics

From: **Stanton T Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 Sep 2008 19:25:52 -0300
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 08:36:52 -0400
Subject: Re: The X-Files Economics

Source: livemint.com - New Delhi, India

<http://www.livemint.com/2008/09/03222833/The-Xfiles-economics.html?h=B>

Sept 09, 2008

The X-Files Economics
Peter Leeson
Professor, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia

Tourism is an important industry in nearly all major UFO and Bigfoot states

Flying saucers and little green men? The idea that extraterrestrials might be visiting earth became popular in the US at least 60 years ago. But over the last several months, a series of UFO-related events - impressive enough to catch even the most hardened sceptic's attention - have burst onto the scene.

<snip>

I hate to say it, but Leeson has an impressive resume and has published lots of papers (on other subjects) even though he was born in 1979 and unfortunately, as with Peter Jennings, on my birthday July 29. Note no mention of the sources he used and why a limit to the past 10 years and what about military installations in the western states and cases other than "airborne craft seen against the night sky"... Like physical trace cases, radar visual sightings, pilot daytime sightings, etc. Arrogance still reigns supreme

Stan Friedman

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.5](#)

Argentine Sheep Mutilation Report

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Thu, 4 Sep 2008 14:52:55 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 08:39:56 -0400
Subject: Argentine Sheep Mutilation Report

Source: VISION OVNI and Clarin.com
Date: September 4, 2008

A Sheep Mutilation Report from the City of Rosario, Santa Fe Province, Argentina, March 24, 2008
By Andrea Perez Simondini and Elias Kolev

The case occurred on the premises of a marine company that does barge construction and repair work, located near the old facilities of the Swift packing plant. The premises border on the north with a unit of the Naval Subprefecture, on the south with the Saladillo Creek and on the east with the Parana River.

The events took place on the evening of April 23, 2008 according to information furnished by Mr. Claudio Petri, watchman of the premises. Before leaving his shift at 20:00 hrs, he saw the sudden motion of what he defined as "a shadow" through his office window. When he went out to investigate, he saw nothing unusual. When the shifts changed, he turned over his post to his relief and went away.

Matters developed normally until 02:00 hrs., when then watchman saw a shadow through the window. Arming himself with a pistol for protection, he went out to investigate. He headed toward a light panel located between the vessels. At that location, he saw a shadow facing him, and according to the remark he later shared with his co-workers, he heard a voice that said: "Mutate" (kill yourself) over and over again, imperatively. At that moment, his wife reached the site (she had been keeping him company during the late shift) and she managed to pull away the gun that the watchman was pointing at his head. At no time did the wife see or hear any of the things reported by the watchman. Returning to the office, the watchman headed for the restroom, babbling "kill yourself" over and over. When the officer-in-charge arrived, he asked the watchman to take a few days off, in view of the state he was in.

Our witness, Mr. Petri, remarks that upon entering at 06:00 shift on 04/24/08, his co-workers apprised him of what had transpired the night before, adding that the sheep they kept at work had also died overnight. Upon seeing the animal, he became aware that it was a highly unusual event. The specimen was missing its upper lip and upper front teeth; its entire right eye was gone, along with the front right leg and muscle mass near the upper joint nearest the body, forming a hole with a depth and diameter greater than 10 cm. Also gone were its right rear nipple and anus. There were signs of hair sheared off in the areas affected by the alleged mutilation, similar to the shaving done during animal sterilization surgeries, but missing all types of fur (sic). There was no tearing of the muscular mass, broken or splintered bones.

Also noteworthy was the fact that there was no sign of a struggle or defense on the part of the animal. Despite the magnitude of the phenomenon, there was no blood spilled on the floor, or traces of blood on the animal itself, or any sign that it was dragged. Even more surprising were the prints found at the site, which were photographed by the witness along with the mutilated carcass. The prints were approximately 15 cm long and have a rear

base of support (the point of support that sunk 2-3 cm into the sandy soil) with a front part consisting of three fingers ending in nails or claws. The middle part of the print is not perceptible. The distance between one print and another is of approximately 50 cm. Following the corresponding analysis, it was determined that whatever left the prints walked erect and measured between 1.80 to 2 meters.

We consider this case to be very important by virtue of having occurred within the city limits, along with the chance to have found the "prints".

Translation (c) 2008, S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Andrea Perez Simondini and Vision OVNI

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 5](#)

Fighting For Survival

From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2008 12:44:09 +0100
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 09:05:31 -0400
Subject: Fighting For Survival

This item from the BBC news may not seem to have much to do with Ufology: But I think it does, because it is yet more evidence that people initially react to anomalous events by attempting to rationalize them.

Cathy

Source: BBC Radio 4 - London, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/5uhxoz>

Wednesday, 3 September 2008

Fighting For Survival

By Amanda Ripley

Author of The Unthinkable: Who Survives When Disaster Strikes - and Why

If it seems like disasters are getting more common, it is because they are. Over the past 50 years, human beings have moved into more places that were never meant to be inhabited by our species.

We have built large, vertical cities near water, stripping the earth of natural protection and leaving us more vulnerable to all kinds of trouble.

At the same time, we have learned to forecast storms days before they arrive, and we can (with enough money) build sophisticated tsunami warning systems in our seas. But as we have built ever more impressive gadgets, we have done less and less to build better survivors.

Not just luck

That is a mistake. Having covered the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks from New York City, Hurricane Katrina from New Orleans, and many disasters in between, I can tell you that regular people matter more than anyone else at the scene of a catastrophe.

Their behaviour makes a massive difference. Luck is not as all-important as we expect. And in major disasters like the 2004 tsunami in southeast Asia, regular people do the vast majority of lifesaving.

Our disaster personalities are not, in fact, anything like our normal personalities

After the 7 July 2005 terrorist attacks on London buses and subway trains, the official report on the response would find one "overarching, fundamental lesson" - emergency plans had been designed to meet the needs of emergency officials, not regular people.

On that day, the passengers had no way to let the train drivers know that there had been an explosion.

They also had trouble getting out - the train doors were not designed to be opened by passengers. Finally, passengers couldn't find first aid kits to treat the wounded. It turned out that supplies were kept in subway supervisors offices, not on the trains.

When emergency plans are written, regular people need to be at the table. When drills are held, regular people need to make up the majority of the participants.

And most of all, we need to understand what exactly happens to us in the worst of times. What happens to our brains under extreme fear? Why do we lose some powers and gain others? And how can we learn to do better?

Period of disbelief

Our disaster personalities are not, in fact, anything like our normal personalities. Strong men can wilt, and neurotic women can suddenly become bold and purposeful. Everything changes.

We know that in all kinds of disaster, from ship wrecks to burning buildings, the brain tends to go through three phases: denial, deliberation and the decisive moment.

The first phase may be the most important one to know about in advance. Survivors of fires, terrorist attacks and shipwrecks have all told me how incredibly powerful this period of disbelief can be.

On the deck of the Estonia ferry, which sunk in the Baltic Sea in 1994, one man smoked a cigarette. Others sat in groups, doing nothing, as the water surged onto the ship.

The most common response in most disasters is not panic, but rather the opposite.

Our first instinct is to normalize the situation - to come up with wildly creative and reassuring explanations for why smoke might be creeping across the ceiling or why oxygen masks might have dropped from the airplane ceiling.

In the World Trade Center on 11 September 2001, about 1,000 people took the time to shut down their computers before evacuating.

On average, people waited six minutes before beginning to leave. Once they entered the stairwell, they descended at the rate of about one minute per floor - twice as long as engineers would have predicted.

There are reasonable explanations for why we respond to threats this way, most of them rooted in our evolution.

And we can dramatically improve our response and train our brains to do better. But understanding how we actually behave is the first step.

Once we know we tend to move in slow motion, we can learn to push through that phase and get out faster. Buildings and planes can be designed to help us understand what is really happening more quickly - and get to an exit.

It is time to move past the hackneyed disaster narrative - where we simply gape at the loss and then blame government or God alone for our suffering.

It is time to accept that regular people matter, and work intelligently to make ourselves more resilient.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 5](#)

UFO Initiative Could Cost Denver \$600,000

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 09:51:56 -0400
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 09:51:56 -0400
Subject: UFO Initiative Could Cost Denver \$600,000

Source: The Denver Post - Colorado, USA

http://www.denverpost.com/politics/ci_10382294

09/04/2008

UFO Initiative Could Cost Denver \$600,000

The man pushing a ballot initiative for creation of a commission to study visitors from outer space wants to put his plan before voters in May, which potentially could cost the city as much as \$600,000 to hold the election.

Jeff Peckman, the UFO buff, met with city officials today to discuss his revamped plan to create the world's first Extraterrestrial Affairs Commission and revealed that he's now shooting for the spring election date.

No other ballot issues have surfaced so far, and there are no other municipal elections, Assistant City Attorney David Broadwell told Peckman during the meeting. That means holding a special election to deal with Peckman's pet project could cost the city anywhere between \$500,000 to \$600,000,

"As we sit here now on September 4th, you're the only game in town," Broadwell said during the required "review and comment" session on the proposal.

If Peckman succeeds in collecting nearly 4,000 signatures within 180 days after certification by the clerk and recorder's office, the city would have to place the proposal before the voters.

"Well, that's a lot of money," Peckman said. "Being the fiscal conservative I am, I share that concern. But I have to weigh that against the benefits of having this commission."

He suggested that the City Council could pass an ordinance establishing such a commission and save the cost of holding an election.

Peckman said he has revised his plan to make it clear that any costs associated with running the commission would be paid for by grants, gifts and donations.

He also has pared the number of people who would be on the commission to seven from the original 11, and he no longer is requiring all of them to be residents of Denver or some of them to be actual city officials. Now, Denver residents will get preference for four of the seats, and the remaining commission members could come from "anywhere in outer space."

In an interview, Peckman said he's not worried about getting enough signatures to place his proposal before voters.

"Are you kidding?" he said. "The Day the Earth Stood Still" is getting re-released in September."

Christopher N. Osher: 303-954-1747
or coshernul

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.5](#)

NASA's Carl Sagan Fellows To Study ET Worlds

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 10:10:00 -0400
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 10:10:00 -0400
Subject: NASA's Carl Sagan Fellows To Study ET Worlds

Source: NASA Headquarters - Washington, DC, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/6nbzdn>

Sept. 3, 2008

RELEASE : 08-218

NASA's Carl Sagan Fellows To Study Extraterrestrial Worlds

WASHINGTON -- NASA announced Wednesday the new Carl Sagan Postdoctoral Fellowships in Exoplanet Exploration, created to inspire the next generation of explorers seeking to learn more about planets, and possibly life, around other stars.

Planets beyond our solar system, called exoplanets, are being discovered at a staggering pace, with more than 300 currently known. Decades ago, long before any exoplanets had been found, the late Carl Sagan imagined such worlds, and pioneered the scientific pursuit of life that might exist on them. Sagan was an astronomer and a highly successful science communicator.

NASA's new Sagan fellowships will allow talented young scientists to tread the path laid out by Sagan. The program will award stipends of approximately \$60,000 per year, for a period of up to three years, to selected postdoctoral scientists. Topics can range from techniques for detecting the glow of a dim planet in the blinding glare of its host star, to searching for the crucial ingredients of life in other planetary systems.

"We are investing in our nation's best and brightest in an emerging field that is tremendously inspiring to the public," said Jon Morse, Astrophysics Division director at NASA Headquarters in Washington.

The Sagan Fellowship will join NASA's new Einstein Postdoctoral Fellowship in Physics of the Cosmos and the Hubble Postdoctoral Fellowship in Cosmic Origins. All three fellowships represent a new theme-based approach, in which fellows will focus on compelling scientific questions, such as "are there Earth-like planets orbiting other stars?"

"NASA's science-driven mission portfolio, its cultivation of young talent to pursue cutting-edge research, and the decision to commit its genius to a question of transcendent cultural significance, would have thrilled Carl," said Ann Druyan, Sagan's widow and collaborator, who continues to write and produce.

"That this knowledge will be pursued in his name, as he joins a triumvirate of the leading lights of 20th century astronomy, is a source of infinite pride to our family," said Druyan. "It signifies that Carl's passion to engage us all in the scientific experience, his daring curiosity and urgent concern for life on this planet, no longer eclipse his scientific achievements."

A call for Sagan Fellowship proposals went out to the scientific

community earlier this week, with selections to be announced in February 2009.

"There is an explosion of interest in the field," said Charles Beichman of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif. "Now we are going down a scientific path that Carl Sagan originally blazed, torch in hand, as he led us through the dark." Beichman is executive director of NASA's Exoplanet Science Institute at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, which will administer the fellowship program.

Recently, NASA's Hubble and Spitzer space telescopes have made landmark observations of hot, Jupiter-like planets orbiting other stars. The telescopes detected methane and water in the planets' atmospheres -- the same molecules that might serve as tracers of life if discovered around smaller, rocky planets in the future. In a 1994 paper for the journal Nature, Sagan and colleagues used these and other molecules to identify life on a planet -- Earth. They used NASA's Galileo spacecraft to observe the molecular signatures of our "pale blue dot," as Sagan dubbed Earth, while the spacecraft flew by.

"Only a select few scientists carry the insight, vision and persistence to open entire new vistas on the cosmos," said Neil deGrasse Tyson, astrophysicist and Frederick P. Rose director of the Hayden Planetarium at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. "We know about Einstein. We know about Hubble. Add to this list Carl Sagan, who empowered us all -- scientists as well as the public -- to see planets not simply as cosmic objects but as worlds of their own that could harbor life."

NASA's Kepler mission, which Sagan championed in his last years, will launch next year and will survey hundreds of thousands of nearby stars for Earth-like worlds, some of which are likely to orbit within the star's water-friendly "habitable zone" favorable for life as we know it.

More information about NASA's Sagan Fellowships is available on the Web at:

<http://nexsci.caltech.edu/sagan>

[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.5](#)

Phoenix Mars Mission Extended

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 10:11:00 -0400
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 10:11:00 -0400
Subject: Phoenix Mars Mission Extended

Source: PysOrg.Com - Douglas, Isle Of Man, UK

<http://www.physorg.com/news139500908.html>

September 01, 2008

Phoenix Mission Conducting Extended Activities On Mars

NASA's Phoenix Mars Lander, having completed its 90-day primary mission, is continuing its science collection activities. Science and engineering teams are looking forward to at least another month of Martian exploration.

Due to the spacecraft's sufficient power and experiment capacity, NASA announced on July 31 that the mission would continue operations through Sept. 30. Once the lander finishes collecting science data, the mission teams will continue the analysis of the measurements and observations.

"We have been successful beyond my wildest dreams, and we're not done yet learning from Mars about its secrets," said Peter Smith, Phoenix principal investigator from the University of Arizona, Tucson.

"We are still working to understand the properties and the history of the ice at our landing site on the northern plains of Mars. While the sun has begun to dip below the horizon, we still have power to continue our observations and experiments. And we're hoping to see a gradual change in the Martian weather in the next few weeks," he said.

Among the critical questions the Phoenix science team is trying to answer is whether the northern region of Mars could have been a habitable zone.

Phoenix has already confirmed the presence of water ice, determined the soil is alkaline and identified magnesium, sodium, potassium, chloride and perchlorate in the soil. Chemical analyses continue even as Phoenix's robotic arm reaches out for more samples to sniff and taste.

"It's been gratifying to be able to share the excitement of our exploration with the public through the thousands upon thousands of images that our cameras have taken. They have been available to the public on our web site as soon as they are received on Earth," Smith said. Phoenix's Surface Stereo Imager, Robotic Arm Camera and microscope have returned more than 20,000 pictures since landing day, May 25.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 5](#)

A Hum-Related Anecdote

From: **Eleanor White** <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 08:09:42 -0400
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 10:12:00 -0400
Subject: A Hum-Related Anecdote

FYI - A "Hum" sufferer recounts a Hum-related anecdote:

I remember a story a friend was telling me that when he was cave exploring in WV, one time in the cave, he heard a hum so loud that he had to cover his ears and get out of the cave.

About half-way out, the hum stopped.

He was telling that to another friend who was about 50 miles away exploring in another cave and he explained the same type of hum.

They compared the times and it was the same time both heard it.

Tom always thought it was a military sensor he has set off somehow. But later he was back in the same cave and never heard it. This was back around 1969.

The cave is not open to the public and is on an old farm. They have been inside it up to 1 and a half miles.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep.5](#)

UFO Secrecy National Security & FOIA

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 11:15:00 -0400
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 11:15:00 -0400
Subject: UFO Secrecy National Security & FOIA

Source: American Chronicle - Beverlay Hills, California, USA

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/73206>

September 05, 2008

UFO Secrecy, National Security and the Freedom of Information Act
Franklin D. Fields

"Unknown objects are operating under intelligent control... It is imperative that we learn where UFO's come from and what their purpose is..."

--Admiral Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, Former Director, CIA

For over 60 years, the Unidentified Flying Object (UFO) phenomenon has mystified and intrigued Americans. There are many theories concerning the nature of UFOs and they are heatedly debated. Even the usage of the term "UFO" is debated by some. For the purposes of this article it is defined to be a flying object that does not have a known conventional explanation. There is however not much debate on the topic of government secrecy relating to UFOs. According to poll data, over eighty percent (80%) of Americans believe the U.S. Government is hiding knowledge of the existence of extraterrestrial life and UFOs (See: CNN/Time Poll). This poll data shows a strong belief that our government is far too secretive. Many Americans have asked the government for information on the topic and have been refused. When refusing the information, government agencies often use national security as a justification. This should greatly concern Americans, our media and Congress. However, none have shown much interest.

Our courts have not been very helpful either. In fact, official secrecy around the UFO subject is being shielded by a large degree of judicial deference that is routinely granted to agencies when refusing to release information to the public. As a result, the balance between civil rights and secrecy is shifting towards increased suppression. This article examines the legal concerns around the U.S. Government's use of national security as justification for keeping information on UFOs secret. Additionally we will discuss whether or not our courts are properly adjudicating the legal issues or effectively weighing the alleged national security concern against the loss of our Constitutional rights. It is important to state up front that inappropriate biases are given to the government and that has allowed government secrecy to run rampant in UFO cases as well as all others dealing with national security.

Obviously, there is no dispute about the fact that our government is using national security to justify secrecy and in many cases it is appropriate. However, it is not clear what national security concerns are involved within the UFO subject area. Of course some UFOs could actually be classified government aircraft and in that event secrecy may be required. Interestingly, the evidence indicates that classified aircraft are rarely involved

in UFO sightings. UFOs often defy conventional flight capabilities well beyond what experienced pilots and engineers would expect from even future generations of aircraft. The idea that UFOs are classified aircraft is suspect and should only be valid for UFO sightings that occur in areas where our government tests aircraft or where aircraft would be deployed, like in a war campaign. I do not see an allowable reason for our government to routinely fly highly classified test vehicles over populated areas of the United States.

Take the recent UFO reported near Stephenville, Texas, on Jan. 8, 2008. Why would our government be flying in that area? Incidentally, the case has over seventeen witnesses with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) radar data to substantiate their testimony. The residents reported a very large craft that was "as big as a Wal-Mart", that did not make a sound, and flew out of our atmosphere in "the blink of an eye". If the reports are correct and it was not an alien spacecraft, but is instead a classified U.S. aircraft, we may well have a bigger national security problem than UFOs. The Air Force has yet to release radar or other information on the sighting.

An argument has been made that the government does not have additional UFO information to provide, and that they have released all their files. This argument fails because we know that information on UFOs has been denied to the public and national security has been listed as the reason for nondisclosure, this fact can not be disputed. Those that argue the government does not know anything should explain this blatant discrepancy. In the government documents that have been released there are large portions and even whole pages that are blackened out or redacted. Granted the redacted information may not be clear evidence of the reality of UFOs, it is however clear proof the government is withholding some information on the subject.

The heart of the legal matter, which should be addressed by our courts, is whether or not government bureaucrats and elected officials have a justification strong enough to maintain this secrecy at the expense of our Constitutional rights. To my knowledge, our courts have not yet answered this question. To state this more precisely, a Court has not conducted a trial to examine the facts and then weighed the impact of their release against the loss of our Constitutional rights. If for example, the information showed UFOs were not of this earth, I would argue that a clear showing of extreme national security danger (not just some frightened citizens or market turmoil), that is in fact likely to materialize, must be demonstrated to maintain secrecy. If such a trial were to occur, experts on national security, sociology, psychology, and other relevant areas would be called by both sides to properly weigh the need for continued secrecy against the burden of our rights.

The current judicial review process virtually never (less than 1%) conducts a trial to determine if an agency is acting appropriately. The mere unchecked opinion of our government bureaucrats, that the release of the information might be a national security threat, is insufficient. Under the present system an agency is not required to prove that the national security risk is likely, just simply state it is a potential. This type of unsupervised government secrecy should not be allowed to continue. The right to know the truth is a fundamental civil right granted by our Constitution and essential to our democracy. The need for information is especially important in a democracy; citizens must know what their government knows in order to participate in the process. Only with real information can citizens actually take part in government. True participation, is the way accountability occurs in their name, and in that way they can hold authorities, elected and non-elected, accountable for their acts.

The distinguished former U.S. Senator William Proxmire once stated, "Power always has to be kept in check; power exercised in secret, especially under the cloak of national security, is doubly dangerous." Our Constitution requires that the free exchange of opinions and ideas must never be unnecessarily restricted. It also states that all citizens must be equal before the law and that the Government exists to serve the people, because it derives its power from the people. If UFOs were in fact not of our earth, what could be more essential than knowledge that we are not alone in the universe? As an example, this knowledge would almost certainly change how we as a society

allocate resources. Specifically, we might act through our elected officials and add additional funding to NASA=B4s budget to study the issue in more detail. Even if the hidden information was inconclusive on the origin of UFOs or proved they were of earth origin, it is still relevant and the public has the right to know.

It is easy to see how information can change our social and political workings. To insure our democracy functions appropriately and to address secrecy, citizens must have the ability to obtain information from the government. This is one of the essential elements needed to keep power in check and insure our democracy=B4s health. Congress understood this essential requirement and passed legislation to address it by setting up a legal framework called the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) also known as Title 5 of the United States Code, section 552. FOIA states that any person has the right to request access to federal agency records or information and provides rules for its use. FOIA requires all agencies of the U.S. Government to disclose records upon receiving a written request, except those records that are protected from disclosure pursuant to nine exemptions and three exclusions.

The current framework for administering UFO secrecy is through these exemptions. They allow the government to withhold certain information when they designate information to have national security importance. The most significant is Exemption 1, which allows agencies to withhold records in the interest of national defense or foreign policy. Also, Exemption 3 allows agencies to withhold records that are specifically exempted from disclosure by statute. Exemption 1 is however, the main national security exemption. The FOIA process has been used by thousands of citizens in their attempt to retrieve information about UFOs. The ongoing process to discover all of what our government knows has, however, proven exceedingly frustrating. Many of the documents that have been released are either irrelevant to the specific requests or are almost entirely redacted as mentioned above. When a government agency refuses or incompletely releases requested information, the requester goes through a prescribed administrative process to challenge the agency, after exhausting administrative remedies, a dissatisfied FOIA requester may contest agency decisions in federal district court.

When a court hears a requester=B4s FOIA complaint it is arguably fulfilling the judiciary=B4s Constitutional role of review. Nevertheless, in the 1982 case *Gardels v. CIA*, (See: 689 F.2d 1100, 1105) the Court stated that the standard for withholding records on national security grounds is very accommodating since courts only test an agencies national security claims for reasonableness, good faith, specificity, and plausibility. In other words, they do not assess whether the alleged risks of disclosure would be likely to materialize, or weigh those risks against other interests. The court=B4s main emphasis is to determine if the agency complied with administrative requirements such as filling out an affidavit indicating it searched for records and provided a legitimate reason information was exempted, such as national security.

Actually, the Department of Justice states in instructions to agencies that the administrative task of filling out the affidavit is the single most important requirement for an agency to defend against an FOIA lawsuit. In the 1987 *Struth v. FBI* case the Court specifically stated "courts have consistently held that a requester's opinion disputing the risk created by disclosure is not sufficient to preclude summary judgment for the agency when the agency possessing the relevant expertise has provided sufficiently detailed affidavits." (See 673 F. Supp. 949, 954, E.D. Wis.) This clear statement adds strength to the argument that the current legal method of review does not meet the required level of a Constitutional judicial review. Does an affidavit from one party fulfill the judicial review requirement? It is important to understand that the affidavit is a document that contains information relevant to the case and is sworn to by an agency employee. It is documentation provided by the agency stating that they complied with the FOIA requirements. It is a one sided statement from an agency and it is not a presentation of legal arguments or legal conclusions. It can not be challenged in a trial by the requester, and therefore does not receive a full legal review. The result is that the government almost always prevails in FOIA national security litigation. (See: *Holding the Spymasters Accountable: A Proposed Model for CIA*

Disclosure Requirements under the Freedom of Information Act, by Martin Halstuk, Pennsylvania State University, 27).

Take the case of the CIA, which derivatively classifies more documents than any other government body and may hold the most information on UFOs. They have proven especially invulnerable to FOIA review. The Ninth Circuit conceded in 1992 that "we are now only a short step away [from] exempting all CIA records from FOIA." (See: Hunt v. CIA, 981 F.2d 1116, 1120, 9th Cir.). This sad state of affairs means that over 99% of all FOIA law suites end before the trial ever begins. An agency affidavit is filed, to support a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court makes its judgment with no trial. The summary judgment is based upon a motion by the agency that contends that all necessary factual issues are settled and the case is not tried. Essentially, if an agency employee signs the required affidavits and states that the information, if publicly disclosed, would harm national security, then that is generally good enough.

It is especially worthy of note, that the administrative agencies are responsible for processing initial requests for access to their records and for adjudicating any appeals from those actions. However, when an agency is taken to court by a requester in a FOIA lawsuit, the Department of Justice almost always represents the defendant agency on behalf of the government. FOIA cases are defended either by the local U.S. Attorney's office or by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, with agency legal and FOIA staffs playing a supporting role. In FOIA litigation, the defendant agencies are the clients of the Department of Justice. During the past two decades, as FOIA case law has developed in the courts, this attorney-client relationship has developed as well. This means that a select, well-trained cadre of government lawyers are used to defend these cases and is often the same group representing all the agencies of the U.S. government. They have become very effective at winning.

It is also clear from the cases that a degree of judicial deference is routinely granted to agencies defending against FOIA requesters. This trend is directly opposite the clear congressional objectives defined when Congress was drafting the FOIA. The U.S. Supreme Court specifically stated in its 1976 ruling, Department of the Air Force v. Rose, (See 425 U.S. 352, 361) that the intention of the FOIA was "to pierce the veil of administrative secrecy and to open agency action to the light of public scrutiny". However, from the start the FOIA was compromised, secretive government agencies and court deference shunted its underlying principles of openness and accountability. It can not be more apparent; FOIA national security claims deserve additional judicial scrutiny. The judicial record of FOIA case law shows that the inappropriate bias has caused uncontrolled government secrecy. According to the Information Security Oversight Office (part the National Archives) the number of documents classified in the last six years has almost quadrupled. Going from 5.8 million in 1996 to more than 20 million last year. The government bureaucrat=B4s huge advantage is preventing vital information from getting into the hands of our country's real rulers, you and your fellow citizens.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 5](#)

Santa Rosa Argentina Pig Mutilation

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2008 11:53:16 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 14:35:47 -0400
Subject: Santa Rosa Argentina Pig Mutilation

INEXPLICATA - The Journal of Hispanic Ufology - September 5, 2008

Source: Planeta UFO

Date: September 4, 2008-09-05

ARGENTINA: The Santa Rosa Pig Mutilation
By Salvatore Carta

<http://ufopampa.blogspot.com/2008/05/chancha-mutilada.html>

In the morning hours of Monday, May 19, 2008, a small farm located some 15 kilometers northeast of the locality of Santa Rosa was in a stir as several nervous pigs and their piglets were being placed in a truck for an early morning transfer to another field.

At daybreak, the farm's occupants were stunned by the scene that confronted them: only a few meters away from the vehicle, they found one of the sows and her young, displaying deep incisions and with no apparent explanation as to how they managed to jump over the 1.80 meter tall siding that surrounded the truck.

The pig farmer contacted Quique Mario of CEUFO and the undersigned as well, and we visited the location. We are displaying photographs of the pig as well as a video that presents other details. At first sight, the incisions are completely different from the ones reported as part of UFO case histories in this region. They are not mechanical and appear irregular under the microscope. The entire rear section of the sow's skull was missing, along with muscular mass and a piercing incision in the area within the legs, as well as strange scoring from what appear to be claws. Regarding this last detail, the pig farmer's son found some strange prints similar to those of a Arandu or ostritch. He and his cousin photographed them with their cellphones.

This animal has been sent to veterinary experts. We shall be forwarding a report on the results shortly.

We compared photographs with our friends from VISION OVNI, comparing the characteristics of our strange case with one that occurred only days earlier in the city of Rosario.

A priori conclusions lead us to believe that the entities operating here are different from the ones that the case histories had presented us with.

Translation (c) 2008, S. Corrales, IHU
Special thanks to Guillermo Gimenez and Salvatore Valentin Carta

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Re: Fighting For Survival

From: **Eleanor White** <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 14:57:45 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 09:37:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Fighting For Survival

>From: Cathy Reason <CathyM.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2008 12:44:09 +0100
>Subject: Fighting For Survival

>This item from the BBC news may not seem to have much to do with
>Ufology: But I think it does, because it is yet more evidence
>that people initially react to anomalous events by attempting to
>rationalize them.

Hoo-boy! You got a hundred on that test!

Eleanor White
[someone who has tried to explain that a
campaign of vicious stalking and electronic
harassment has been going on for two
decades now!]

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Re: Phoenix Mars Mission Extended

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Fri, 05 Sep 2008 15:05:14 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 09:38:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Phoenix Mars Mission Extended

>Source: PysOrg.Com - Douglas, Isle Of Man, UK

<snip>

><http://www.physorg.com/news139500908.html>

>"We have been successful beyond my wildest dreams, and we're not
>done yet learning from Mars about its secrets," said Peter Smith,
>Phoenix principal investigator from the University of Arizona,
>Tucson.

Send it down to have a look at the vegetation and the Mars face
from ground level, you fraud artists!

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Texas Official Demands Answers About Alleged UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 10:10:31 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 10:10:31 -0400
Subject: Texas Official Demands Answers About Alleged UFO

Source: CBS-TV 11 - Dallas Fort Worth, Texas, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/5qc6wd>

Sep 5, 2008

Texas Official Demands Answers About Alleged UFO
Pam Harris

STEPHENVILLE (CBS 11 News) -- Dozens of Stephenville residents reported seeing UFOs in the area in January. At first, the military reported there were no aircraft in the area that night. Two weeks later, officials said they were conducting training exercises in the area.

Now some city officials want to know if a government exercise was being performed, why they weren't notified ahead of time.

"I want to know why public officials weren't notified of a large military operation in our area," said Stephenville City Councilmember Mark Murphy. He has filed a complaint with U. S. Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration, demanding answers.

"My main concern is public safety," said Councilman Murphy. "I want to make sure that if anything like this is going on, people are alerted."

But residents were mixed on what the public needs to know.

"I think the government needs to let us know when we need to know, but on something like this, it's not appropriate," said Stephenville resident Cliff McMinn.

"I think the city has a right to know," said Dell Eastwood, a resident of Stephenville. "I guess the federal government doesn't think they do."

According to a local aviation expert, the military must communicate with the FAA, but they are not required to contact city officials. Councilman Murphy thinks that rule should be changed.

"Just so we know they're going to be operating in this area," he said. "It's only a courtesy - intergovernmental courtesy."

Councilman Murphy says he doesn't need to know details about what the military was doing over the skies of Stephenville that night, he just wants corrective action to be taken.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

The UFO Proof Is Out There

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 10:15:24 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 10:15:24 -0400
Subject: The UFO Proof Is Out There

Source: Northern Territory News - Darwin, Australia

http://www.ntnews.com.au/article/2008/09/06/5717_ntnews.html

September 6th, 2008

The UFO Proof Is Out There
Nick Calacouras

STORIES about fleets of UFOs invading the Territory have flooded in to us in recent weeks but UFO hunter Keith Douglas says the NT has been a flying saucer hotspot for decades.

The 57-year-old former cabinet maker now runs UFO Research Alice Springs - a branch of the Australian UFO Research Network.

"People are very heads down, arse-up, and ignore what is going on," he said. "But I've got plenty of time. I go out for night watches all the time."

Mr Douglas' night watches start at 11pm and last until 7am.

"I know what I've seen and the stories I've heard. I've come across enough to be convinced there are UFOs," he said.

"I just get amused as to why they spend so much watching us."

Mr Douglas has had two "good sightings", but has covered reports of abductions, crop circles and unidentified crafts. He said Central Australia had several "hotspots" - such as the Pine Gap joint-defence facility or Wycliffe Well, 1100km south of Darwin.

"There's a lot of stuff coming and going from Pine Gap," he said. "And you can see crafts reasonably well at Wycliffe Well - they generally look like a white light. But down south, near the South Australian border, they are orange lights."

Mr Douglas said he was contacted once by an indigenous woman from a remote community who reported being followed by a UFO for several hours.

"She didn't have a camera or anything, so she painted me a picture of it."

The Northern Territory News has tracked down a sample of UFO cases dating back to 1970 (see below and also check out our related articles links at bottom of page for more recent sightings).

But Mr Douglas said there were many more cases.

"For every one you hear about, there are two or three you don't," he said.

1970: Mongrel Downs Station, near WA border.
Three scientists working for a mining company in the Tanami Desert spot two UFOs with pulsing or flaming lights going on a

"Sunday afternoon cruise".

1976: Elliott.

An old man claimed to be abducted after a bright object landed near him. Beings took him on board and asked him about life on Earth before returning him unharmed.

1983: Darwin. A 16-year-old reported a close encounter and "entities" about the house.

APRIL 1995: Nightcliff. A jumbo-jet-sized cigar shaped object "whooshed" by as it passed through the clouds.

DECEMBER 31, 1995: Moulden. Reports of four orange light objects objects travelling over the area at 11.45pm. They returned two hours later.

JANUARY 7, 1996: Central Australia. Station hand has a daylight sighting of a "battleship grey" object hovering 40m above the ground.

FEBRUARY 3, 1996: Two carloads of people reported seeing a fast-moving, orange and soundless fireball. It hovered before meeting another fireball and the pair travelled south.

MARCH 8, 1996: Santa Teresa, near Alice Springs. UFOs were seen hovering over the community for several nights. Described as large, glowing objects the size of a train.

NOVEMBER 1996: Honeymoon Gap, near Alice Springs. A bright blue glow was noticed in the trees at the base of a mountain 500m away. The light rose up and hovered over a car before flying towards Pine Gap.

JUNE 6, 1998: Uluru. Two astronomers noticed a bright pulsating star moving erratically, before it changed direction and flew out of sight.

JULY 12, 1998: Katherine. Several people saw an object the size of the moon - "rimmed with fire" - moving west.

AUGUST 8, 1998: Alice Springs. Two bright white fluorescent lights seen high in the northern sky, one cigar shaped followed by a small ball.

AUGUST 30, 1998: Alice Springs. A Baptist Church group camping outside Alice Springs noticed a bright silver ball of white light flickering and moving up and around.

2001: Palmerston. Reports of 11 bright orange lights flying in a V-formation.

JUNE 22, 2001: Alice Springs. Five red lights spotted flying in the sky in the shape of a pentagon.

MARCH 2003: Palmerston. A bright red-orange light moving at a steady pace suddenly splits into a row of six or seven smaller orange-yellow lights.

MARCH 2003: Palmerston. An egg-shaped object was spotted flying above a plane.

JUNE 18, 2005: Darwin. A green and amber coloured octagonal craft, reportedly moving at 450km/h flew overhead near the airport.

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

See:

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

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Re: Texas Official Demands Answers About UFO

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 02:08:01 EDT
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:20:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Texas Official Demands Answers About UFO

>Source: CBS-TV 11 - Dallas Fort Worth, Texas, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/5qc6wd>

>

>Sep 5, 2008

>Texas Official Demands Answers About Alleged UFO

Looks like this UFO picked the wrong State to try to be obscure.

Texans ain't folks for givin' up easy.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Tasmania's UFO Mystery

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:21:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:21:00 -0400
Subject: Tasmania's UFO Mystery

Source: The Examiner - Launceston, Tasmania, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/6416yo>

7/09/2008

No Trace Of Plane Or Pilot - Tasmania's UFO Mystery

The Sunday Examiner's LUKE SCOTT looks into a disappearance that was never solved. NEXT month will mark the 30th anniversary of one of the State's most bizarre aviation mysteries.

On Saturday, October 21, 1978, pilot Frederick Valentich took off from Victoria's Moorabin Airport in his single-engined Cessna 182, bound for King Island.

It was about 6.15pm, and conditions were ideal for flying, with fine weather, a mild north-westerly breeze and almost unlimited visibility.

But Valentich never made it.

No trace of the 20-year-old volunteer flight instructor or his aircraft was ever found, but the manner of his disappearance has fuelled speculation by UFO buffs for nearly three decades.

Some say Mr Valentich was abducted by aliens, some that his aircraft simply crashed into Bass Strait, some that he faked his disappearance and started a new life somewhere else.

The extraordinary conversation Mr Valentich had over the radio with Melbourne Flight Service flight controller Steve Robey in the moments before he disappeared has gone down in UFO folklore.

According to The Examiner's original report of the incident, Mr Valentich radioed Melbourne at 7.06pm, after passing Cape Otway, asking if there was any known traffic in the area below 1600m.

The flight controller replied that there was no known traffic in that area.

Mr Valentich radioed again to say there appeared to be a "large aircraft" below 1600m.

Mr Robey asked Mr Valentich about the type of aircraft he could see.

"I cannot confirm," Mr Valentich replied.

"It has four bright lights that appear to be landing lights. The aircraft has passed over me."

At 7.08pm, Mr Valentich radioed Mr Robey at Melbourne Flight Services again, saying the unidentified aircraft was flying towards him.

"It seems to me to be playing some sort of game," he reported.

"It's flying at speed I cannot estimate."

Moments later, Mr Valentich was asked how large the mystery aircraft appeared to be.

"It seems to be stationary," Mr Valentich answered.

"I'm orbiting and the thing is orbiting on top of me also. It has a green light and a sort of metallic light on the outside."

A few seconds later, the pilot radioed to say the object had vanished.

At 7.12pm, Mr Valentich reported that his engine was coughing and rough idling.

He said that he was continuing to King Island, then added: "Unknown aircraft hovering on top of me."

This was followed by a series of metallic noises and contact with Mr Valentich was lost.

It was estimated Mr Valentich's Cessna would have been about half way between Cape Otway and King Island when it disappeared.

Six aircraft and a team of boats scoured about 7000sq.km from Cape Otway to King Island searching for the missing pilot.

The search was called off four days after Mr Valentich disappeared.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:22:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:22:00 -0400
Subject: Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures

Source: Joseph Capp's UFO Media Matters Blog - New York, NY, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/6jdg8w>

Thursday, September 4, 2008

Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures
Joseph Capp
UFO Media Matters

[Pictures & clip at site]

You've heard it, thought it, wondered about it:

Why are UFO videos, photos - and even vetted witness reports- so full of blur?

A massive amount of UFO/craft objects captured on film, video, and digital imagery have one thing in common, and that's blurry outlines. As in no sharp edges, no detail. I even heard this most common characteristic of UFOs discussed in depth at a MUFON training I attended.

Debunkers and assorted fools on the internet have a field day with this single aspect of ufology. But the truth is, blurry is probable - and clear is improbable- if we are talking real ET craft.

NASA Scientist Paul Hill finds no problem with blurry UFOs and his book Unconventional Flying Objects explains why. [Read Unconventional Flying Objects, A Scientific Analysis, Hampton Roads Publ. Co., Charlottesville, VA, 1995 (ISBN 1-57174-027-9)]

But before we go to the expert, I'd like to take a walk down what I call Common Sense Highway, my kind of Highway 61 Revisited. Walk with me a moment...There are plenty of famous well-documented UFO pictures that are clear and plenty that are blurry. Most of the clear pictures of UFO craft are hovering or moving very slowly. In many reports of UFO craft, parts of the craft can clearly be seen to rotate, yet that rotation itself, should not cause the whole image to be blurry.

So here's an important question. If UFO are Extraterrestrial craft, then what would the Extraterrestrials [Off-Planet Pilots] be using as the primary mode of transportation here?

1. Propellers
2. Jet Engines
3. Rocket Engines

In the case of ET craft using any of the travel modes from the short list above, shouldn't images captured of craft using one of these methods have clear edges? And then we have to ask, in our hearts, do we believe this?

I have, on occasion videoed and photographed jets, balloons, and birds, and have always been able to get clear edges. I have videoed a passenger jet, and, near the engine, of course it showed wavy images, from the jet engine's heat exhaust; but the wavy effect never distorted the video image of the whole plane.

We treat blurry images as a strong indication of hoaxing, right? I have to admit my WARNING! flag goes up when I see blurry UFO images.

But I am wrong. Dead wrong.

The very strong possibility that these craft are powered by a propulsion system that affects the area around them is a given.

This is not the nineteenth century, although debunkers try to keep us there. I'm 65, and I know Atomic Drives are not going to hack it for travel between worlds. You get that, too, right?

I don't even want to bring up what I can imagine about the main body of a long-distance traveling ship - say in a thousand years from now. But what the hell, I will: intelligent bio-skins.

In Star Trek we see good movie theatrics showing rockets of plasma discharge from the rear of the craft. But in real life, rockets and those types of devices would have been abandoned long ago in the Star Trek timeline.

And we also see in Star Trek human travelers being affected by inertia at warp ten. Based on what we know now, they'd be butter.

Remember, what we're seeing in UFO photos is not Star Trek and shuttle craft. Whatever else is true about the travelers in the UFOs we're seeing, we do know what they are using is beyond Star Trek. Moving sideways at speeds like a thousand-plus miles an hour suggests something far more sophisticated at work here.

There are times when UFO craft have even been witnessed floating like a falling leaf. This could signify, along with other circumstantial evidence, that these craft charge their very mass.

So what could be causing this blurriness? Dr. Hill formulates an interesting theory, and I will quote from this great book:

"The quantum mechanical explanation for the indistinct or invisible out line at night is particularly straightforward..."
[After the thoroughly excited molecules and electrons explanation, he continues, as excerpted below...]

"At night when the witness must see the UFO by its own light, it follows if the plasma is fully developed (saturated with ions) the plasma can completely obscure the UFOs, for the critical distance is small. In the more general case where the UFO is operating at a lower radiation the witness can see the UFO surface directly... The absorption characteristics of the plasma can also account for a daytime hazy or smoky appearance of the Atmosphere around the UFO."

Blurriness and fuzzy outlines of UFOs are what we would expect in a craft from another world. UFOs use propulsion and engine mechanics completely different than we have. And those propulsion and drive methods do, at times, affect their surroundings. UFO technologies have apparently been developed to cancel inertia and gravity, including mass.

Unless they are conjuring it all up as 100% illusion - an interpretation too many thousands of reliable reports and images contradict- UFO craft need power, and that power affects external things as part of its normal operations.

Paul Hill is a futurist in all aspects of this work, as was Arthur C. Clark. But we must understand that these Extraterrestrial travelers and their vehicles are far beyond what our best science - and maybe even our best science fiction minds - now understand.

But what Hill has done is tell us we should be looking very close at these blurry photos and videos because in the end, they may be a signal we are looking at an authentic UFO.

[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 16:52:33 +0200
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 11:23:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Source: Kevin Randle's Blog

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

>Saturday, August 30, 2008

>Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>Lytle told Hastings that in February 1953, with Blanchard now a
>general officer, they were in Alaska while Lytle's wife was in
>Chicago about to give birth. Lytle was desperate to get home and
>Blanchard said that they could take an Air Force aircraft to
>Illinois, land at one of the bases close to Chicago and Lytle
>could get home from there.

>While on the flight, somehow the subject of UFOs came up, maybe
>because of a couple of sightings at Elmendorf Air Force Base near
>Anchorage sometime earlier. Blanchard then told Lytle that an
>alien craft had crashed near Roswell. According to Hastings,
>Blanchard told Lytle that four bodies had been recovered.

>Surprised by this, Hastings asked Lytle, "Blanchard actually
>told you that the Roswell object was an alien spacecraft."

>Lytle said, "Oh, absolutely."

>In break with the traditional story, Blanchard said that some of
>the bodies had gone originally to Muroc Army Air Field (now
>Edwards Air Force Base), but that they all wound up at Wright
>Field.

Thank you to Kevin Randle for that important testimony, although
second hand.

It raises again the question of the number of bodies found, about
which there is some divergence between testimonies.

Here is a quick list, probably incomplete.

According to Frankie Rowe, quoting her father Dan Dwyer, there
were two bodies, in bags, and one live being, standing.
Among more recent witnesses, in the book of Tom Carey and Don
Schmitt Witness to Roswell:

Roland Menagh mentioned three bodies

Eli Benjamin saw three or four, lying on gurneys, and thought
that one of them was alive

Homer Rowlette saw three bodies, one of them alive;
Roland Menagh saw three bodies

Montoya saw three bodies, one of them alive, moaning

A member of the archeologist team remembered seeing three dead
bodies and one survivor

Ann Robbins, in Randle's book, talked of three beings: one dead and two alive!

So, there are some differences. Does it mean that we should put all these testimonies in doubt, as skeptics will surely argue? No, it just means, probably, that some of them had just a glance, and that some others did not remember well, because it was a long time ago. In fact, it would be more troubling if they all gave exactly the same count!

In addition to that, there remain the question of the other site with bodies, the so-called Dee Proctor site, on the Foster ranch, two miles and a half east of the debris field. According to several testimonies, these bodies were badly injured and smelling. It seems that they were treated apart from the rest, put in a tent at a far side of the Roswell base, packed in a crate and put on board the B-29 Straight Flush to be carried to Fort Worth. If Blanchard included them in the total of four, it would mean, perhaps, two bodies on each site. But he did not mention the live being, so his brief confidence may have been incomplete. Perhaps he did not include the bodies of the Dee Proctor site?

Another question is the destination of the bodies. Some were carried to Fort Worth, some to Wright Field. Blanchard said that some of them were carried first to Muroc, before being shipped to Wright. All that is compatible, it seems to me. It makes sense, in terms of security, not to have transported them together, to the same place.

One thing is sure. It is an important testimony which reinforces the whole story of a UFO crash near Roswell.

Gidas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 6](#)

Re: Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures

From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 12:03:57 -0400
Archived: Sat, 06 Sep 2008 13:53:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates Subscribers <UFO-UpDates.nul>
>Date: Saturday, September 06, 2008 11:22 AM
>Subject: Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures

>Source: Joseph Capp's UFO Media Matters Blog - New York, NY,
>USA

><http://tinyurl.com/6jdg8w>

>Thursday, September 4, 2008

>Those Damned Blurry UFO Pictures
>Joseph Capp
>UFO Media Matters

>Why are UFO videos, photos - and even vetted witness reports-
>so full of blur?

>Blurriness and fuzzy outlines of UFOs are what we would expect
>in a craft from another world. UFOs use propulsion and engine
>mechanics completely different than we have. And those propulsion
>and drive methods do, at times, affect their surroundings. UFO
>technologies have apparently been developed to cancel inertia
>and gravity, including mass.

With respect to UFO propulsion technology, I've collected some
photographic evidence suggesting that a localized, artificial
gravitational field is employed. My discussion of the photos may
be found at

<http://www.treurniet.ca/tori/toriphys/toriphys.htm>.

Regards,

William

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 7](#)

Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 07 Sep 2008 08:29:11 -0400
Archived: Sun, 07 Sep 2008 08:29:11 -0400
Subject: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

Source: KYTV 3 - Springfield, MO

<http://www.ky3.com/news/local/27934754.html>

Sun, 07 Sep 2008

Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People Near Norwood
by Sara Sheffield
KY3 News

[Photo & video]

NORWOOD, Mo -- Something strange is happening on a farm outside Norwood in Wright County. Someone or something is mutilating cows.

(Warning: some of the video is a little disturbing.)

"I saw a buzzard flying and I thought she might be down or dead," said farmer Gayland Jones.

That's what first gave Jones a reason to worry. He thought perhaps the one sick cow that he owns had died. But that wasn't the case.

"You can see right here the way the knife mark cut it and left the flesh like you would skin a piece of meat out," he said.

His best head of cattle was killed. Jones had stumbled upon the same sight that he's seen periodically since the mid-'90s: one of his Black Angus mutilated.

"It had some cutting on its mouth and tongue and on its back end."

With no way to explain it, other than a long-adopted theory that Jones doesn't buy.

"That's a theory that's always went around here: it's aliens."

"Myself, I don't believe in aliens, but who knows?" said Wright County Sheriff Glen Adler.

This is about his 20th head of cattle killed in the same way, all on Jones' property. Jones says he thinks his cattle are being targeted. He had one killed Thursday night. In August, he had another one killed on his farm a mile and a half away.

Adler is trying to figure it out, just as many sheriffs did before him.

"In 2004, a retired officer worked two or three cases that were basically the same thing," the sheriff said.

It's all a mystery. There is little to no blood to show.

"It was just like a round perfect circle when they take the udder

off," said Adler.

"We don't know. Is it a cult? Someone wanting to make it look like one? Is it animals? I just can't see even a pack of dogs taking a cow down without cutting them up.

"They knew how to use a blade or a surgical knife, whatever they used.. They were good at it," said Jones.

Jones says it takes a lot to scare him. He's getting there now with this.

Anyone who can help the Wright County Sheriff's Department with its investigation can call (417) 741-7576.

[Thanks to Chaz Stuart 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 7](#)

Colorado Project Had More Than 50% 'Unexplaineds'!

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 08:29:51 EDT
Archived: Sun, 07 Sep 2008 08:55:17 -0400
Subject: Colorado Project Had More Than 50% 'Unexplaineds'!

New Revelation -- Colorado Project Had More Than 50% Unexplained

Two stunning new revelations have emerged from the collection of 1,200 pages of files copied by MUFON's Project Pandora from the files of the late Roy Craig, a physical chemist who was a key investigator for the University of Colorado's UFO study. One, it turns out that late in the study a project scientist wrote a memo admitting that more than 50% of their cases had turned out to be unexplained. Two, proof has now been found that project director Edward Condon had not in fact read his own report before writing up the report's "Conclusions and Recommendations," the opening chapter in the front of the report.

MUFON Director of Research Robert Powell and MUFON historical consultant Michael Swords traveled to Texas A&M University earlier this year to examine the Craig files and copy what they could. Powell kindly made the files available, which will eventually be posted online by MUFON. A more detailed report will be made by Swords who has investigated the history and internal workings of the controversial Colorado UFO project.

The "Colorado Project", as it is best termed (often called the "Condon Committee") was a US Air Force funded \$525,000+ contract study of UFO's conducted from 1966 to 1968. The release of its thousand-page final report in January 1969, usually called the Condon Report, was a devastating blow to serious UFO research because of its scorchingly harsh anti-UFO conclusions rendered by the project's chief scientist Condon. The Condon Report was endorsed by the National Academy of Science and set back scientific UFO research for decades by making the very subject disreputable.

Condon declared that no scientific progress had ever been made by UFO studies and that none could be expected in the future. He recommended that the AF close down its UFO study, a long-standing PR nightmare, called Project Blue Book. It has been known for some time from internal documents that the AF in fact apparently set up the project in order specifically to "scientifically justify" (my phraseology) its closure of Blue Book (AF Directorate of S&T Lt. Col. Robert Hippler letter to Condon, Jan. 16, 1967).

The most telling criticism of the Condon Report, universally pointed out almost from day one by Hynek, McDonald, the AIAA, Sturrock, Jacobs, Friedman, Maccabee, Swords, and many others, has been that Condon's "Conclusions and Recommendations" bore no relationship to the actual contents of the report (written by other staff members) and its UFO case investigations. Many commented that it seemed as if Condon had not even read "his" own report, since he completely glossed over the disturbingly large numbers of unexplained UFO cases that his own project had documented and had admitted could not be solved.

Now we have documentation proving it. Craig's notes of his all-day meeting with Condon and other project staff on Sept. 13, 1968, begin with Condon presenting his draft "Conclusions and Recommendations" chapter. Condon had not read the rest of the report because he wrote this Conclusions chapter before the rest of the report had even been written.

Craig's notes (p. 1) state concerning the draft "Conclusions and Recommendations" that Condon distributed to the group:

"EUC [Condon] produced a draft of this section, written 1 to 3 mo [months] previously, written without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the report which were by now nearing completion."

Condon said he would consider altering his draft, as if that would exculpate or exonerate him from having written the Conclusions before even reading the then unfinished report. However, all indications are from Craig's notes that Condon's caustic anti-UFO conclusions remained unchanged and are those we are painfully familiar with from the published report. It will require in-depth line by line analysis to see if there were any subtle changes as a result of this project staff meeting and other inputs. It would be very helpful if Condon's original draft could be found, perhaps in the Condon papers at the APS Library in Philadelphia, where the Colorado Project files have been preserved.

The other bombshell also dates from the same time period near the end of the Colorado Project as the final report was being written up.

Project investigator and physicist at NCAR (National Center for Atmospheric Research), Joseph Rush, wrote a confidential 3-page memo to Condon on Sept. 5, 1968. In it he revealed that he had begun his study fairly open-minded about UFO's but as a result of the project's work had grown skeptical. Rush commented to Condon that this skepticism was ironic because so many of their UFO investigations had resulted in unexplained cases, specifically stating (p. 1) that:

"This may seem an anomalous conclusion, since more of the C-cases [CU Project investigations] are unexplained than explained."

Thus, Rush admits that the Project had more than 50% unexplained UFO cases after investigation by the Colorado Project. This is a stunning statistic. Again, from day one numerous scientific critics have pointed out that Condon Report had about 30% to 34% of its cases remaining unexplained. This has been rightly regarded as a profound contradiction to Condon's Conclusions which disclose no awareness of such a high percentage. It has been wondered whether the Project was even consciously aware of the high percentage of unknowns or were oblivious to it, and whether or not the staff discussed it among themselves and/or with Condon. Now we know. They did. And the situation was much worse than we imagined, since the percentage evidently exceeded 50% unexplained.

(An important resource in identifying the cases the Colorado Project could not explain is the "Sightings, unexplained" list in the Index to the Bantam Books edition of the Condon Report, p. 961. The Project hired not one but two professional indexers, Victoria Siegfried Barker and Margaret C. Shipler, who were full-fledged members of the Project staff, thus the index of unexplained sightings is an official list and not a product of an outside publisher, which might have been discounted as unofficial.)

Thus, when Condon wrote his Conclusions in the Summer of 1968 he was apparently unaware of the high percentage of unknowns that his project had left him with, because he had no report to read yet in which this pattern could be seen, and because Rush had not yet told him about the 50%+ unexplained rate (though admittedly we do not know if other project staff members might have previously informed Condon of the problematic statistic on the UFO unknowns).

However, we now can establish that Condon was made aware of this high unexplained rate in Sept 1968 (by physicist Rush) and did nothing to incorporate that challenging fact in any revised draft of his Conclusions. This conscious and willful suppression of contrary evidence certainly reflects badly on the scientific ethics and integrity of the Condon Report, as has often been

declared based more on inference. Now we have direct evidence.

Still more disturbing is this fact we now must consider: When the Final Report was finalized a few weeks later, in October 1968, somehow this 50%+ unexplained percentage had been reduced to about 34%. How was that possible? All Project investigations had ended months earlier in 1968 so the drastic reduction of unknowns could not have come about by new or continued investigations. Only days remained before the contract would end and the final report submitted to the AF -- one contract extension had already been granted in order to allow time to write the report so another extension was out of the question.

The only way the numbers of unexplained UFO cases could have been reduced is if more than a dozen unexplained reports in the draft Condon Report were arbitrarily rewritten to make them into explained IFO's, by blatant doctoring of the case write-ups.

Ideally what we need to pin down the details of this shocking manipulation of the Condon Report case evaluations is to find the original drafts of each case (in the Condon papers in Philadelphia) and compare the UFO vs. IFO conclusions as rendered in the published edition. This will be an enormous task due to the sheer volume of the Colorado Project files and the expense of travel, lodging and photocopying in Philadelphia, and is not likely to be done any time in the near future, regrettably.

(c) 2008 by 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 7](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Joachim Koch** <koch.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 18:00:52 +0200
Archived: Sun, 07 Sep 2008 13:05:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 16:52:33 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>Another question is the destination of the bodies. Some were
>carried to Fort Worth, some to Wright Field. Blanchard said that
>some of them were carried first to Muroc, before being shipped to
>Wright.

Hi Gildas, Listers,

A very interesting source is the "Roswell Report" issued by CUFOS
(July 1991).

There you can find the timeline of events. On page 4 you can read
that on noon of July 9: "the crate with bodies is moved from the
hangar to Bomb Pit Number One".

One crate for several bodies.

On page 5 you can read that in late afternoon the same day at
4:00 p.m.:
"The crate from Bomb Pit Number One is transferred to a B-29 and
flown (8th flight out)to Fort Worth."

Joachim

Project Wandsdyke Path July 25, 2009
Avebury/Alton Barnes, Wiltshire, UK
In Contact With The Cosmic Matrix

<http://www.kochkyborg.de>

For those in U.S.A. who want to join
and come over to the UK please contact Ron Russell:
<http://www.cropcircles.org/TourSite/Welcome.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 09:39:24 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 09:33:21 -0400
Subject: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

Several scientific sources have published spreadsheet summaries of UFO data. These list numbers of observations by place, time, date, type of craft, craft characteristics, number of witnesses, etc. But where can we find a similar spreadsheet summary of alien abduction accounts?

I reviewed several source books and websites with negative results. References, in a few of the sources, indicate numbers of victims in the hundreds of thousands, and possibly much more. But I can find no quantified lists or spreadsheets. For those interested, I can email the list of the sources I have reviewed so far.

For possibly too short of a time, I also hosted a now defunct blog listing the alien abduction accounts of anyone gutsy enough to post, even anonymously. But the samples and numbers I was working with never approached any accurate level of credibility, before general interest, measured by numbers of original responses, waned.

Can anyone point to an answer available to the public?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: **Ed Gehrman** <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 11:19:06 -0700
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 09:37:10 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>Source: KYTV 3 - Springfield, MO

><http://www.ky3.com/news/local/27934754.html>

>Sun, 07 Sep 2008

>Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People Near Norwood
>by Sara Sheffield
>KY3 News

>[Photo & video]

>NORWOOD, Mo -- Something strange is happening on a farm outside
>Norwood in Wright County. Someone or something is mutilating
>cows.

>"I saw a buzzard flying and I thought she might be down or dead,"
>said farmer Gayland Jones.

>That's what first gave Jones a reason to worry. He thought
>perhaps the one sick cow that he owns had died. But that wasn't
>the case.

>"You can see right here the way the knife mark cut it and left
>the flesh like you would skin a piece of meat out," he said.
<snip>

EBK, List,

My wife's family farm is located about ten miles, as the crow flies, from Gayland's farm. In early March of 2003 I traveled to Missouri to spend some time with my 100 year-old mother-in-law. I arrived one day after a severe Spring snow fall; there were ten inches of snow and it had been very cold.

Both my mother-in-law and her niece were extremely upset because the farm dog had been coming home covered with a very ripe smelling, pinkish fluid. They had washed him twice but were unable to get rid of the terrible odor.

The farm is about sixty acres of pasture, with three ponds and a few stands of Oak and Walnut trees. I know it like the back of my hand because I've spent much of my time hiking it and the surrounding farms.

I immediately started searching for the source of the strange pink fluid. It didn't take me long to find. The smell and the dog's tracks led me to a cow who was laying on her side about fifty feet from one pond, under a Walnut stand. Her tongue, anis, tits, and lips were all missing and seemed to be cut away with surgical precision. The opening around the anis was very large and I could see where the farm dog had tried to crawl inside and eat the intestines. There were no other tracks of any kind in the deep snow.

There wasn't a sign of blood, only the pink, water-like odorous fluid. Then I found the others. They were located about two hundred yards from the mutilated cow. There were seven in all: four mature cows and three new born calves, all dead but none had

been mutilated. The rest of herd of about thirty were all standing around as if nothing had happened.

I called the farmer who owned the cattle.

While I was waiting for him to arrive, I took several photos of the carnage and the mutilated cow. When he arrived, I was shocked at how unconcerned he seemed. He was upset about the monetary loss, but mutilation didn't seem to bother him at all.

"Just possums".

I talked with him later and he said the Vet blamed it all on a bacteria that often can make cattle sick after a Spring snow fall. At the time, I didn't realize how common the mutilation problem was in the area. I still have the photos. The farm dog, seemingly healthy at the time of the incident, curled up and died a month later, without any warning.

Since then, I've seen UFO on two different occasions, about a thousand feet above the farm.

I know this is subjective, but from my fisherman's perspective, they seem to be trolling. There haven't been any more mutilations, at least not on our farm.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 12:37:05 +0200
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 09:57:43 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 18:00:52 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 16:52:33 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>Another question is the destination of the bodies. Some were
>>carried to Fort Worth, some to Wright Field. Blanchard said
>>that some of them were carried first to Muroc, before being
>>shipped to Wright.

>A very interesting source is the "Roswell Report" issued by
>CUFOS (July 1991).

>There you can find the timeline of events. On page 4 you can
>read that on noon of July 9: "the crate with bodies is moved
>from the hangar to Bomb Pit Number One".
>One crate for several bodies.

>On page 5 you can read that in late afternoon the same day at
>4:00 p.m.:

>"The crate from Bomb Pit Number One is transferred to a B-29
>and flown (8th flight out)to Fort Worth."

Joachim, and all,

Yes, it was a very good source, but there have been many other
valuable publications,since, especially the book of Tom Carey and
Don Schmitt, Witness to Roswell, in 2007.

They proposed a new time line, with a lot of new witnesses.
However, I feel that it raises some questions, and I propose a
slightly different one, which is probably not the last word
either.

I will read with great interest any comment about it.

Monday July 7, 1947

On the Foster ranch

On Monday 7, Major Marcel and Captain Cavitt inspect the debris
field.

Since Brazel had already spoken to Franck Joyce on Sunday of the
nearby body site (let's call it the third site), it seems very
probable that he also led them to that site, although he son of
Marcel does not believe it because his father never talked to him
about it. But Marcel revealed later to other witnesses that he
had seen alien bodies (Sgt Herschel Grice, and Sue Marcel
Methane).

The bodies at the third site were badly injured ,and smelling.

Could the Roswell base send troops to take control of the third site already on Monday evening?

We know that Cavitt returned to the base earlier than Marcel, who remained on the debris field. There are some reasons to suppose that it would have been decided then to go back urgently to the third site, to take back the bodies, even before taking control of the area of the Foster ranch. Brazel was not available then to lead them, having been brought back to Roswell by Whitmore, but Cavitt could do it.

The second site or impact site, closer to Roswell

The archeological team (and presumably Barney Barnett) found the site, with craft and bodies, probably on Monday morning . According to Carey and Schmitt, they called the authorities in Roswell - police and fire department - after walking some five miles to find a phone in the hamlet of Mesa, on the road 285. That took some time, evidently. We don't know at what time the police and the firemen, rapidly followed by the military, reached the site. It is plausible that it took them also a bit of time to find the place. So, it seems probable that this operation of taking control happened only in the afternoon, or early evening.

It seems that they decided not to bring back the bodies immediately, having gained complete control of the site, smaller than the debris field and closer to Roswell. They decided to install them in a tent for the night. Two witnesses, Ed Sain and Raymond Van Why, told their families that they had been posted to guard the tent for the night. Both said that they had seen the craft, so it had to be at the second site, closer to Roswell. This seems confirmed by the duration of travel to the site, half an hour or so.

This decision not to bring back the bodies immediately may have been taken because the sanitary risk (already perceived as critical with the deteriorated bodies of the third site). The testimony of the photographer Benthall, brought the next morning, seems to confirm that (obliged to wear a protective suit, noticing a smell of formaldehyde in the tent, seeing a refrigerator truck.).

On the other hand, the survivor may have been brought back to the base as soon as Monday evening, in an ambulance.

Tuesday, July 8

Briefing of Colonel Blanchard, at 7.30 am.

If General Ramey and Colonel DuBose were there, as revealed by Walter Haut, they probably had arrived on Monday evening , and they returned to Fort Worth as soon as Tuesday morning after the briefing, to prepare the press meeting with a weather balloon in the afternoon.

Marcel and Cavitt make their report. At this time, all must be worried by the risk of not being able to control rapidly enough the two sites at the Foster ranch, hence the decision to issue a rather vague press release in the morning, in order to be able to look good if they fail. At the briefing, that decision is made in liaison with the Pentagon.

Toward the end of Tuesday morning, the military are able to cordon the whole area. The risk of leak in the public is considerably reduced, and it becomes possible to organize the balloon story at Fort Worth in the afternoon.

Bringing the craft and bodies to the base

The craft is brought back to the base during Tuesday afternoon, as told by several witnesses.

The bodies of the second site, after the photographic session, are brought to the base during Tuesday, at the end of the morning, or early afternoon.

It remains a little difficult, however, to place correctly the testimonies of Eli Benjamin and Montoya. Regarding Benjamin, a

clear point, apparently, is that he had just finished a night guard when he was requested to go again on guard at the big hangar P3. Also, he recalls that there were more cars than usual at the parking of the headquarters, a detail which seems to confirm the date of Tuesday morning, with a briefing more important than usual. In that case, the bodies that he saw were those of the second site, brought sometime in the morning. And these are the bodies that Benjamin had to bring to the hospital, where he saw several medical and nonmedical officers already waiting for them.

Benjamin noticed the foul smell at the hospital, a detail which seems to confirm that the smelly bodies of the third site were already there, for an autopsy, and had been brought already on Monday evening. In any case, we have the credible testimony of Miriam Andrea Bush who confirmed a medical examination.

If this time line is correct, Montoya would have seen the bodies, in the hangar P3, sometime on Tuesday. Was it in the morning or in the afternoon? One question is: how could he enter the base, which was supposedly locked at that time? Perhaps because there was a lot of agitation during the whole day, and some lack of command, many officers being already out, at the sites, or on their way to Fort Worth.

Transportation of the craft, the debris, the bodies and the survivor.

It seems probable that the smelly bodies, after an aborted autopsy at the hospital, were secured in a distant area, under a tent for the night of Tuesday to Wednesday, before being loaded in a crate in the B-29 "Straight Flush", on Wednesday. There is some uncertainty remaining for the transportation of the bodies of the second site. According to the testimony of General Blanchard, they were sent first to Muroc (now named Edwards AFB), and later to Wright field, in a plane piloted by Captain Henderson.

There is uncertainty as to the transportation of the living being, and of the remains of the craft.

According to Lt.col Magruder, they were carried to Wright field, since he told his sons that he had seen them there around mid-July. The transportation of the craft would have been made by road, presumably.

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 07:45:18 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 13:40:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 11:19:06 -0700
>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

<snip>

>When he arrived, I was shocked
>at how unconcerned he seemed. He was upset about the monetary
>loss, but mutilation didn't seem to bother him at all.

Ed,

When I read accounts like this, where the livestock owners are seemingly so disconcerned about determining the nature of what happened to their animals (obviously to be able to better protect those remaining,) I am brought back to the interesting experience I had in Ohio in 1972. In the same general area where I have mentioned the season-long occurrence of a UFO.

Many farms had been condemned for the underway efforts to build a reservoir, Caesar Creek Reservoir. This area being central to the Adena/Hopewell cultures, I had begun to try and attract the state to expend efforts for reclamation excavation of important archeological sites before they came underwater. I was asked to provide a governor's report and this required extensive access to these lands in question and my presence became more and more familiar to those still yet to leave.

One farm still had a number of cattle and horses, as well as Hopewell mounds. It's owner and I became friendly, especially when I found something in my forays that had been lost to the family and sought for some 75 years, the complete harness for a Civil War era Union six-horse wagon team.

One morning I discovered a pony on this farm that had been mutilated in the manner so often described. No blood, no apparent tissue decay, no signs of predator involvement; genitalia, renal track, incision of part of the jaw line and mouth tissue...all removed.

I was surprised to learn the farmer, who I had spoken with just earlier that same morning, was aware of this and yet had not mentioned it to me. In fact, he wasn't even upset.

I pressed this point. His reply took me back when he answered that he wasn't supposed to tell me, but "he always received compensation when these things happen."

I asked who was compensating him and he passed it off, "well, the government or the military... but they don't wear uniforms."

And the matter dropped there. The very next month I was taking samples from a loaf mound and approached by a man claiming to be "with the State" who advised me to "stop harming the geosyncline pattern of erosion".

Checking with the State, no one had any idea what this BS meant or who might have uttered it.

How many witnesses have been tampered with in this manner long before any investigators get to them? As the public opinion, thanks to the increase of UFO documentaries on television, broadens, perhaps we'll begin to find out.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: Carol Maltby <carolmaltby.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 11:51:27 -0400
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:11:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 11:19:06 -0700
>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>While I was waiting for him to arrive, I took several photos of
>the carnage and the mutilated cow. When he arrived, I was shocked
>at how unconcerned he seemed. He was upset about the monetary
>loss, but mutilation didn't seem to bother him at all.

>"Just possums".

>I talked with him later and he said the Vet blamed it all on a
>bacteria that often can make cattle sick after a Spring snow
>fall. At the time, I didn't realize how common the mutilation
>problem was in the area. I still have the photos. The farm dog,
>seemingly healthy at the time of the incident, curled up and died
>a month later, without any warning.

Were you able to talk with any of the local vets about this, to
get their opinions?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 13:30:18 -0400
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:37:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 09:39:24 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

>Several scientific sources have published spreadsheet summaries
>of UFO data. These list numbers of observations by place, time,
>date, type of craft, craft characteristics, number of witnesses,
>etc. But where can we find a similar spreadsheet summary of alien
>abduction accounts?

>I reviewed several source books and websites with negative
>results. References, in a few of the sources, indicate numbers of
>victims in the hundreds of thousands, and possibly much more. But
>I can find no quantified lists or spreadsheets. For those
>interested, I can email the list of the sources I have reviewed
>so far.

>For possibly too short of a time, I also hosted a now defunct
>blog listing the alien abduction accounts of anyone gutsy enough
>to post, even anonymously. But the samples and numbers I was
>working with never approached any accurate level of credibility,
>before general interest, measured by numbers of original
>responses, waned.

Hi Rick,

You asked:

>Can anyone point to an answer available to the public?

The short and dirty response is a resounding, 'No'!

Rick, spend a little time at the archives reviewing some of my
old posts to the List. For many moons I pushed hard to get all
the raw data that was, then, in the possession of the few
existing UFO abduction researchers to be gathered/catalogued into
a single data base. Efforts have been made to get all that data
catalogued by the people running the MUFON Abduction Project. But
it has not yet produced anything of much value, at least in terms
of raw stats that are useable by people who can reliably
interpret it.

Just a side note: MUFON never publicly revealed the results of an
"internal investigation" it promised to conduct as to whether the
then head of the MUFON Abduction Project, John Carpenter, had
compromised the privacy rights of abductees by selling unredacted
abductee reports - that had been submitted to the Project by
various researchers -) to millionaire Robert Bigelow and his NIDS.
Never did get an answer to that one.

Also, very important to bear in mind at all times; almost without
exception, the individuals who are considered to be 'abduction
researchers' are not really 'researchers' - by any stretch of the
imagination.

The individuals oft referred to as "abduction researchers" are
nothing more, or less, than authors of books on the subject.
I'm not minimizing their role, just stating the fact that it's a
misnomer to call an auto-mechanic a brain surgeon.

Research involves the very systematic gathering, cataloguing, and analysis of the data. What individuals like Budd Hopkins, Ray Fowler and most of the others do is; gather the raw data and then write/publish a book about it.

Don't expect authors to behave, or to follow the same protocols as a highly trained 'research' person. I learned that lesson the hard way by repeatedly bashing my head against that wall.

Keep in there swinging, Rick. The only way to take down walls is to hammer and chip away at them. You might want to pick up where I left off on a few 'worthy' battles -for the sake of the abductees. Before you joined the List I was swinging a sledge hammer at those walls for more than a decade. My arms just got tired.

Pick up the hammer and swing away, Rick.

Best,

John Velez, Battle-weary warrior

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 8](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:44:31 -0300
Archived: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:41:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 08:29:51 EDT
>Subject: Colorado Project Had More Than 50% 'Unexplaineds'!

>New Revelation -- Colorado Project Had More Than 50% Unexplained

>Two stunning new revelations have emerged from the collection of
>1,200 pages of files copied by MUFON's Project Pandora from the
>files of the late Roy Craig, a physical chemist who was a key
>investigator for the University of Colorado's UFO study. One, it
>turns out that late in the study a project scientist wrote a memo
>admitting that more than 50% of their cases had turned out to be
>unexplained. Two, proof has now been found that project director
>Edward Condon had not in fact read his own report before writing
>up the report's "Conclusions and Recommendations," the opening
>chapter in the front of the report.

<snip>

Hi Brad,

You, myself and a few others have been making the point for some time that the "thrown bone" of 5 percent unexplained is not supportable. Never has been in the cases I've personally come investigated. I suspect that investigators and to some extent researchers have grabbed onto the admitted 5 percent allowed by some nebulous authority. Ufology saw this as a thin wedge and proof of true unknowns. On the other hand however that authority could claim that there wasn't enough detail to prove that they were IFOs.

It is surprising frankly - considering the skewed "tone" of the investigation [unsuspected at the beginning] - that Condon didn't deliberately cherry pick his cases to influence the outcome. Perhaps he did to some extent. But it didn't work apparently. The book, UFOs Yes - Where the Condon Committee Went Wrong, by Dr. David R. Saunders and R. Roger Harkins should be sold as a package with the Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects. Saunders was part of the original research team but was fired later when he among others began to question Condon's non-scientific methods.

Under the Chapter 15 title Condon's Favorite Cases, Saunders writes the following:

"Dr. Edward U. Condon had developed a chronic case of psychocermaic itch, and to our constant dismay, he scratched it constantly.

It was this monomania-Condon's seemingly inexplicable preoccupation with "crackpot" aspect of the UFO problem-that laid us open to the most criticism from outsiders."

Saunders goes on to say that he personally was offended. Condon was spending half of his valuable time investigating these case

and alienating APRO and NICAP whose resource the committee relied upon:

"It was as if Condon had lost all sense of perspective and was sacrificing these unfortunates [the crackpots] to relieve his own frustration.

In each case the the situation was the same; only the characters were changed. It seemed that as soon as Condon had gotten as many laughs as he could from one case, he would immediately top it with another."

Saunders goes on to give examples.

I'm aware that both Condon and Roy Craig spent time investigating cases that most of us would have blown off as not worth bothering with. His excuse being that all phases of the phenomenon had to be explored doesn't cut it - and he knew that.

Astronomers/geologists, etc. who study the Moon's make-up for example don't vet the green cheese theory as part of their study. Geologists don't attempt to discount hollow earth theories when they study mantle, plate tectonics or subduction, etc.

In a letter to me, in response to mine to him, Robert Powell mentions the detailed work that Craig would do on cases really not worthy of mention. It's a fault he as a scientist himself has seen often in science where blinders are put on and nothing deters that person from the squirrel tracks when they are hunting Moose. You don't have to go far in this business to see that, BTW.

Robert did allow one thing and that was that the Condon research team often had to wait months - and the term of the study was limited - to get details from the air force on cases that they themselves had reported. This foot dragging mind you was by the very entity that had manufactured the "study" in the first place. Often the material were not forth-coming. In effect the limited term of the study was used as a ploy to avoid providing documents to the team. Robert used the RB-47 case as an example.

As Brad has already mentioned, there is much research to be done as the material comes forth, but it will take time and money. As we all know both are in short supply in this field.

It seems that James Carrion is directing MUFON in a direction it sorely needed. Robert Powell for instance manages a MUFON History team consisting of Jan Aldrich, Mike Swords, Tom Tulien, and several new researchers to the field. It was Jan Aldrich who suggested the Condon Archives in the first place and Jan is an excellent researcher as are the others on that team.

In large part I found this research to be a breath of fresh air in the stodgy, fetid attic of the UFO phenomenon. Sometimes it looks like the field is actually getting somewhere.

(c) 2008 by Don Ledger

Note the above copyright.

Of late I have been plagerized by those such as JD Booth on UFO CaseBook. Booth plagerized an article on this list re the Stephenville case complete with an aviation chart graphic. When he was confronted he pulled it off. Months later he claimed to have written the article himself and had been forced to take it off by the US Secret Service under threat of loosing his website. Mike Salla bought into this lie and made mention of it as just another way that the UFO field is being restricted by covert/black US government agencies.

I would advise anyone reading cases on UFO Case Book to beware of the source which in my opinion lacks any credibility.

Errol, BTW, discontinued Booth's access to this List.

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

See :

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 14:40:29 EDT
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 08:31:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 12:37:05 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 18:00:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sat, 6 Sep 2008 16:52:33 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>><snip>

>>>Another question is the destination of the bodies. Some were
>>>carried to Fort Worth, some to Wright Field. Blanchard said
>>>that some of them were carried first to Muroc, before being
>>>shipped to Wright.

>>A very interesting source is the "Roswell Report" issued by
>>CUFOS (July 1991).

>>There you can find the timeline of events. On page 4 you can
>>read that on noon of July 9: "the crate with bodies is moved
>>from the hangar to Bomb Pit Number One".
>>One crate for several bodies.

>>On page 5 you can read that in late afternoon the same day at
>>4:00 p.m.:

>>"The crate from Bomb Pit Number One is transferred to a B-29
>>and flown (8th flight out)to Fort Worth."

>Joachim, and all,

>Yes, it was a very good source, but there have been many other
>valuable publications,since, especially the book of Tom Carey and
>Don Schmitt, Witness to Roswell, in 2007.

>They proposed a new time line, with a lot of new witnesses.
>However, I feel that it raises some questions, and I propose a
>slightly different one, which is probably not the last word
>either.

>I will read with great interest any comment about it.

>Big Snip

>The archeological team (and presumably Barney Barnett)
>found the site, with craft and bodies, probably on Monday morning .

<snip>

By the way, I lived in Roswell and learned of the story before
any of the Roswell researchers came along and still remain open

minded about it... the core witnesses are difficult to brush aside... It is likely that this information came to me through Emily Simms family (guessing?).

When I first learned about the case, alien bodies were recounted. However, I remain objective and resolutely in the middle despite learning this from my brother's teacher at school. I can understand how Edgar Mitchell could have heard similar accounts.

Barney Barnett had nothing directly to do with the Roswell site. I interviewed ~450 people on the Plains of St. Augustine in the mid 1990's. Any one who tells you differently was just reasonably projecting with less information available. Barney's Secretary (O.T.) had worked for Barnett in 1946(?) and this was her first job (17). It was then she was told of this incident in her first two weeks there. John Greenwald's son told me that unlike J. F. "Fleck" Danley, his father went to the site after Barney came into the office and then watched it get carted away. He did not tell Moore earlier since he was a Bureau of Land Management director. John's son identified the site for me by topographic map (he was a aerial cartographer). There was NO fence south of the road going from Datil to Horse Springs and Alice Knight said Barney had to go through a fence/gate to get to the crash site. This places it north of the road in agreement with Greenwald's son's testimony/site location. His father took him to the site years earlier. Barney had an impeccable reputation. The 1946 date is still an open question since another witness (Dorothy Bissell Cox) also recalls that same 1946 summer as the time that a truck driver friend of hers came through Magdalena on his way to Las Cruces. He said the town was talking about "Space Beings" and a crashed flying saucer. She was between her first and second husband in only that year(?). I have yet to locate the newspapers from the key months in question since those particular ones are mysteriously missing. A great project for someone since this may have been relayed in some fashion in the local paper (Magdalena). I'm open to this being the summer of 1947 but that is not what the witnesses told me...

Not trying to push the data to fit anyone's scenario... I just collected information as it was told to me and tried to find as much corroboration from as many individuals as I could, cross verifying. Yes, more work can be done and loose ends still exist.

Stanton Friedman was very helpful early on in my contact with a local reporter Ann Sullivan and was very giving in his assistance with other witnesses he had talked with previously. Yes, I talked with all the key witnesses at that time...

Roswell site (Foster Ranch):

I had Bill Brazel locate the Foster Ranch crash site on topographic map (yes no one had done that earlier) before he died. He and his son were very helpful. Bill would only tell me it was a bunch of Foil and wood-like fragments . . . Aluminum foil had just come on the market and most people had familiarity with heavier Tin Foil only. If the Al foil had been reinforced with cloth on one side it would have been harder to tear and most likely these pieces would have survived longer (Bill collected them over a period of two years). Also note that the rubber of these balloons will eventually turn black and become brittle in the Sun and not resembling in color nor physical make-up the original rubber material. If the Balsa wood was coated with Wood Glue, it too would have been harder to break and dent (elementary mechanical engineering). Allegedly, tape with purple flowers was used to reinforce some of the bonds between the Foil and Balsa (bought at discount from a toy company if I recall correctly from Charlie Moore). When peeled off they probably would have left an image impregnated on the wood beams... (just relaying what anyone of you would have learned had you investigated these cases).

If you want a description of the Roswell material read the least contaminated source available, "The Roswell Incident, 1980." Yes, purple foil with flowers is described often. People will tell you that other balloons had come down and that we are merely confusing the two . . . but I'll leave that to your thinking cap too.

If this was part of a project to detect Russian bomb tests, they could not know what information was already out there floating around and all safe guards would have been taken to silence witnesses quickly to keep this from unfolding in the National

Press. This was the beginning of the atomic era! And, just think, our enemies could have learned about it from reading the paper. The mind set then would have been to assume the worst case possible. We have the vision of hindsight that they did not. Yes, some high ranking officers at Roswell would not have a need to know nor would others.

This is not just another viewpoint because unlike others I can actually entertain several conflicting possibilities and naturally feel much more comfortable in allowing you to make/weigh that decision/information for yourself as much as I do for myself - by presenting all the facts both pro and con. Is there really any other way to do it correctly... ? Be careful to clarify if you are just hearing of someone else's opinion. And, unfortunately, it is opinion that erroneously become and substitutes for facts and why the truth can seemingly come out of no where years later. But, if you look, its was most likely already there...

If a researcher can not tell you the pros and cons of any case, then you have reasonable justification in looking else where for the truth. Believe me, all cases have pros and cons and it is not our job to filter it but to report it. One researcher should be able to contain the sum total of the possibilities and not be ridiculed for doing so. I'm sure other researchers have some doubts too. So ask them where they think the case is weakest/strongest... that reaches to the heart of the debate from their vantage point. I'm always open to learning more about their pro and cons. . . .

Keep it simple in this prodigious undertaking of UFO fact finding. Never put yourself above any case. Be content in uncovering new information and enjoy the journey of discovery as much as anything else.

Sincerely,

Viktor Golubik

P.S. - Yes, a missile crashed at the Gerald Anderson site in the early 1960's. Who would have thought ...

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep_9](#)

Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 18:45:24 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 08:32:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

>From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 13:30:18 -0400
>Subject: Re: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 09:39:24 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Quantified Alien Abduction Data?

>>Several scientific sources have published spreadsheet summaries
>>of UFO data. These list numbers of observations by place, time,
>>date, type of craft, craft characteristics, number of witnesses,
>>etc. But where can we find a similar spreadsheet summary of alien
>>abduction accounts?

<snip>

>Hi Rick,

>You asked:

>>Can anyone point to an answer available to the public?

>The short and dirty response is a resounding, 'No'!

>Rick, spend a little time at the archives reviewing some of my
>old posts to the List. For many moons I pushed hard to get all
>the raw data that was, then, in the possession of the few
>existing UFO abduction researchers to be gathered/catalogued into
>a single data base. Efforts have been made to get all that data
>catalogued by the people running the MUFON Abduction Project. But
>it has not yet produced anything of much value, at least in terms
>of raw stats that are useable by people who can reliably
>interpret it.

<snip>

>Also, very important to bear in mind at all times; almost without
>exception, the individuals who are considered to be 'abduction
>researchers' are not really 'researchers' - by any stretch of the
>imagination.

<snip>

>Research involves the very systematic gathering, cataloguing, and
>analysis of the data. What individuals like Budd Hopkins, Ray
>Fowler and most of the others do is; gather the raw data and then
>write/publish a book about it.

>Don't expect authors to behave, or to follow the same protocols
>as a highly trained 'research' person. I learned that lesson the
>hard way by repeatedly bashing my head against that wall.

>Keep in there swinging, Rick. The only way to take down walls is
>to hammer and chip away at them. You might want to pick up where
>I left off on a few 'worthy' battles -for the sake of the
>abductees. Before you joined the List I was swinging a sledge
>hammer at those walls for more than a decade. My arms just got

>tired.

>Pick up the hammer and swing away, Rick.

>Best,

>John Velez, Battle-weary warrior

I'd be happy to, my battle-weary friend! With help, that is.

I don't want to re-invent anything, but if the principal's aren't sharing for mercenary or other reasons, we can still use a tabulation approach, footnoting the sources to which we have access. We can preserve anonymity by using data that's been objectified. We'd list the data by category, anonymous and otherwise.

I know this is nothing new. But I, for one, would like to see it done, and published, as freely and widely as possible, for anyone to "number-crunch" ad nauseum!

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 13:31:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 14:40:29 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 12:37:05 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>The archeological team (and presumably Barney Barnett)
>>found the site, with craft and bodies, probably on Monday
>>morning .

><snip>

>By the way, I lived in Roswell and learned of the story before
>any of the Roswell researchers came along and still remain open
>minded about it... the core witnesses are difficult to brush
>aside... It is likely that this information came to me through
>Emily Simms family (guessing?).

>When I first learned about the case, alien bodies were
>recounted. However, I remain objective and resolutely in the
>middle despite learning this from my brother's teacher at
>school. I can >understand how Edgar Mitchell could have
>heard similar accounts.

Viktor,

I am glad to learn that you, too, heard in Roswell of a UFO crash
with alien bodies in the area of Roswell. That makes one more
indirect witness after hundreds of others.

Do I understand you correctly?

>Barney Barnett had nothing directly to do with the Roswell
>site.

>I interviewed ~450 people on the Plains of St. Augustine in the
>mid 1990's. Any one who tells you differently was just
>reasonably projecting with less information available. Barney's
>Secretary (O.T.) had worked for Barnett in 1946(?) and this was
>her first job (17). It was then she was told of this incident
>in her first two weeks there. John Greenwald's son told me that
>unlike J. F. "Fleck" Danley, his father went to the site after
>Barney came into the office and then watched it get carted
>away.

>He did not tell Moore earlier since he was a Bureau of Land
>Management director. John's son identified the site for me by
>topographic map (he was a aerial cartographer). Their was NO
>fence south of the road going from Datil to Horse Springs and
>Alice Knight said Barney had to go through a fence/gate to get
>to the crash site. This places it north of the road in
>agreement >with Greenwald's son's testimony/site location.

<snip>

So, if I understand you well again, Barnett would have seen a UFO crashed , not near Roswell in 1947, but in the Plains of San Agustin 1946.

<snip>

>Roswell site (Foster Ranch):

>I had Bill Brazel locate the Foster Ranch crash site on
>topographic map (yes no one had done that earlier) before he
>died. He and his son were very helpful. Bill would only tell
>me >it was a bunch of Foil and wood-like fragments . . .
>Aluminum foil had just come on the market and most people had
>familiarity with heavier Tin Foil only. If the Al foil had been
>reinforced with cloth on one side it would have been harder
>to tear and most likely these pieces would have survived
>longer (Bill collected them over a period of two years).

<snip>

I have read almost all the books on Roswell, including the skeptical ones, and I have written one too, by the way (480 pages in French).

About balsa wood sticks, I recommend the book of engineer Robert Galganski "The Roswell debris field" (FUFOR, 2002) and his article "The glue explanation just won't stick" (IUR, Winter 1997-1998). I glued myself a balsa wood stick, let it dry for a night, and verified for myself how easy it was to break it. Just try it. No, it does not make it!

And, BTW, as for the flowered tape, the Mogul 4 balloon train (the only one with radar targets and flowered tape) was never launched. Brazel probably found a couple of balloons with radar target, sometime in June - they were launched every day in June in White Sands by the NYU team - but it had nothing to do with the debris field that he discovered at the beginning of July.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 09:51:07 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 13:31:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

List:

I really hate to wade into this again, but here goes nothing...

Don Ledger noted:

>You, myself and a few others have been making the point for some
>time that the "thrown bone" of 5 percent unexplained is not
>supportable. Never has been in the cases I've personally come
>investigated. I suspect that investigators and to some extent
>researchers have grabbed onto the admitted 5 percent allowed by
>some nebulous authority. Ufology saw this as a thin wedge and
>proof of true unknowns. On the other hand however that authority
>could claim that there wasn't enough detail to prove that they
>were IFOs.

I know that Brad and others have attacked me for daring to
publish our results showing that only a small percentage of UFOs
are high-quality unknowns, but to quote Stan Friedman, it seems
to be a matter of: "I've made up my mind, don't bother me with
the facts."

The reality is that when we started doing our case-by-case
analysis many years ago, I was actually surprised that when we
actually looked at each case in the files, the percentage of
high-quality unknowns was really not very high. In fact, the
percentage ranged between 2 and 10 per cent. Overall, on first
pass, the percentage of unknowns from the raw data was about 15
per cent, but when we sat down and went through the cases, we
could whittle that down to a smaller number of "good cases" each
year.

Take a look at our studies available online at:

survey.canadianuforeport.com

[I think the reason why the Condon Report had more than 50 per
cent unknowns is because they seemed to only publish details on
well-investigated cases. (One case in particular that I have
studied and written about extensively, the Falcon Lake case, is
Case 22 in the Report, and I note in my lectures that it's listed
as "unexplained.")]

I'm working with Geoff Dittman now on a 20-year longitudinal
analysis of Canadian UFO reports. It's been two decades since we
began compiling case data and publishing the annual Canadian UFO
Survey as of next year, and I am going back to combine all the
years' data into one file for a thorough analysis. (This is a
difficult job for many reasons I can talk about later.) I started
with the 1989 reports and began sorting through them one by one.
No matter what the source: military, police, UFO groups, NUFORC,
Vike, or UFOROM, the majority of reports are simple lights in the
sky, stars, planets, fireballs, meteors, aircraft and balloons.
Only a small percentage each year are unknowns, and only a
smaller number are "good" cases.

How, then, do we reconcile the difference between the perceived
impression that the percentage of unknowns must be higher than 5
per cent with the result of looking at the actual data?

First of all, I must say that I have great respect for Don Ledger. He has been invaluable in helping me with UFO case investigation in the Maritimes year after year. I cannot disagree with his view that the percentage of unknowns within cases he deals with is higher than 5 per cent.

All I can do is note that in the data we have available to us, and this includes RCMP files, National Defence as well as civilian reports, the percentage of unknowns is relatively low. The much-heralded MoD release of British cases supports this too; most of the official British cases aren't that interesting. (Note: In Canada, we have had access to these kinds of "official UFO reports" for many years.)

One obvious solution to the paradox is to suggest that the databases themselves are flawed. Brad Sparks has argued that we're including too many IFOs instead of UFOs, hence the percentages are skewed. But when you look at the labels for the databases (particularly civilian websites), they all describe "UFO" reports. Even the cases we get from RCMP and military sources are actually titled "UFO Sighting" at the top of the standard form, and most of these turn out to be stars or planets.

So, I doubt this is the case. The reality is that when one looks at raw UFO report data, only a relatively small percentage is categorized as "unknown."

As for the problem that debunkers use the small percentage as fuel for their argument that the unknowns are only outliers and "noise" in the data, this is not supported. As Stan Friedman notes in his lectures (and books), even the USAF Special Report tables show that the unknowns are fundamentally different from the knowns, insufficient data cases and explained cases. Remember, we note in our annual surveys that the high-quality unknowns are not filed as "possible explanation" cases or "insufficient information" cases. These are relatively well-investigated UFO cases that do not seem to have prosaic explanations such as stars, planets, aircraft, fireballs, balloons or the like.

I would suggest that ufologists not deny that the percentage of unknowns is low in the body of UFO data. I don't think there's any reason to worry that debunkers will use this fact as ammunition to attack UFO reports in general. Big deal. The facts speak for themselves. There are a dozen or two good cases every year in Canada; probably a factor of ten more than that in the USA. Many more around the world.

These are the cases to focus on. I don't worry about the IFOs, but I need to identify which cases are which through solid case investigation, research and analysis.

Chris Rutkowski

My blog is: uforum.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 14:20:41 -0400
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 15:58:43 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 14:40:29 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>Barney Barnett had nothing directly to do with the Roswell
>>site.

>>I interviewed ~450 people on the Plains of St. Augustine in the
>>mid 1990's. Any one who tells you differently was just
>>reasonably projecting with less information available. Barney's
>>Secretary (O.T.) had worked for Barnett in 1946(?) and this was
>>her first job (17). It was then she was told of this incident
>>in her first two weeks there. John Greenwald's son told me that
>>unlike J. F. "Fleck" Danley, his father went to the site after
>>Barney came into the office and then watched it get carted
>>away.

>>He did not tell Moore earlier since he was a Bureau of Land
>>Management director. John's son identified the site for me by
>>topographic map (he was a aerial cartographer). Their was NO
>>fence south of the road going from Datil to Horse Springs and
>>Alice Knight said Barney had to go through a fence/gate to get
>>to the crash site. This places it north of the road in
>>agreement >with Greenwald's son's testimony/site location.

><snip>

>So, if I understand you well again, Barnett would have seen a UFO
>crashed, not near Roswell in 1947, but in the Plains of San
>Agustin 1946.

><snip>

Gildas,

The Barney Barnett story relates to the area West of Socorro, and very close to the Plains of San Augustine, if not in them. This is nowhere near Roswell, NM; however, Barnett's name often comes up in Roswell discussions and Stanton Friedman is one who believes that part of the craft responsible for the Roswell event crashed in the Plains. If memory serves, the Barnett story is part of his evidence in support of that site. This is, of course, one of four major sites identified as where the main craft came down (as opposed to the debris field that Marcel saw).

All I can say is that there are a lot of anecdotal tales being promoted with regard to Roswell, and while interesting, they haven't led to any resolution and often muddied the waters even more. I find it interesting that most of the researchers that have spent time investigating the Roswell event haven't rushed to

accept the newer testimony and information that seems to be trickling out via certain researchers. Part of this is personality based, and I don't believe most researchers are willing to compromise their own theories to make them fit with the theories of others. I'm also not convinced that any amount of information or evidence would help to get the general public really interested in Roswell as a real event at this point.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 12:10:34 -0700
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 16:03:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 09:51:07 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>Don Ledger noted:

>>You, myself and a few others have been making the point for some
>>time that the "thrown bone" of 5 percent unexplained is not
>>supportable. Never has been in the cases I've personally come
>>investigated. I suspect that investigators and to some extent
>>researchers have grabbed onto the admitted 5 percent allowed by
>>some nebulous authority. Ufology saw this as a thin wedge and
>>proof of true unknowns. On the other hand however that authority
>>could claim that there wasn't enough detail to prove that they
>>were IFOs.

>I know that Brad and others have attacked me for daring to
>publish our results showing that only a small percentage of
>UFOs are high-quality unknowns...

>The reality is that when we started doing our case-by-case
>analysis many years ago, I was actually surprised that when we
>actually looked at each case in the files, the percentage of
>high-quality unknowns was really not very high. In fact, the
>percentage ranged between 2 and 10 per cent. Overall, on first
>pass, the percentage of unknowns from the raw data was about 15
>per cent, but when we sat down and went through the cases, we
>could whittle that down to a smaller number of "good cases"
>each year.

>[I think the reason why the Condon Report had more than 50 per
>cent unknowns is because they seemed to only publish details
>on well-investigated cases.

<snip>

>No matter what the source: military, police, UFO groups, NUFORC,
>Vike, or UFOFORUM, the majority of reports are simple lights in the
>sky, stars, planets, fireballs, meteors, aircraft and balloons.
>Only a small percentage each year are unknowns, and only a
>smaller number are "good" cases.

>How, then, do we reconcile the difference between the perceived
>impression that the percentage of unknowns must be higher than 5
>per cent with the result of looking at the actual data?

<snip>

>All I can do is note that in the data we have available to us,
>and this includes RCMP files, National Defence as well as
>civilian reports, the percentage of unknowns is relatively low.
>The much-heralded MOD release of British cases supports this
>too; most of the official British cases aren't that interesting.

>(Note: In Canada, we have had access to these kinds of "official
>UFO reports" for many years.)

>One obvious solution to the paradox is to suggest that the

>databases themselves are flawed. Brad Sparks has argued that
>we're including too many IFOs instead of UFOs, hence the
>percentages are skewed. But when you look at the labels for the
>databases (particularly civilian websites), they all describe
>"UFO" reports. Even the cases we get from RCMP and military
>sources are actually titled "UFO Sighting" at the top of the
>standard form, and most of these turn out to be stars or
>planets.

The fact remains that a number of other solid investigations have percentages of unknowns after intensive investigation much higher than 5%: Battelle Memorial Institute, Project Blue Book Special Report #14 (USAF cases through about 1954), 22%; NICAP, 16%; French GEPAN/SEPRA, 13-25%.

In contrast, the private study Alan Hendry did for CUFOS, much like your own, placed the unknowns at only 9%, and even less for the truly baffling ones

May I suggest that part of the reason for these wide differences is a matter of different data bases. People are comparing apples and oranges. The USAF, NICAP, and GEPAN/SEPRA were getting a lot of military and pilot cases, scientists, engineers, radar cases, and so on, that tend to be the higher quality cases with more experienced witnesses and better data.

E.g., the Battelle USAF study had 38% military cases, compared to Hendry's paltry 1%. The Battelle study also showed that the military cases tended to have much higher percentages of cases classified good or excellent and also rated true UFOs than the civilian cases. That is going to skew the percentages of unknowns upwards.

Private civilian researchers such as yourself or Alan Hendry of CUFOS tend to get a lot more of the ordinary civilian cases. As the Battelle study showed, civilians tend to be less experienced and more likely to submit poorer quality cases. As examples of this, Hendry placed the number of cases with "astronomical" explanations at 42% compared to only 22% of the Battelle study; Hendry also classified 37% as caused by "aircraft", vs. only 22% by the Battelle scientists. In particular Hendry had a huge percentage (19%) as being caused by advertising planes, which I suspect reflects a strong bias of cases coming from the Chicago area where CUFOS is based. More experienced witnesses are less likely to make such misidentifications.

Another factor skewing percentages is the experience and personal filters of the investigators. Different people looking at the same data are going to get different percentages of IFOs and UFOs. I think this more likely to run to one extreme or another when individual investigators are involved instead of a team. Battelle had a team of four scientists and at least two had to agree on an object identification before it could be classified identified. Even more stringently, all four had to agree that there was no conventional explanation before a case got labeled as unidentified.

However, working by oneself makes it too easy to toss cases into one category or another. Was there a true identification or probable identification, or did the individual just think there was? I had a lot of trouble with some of Hendry's "identifications", e.g. IMHO, he was a little quick to dismiss cases as "astronomical" and caused by autokinetic motion of the perceptual system when he had no background in human visual perception. However, had he been part of a team, as in the Battelle study, the others might not have been so willing to dismiss a case as identified. (This isn't meant to be a slam against Hendry or yourself, just a caution that we all have prejudices and none of us is sufficiently broad or deep in our knowledge to expertly evaluate all possible causes.)

Individual biases also show up even in some "team" efforts, such as the Condon report, since team members often worked individually on cases. As to Brad Sparks query as to why the Condon percentages of unknowns was much lower than they should have been, a partial answer was there was a lot of flippant dismissal of some very puzzling cases by individual Condon investigators, often with minimal or no investigation, as Dr. James McDonald pointed out 40 years ago. Examples were the 1952 Tremont movie case being (dismissed as probable seagulls), of the November 1957 Kirtland AFB case (a private aircraft with

extraordinary performance characteristics).

Finally there is the problem of whether something has been truly identified or not, or whether it has been only "maybe" or "possibly" identified. As Hynek pointed out, later Blue Book investigators played fast and loose with the statistics to whittle down the number of unidentifieds to very low percentages. If something might even remotely have such-and-such an "explanation" it was classified as "identified", even when it wasn't. More typically, as in the more objective Battelle or GEPAN/SEPRA studies, only about half or less of the "identifieds" were identified with certainty, the remainder being possibly identified. In less objective studies, investigators seeking to debunk cases would seize on any ridiculous rationale to "identify" objects, and boy did we see a lot of that in Project Blue Book and amongst our resident debunkers, from swamp gas to invisible constellations to pelicans.

I think it could be reasonably argued that unless a case truly defies any plausible or conceivable conventional explanation, it does not constitute probative evidence of extraordinary origins. Maybe these cases are down in the 5% or less range, but I suspect the true number of unknowns is much higher than this, as a number of good studies have suggested.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 9](#)

Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 14:40:09 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 16:05:10 -0400
Subject: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

List,

Mea culpa...

In the last line of my post where I gave my blog address, there was a typo. (Or obviously a alien/government intervention of brain alteration.)

The correct URL for my blog is:

uforum.blogspot.com

Chris Rutkowski

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:57:18 -0300
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 07:30:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>Source: KYTV 3 - Springfield, MO

><http://www.ky3.com/news/local/27934754.html>

>Sun, 07 Sep 2008

>Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People Near Norwood
>by Sara Sheffield
>KY3 News

>[Photo & video]

>NORWOOD, Mo -- Something strange is happening on a farm outside
>Norwood in Wright County. Someone or something is mutilating
>cows.

>(Warning: some of the video is a little disturbing.)

<snip>

>Anyone who can help the Wright County Sheriff's Department with
>its investigation can call (417) 741-7576.

I'm reminded of some person who several years ago claimed to have worked for - I believe - a sheriff's department or for the armed services who claimed that this was an ongoing covert study being done to determine the spread or pattern of some biology or radiation throughout North America. I'm beginning to wonder if there wasn't some truth to this theory. But it's in the dim recesses of my memory so I can't even begin to imagine where I read this report. Perhaps other might recall.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 10:14:29 +0200
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 07:32:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 12:37:05 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Joachim Koch <koch.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 7 Sep 2008 18:00:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>The bodies at the third site were badly injured, and smelling.

>Could the Roswell base send troops to take control of the third
>site already on Monday evening?

>We know that Cavitt returned to the base earlier than Marcel, who
>remained on the debris field. There are some reasons to suppose
>that it would have been decided then to go back urgently to the
>third site, to take back the bodies, even before taking control
>of the area of the Foster ranch. Brazel was not available then to
>lead them, having been brought back to Roswell by Whitmore,
>but Cavitt could do it.

I want to suggest here another possibility.

Perhaps the smelly bodies of the third site were brought to the
base only on Tuesday morning, when the military arrived at the
Foster ranch.

If we believe Eli benjamin, who said that he noticed the bad
smell when he brought the bodies from the second site to the
hospital, on Tuesday morning, it implies that the smelly bodies
were already there.

This slightly different scenario could also explain the testimony
of the photographer Benthal who said that his colleague
photographer Kirkpatrick was sent to another location (presumably
the Foster ranch) as soon as they had arrived at the second site.
He was also equipped with a rubberized suit, like Benthal, a
detail wich suggests that he had to take pictures of he smelly
bodies at the third site, before they were taken to the base.

Gildas Boudais

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

See:

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

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 15:37:54 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 07:35:04 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 12:10:34 -0700
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

Dave Rudiak noted:

>May I suggest that part of the reason for these wide differences
>is a matter of different databases. People are comparing apples
>and oranges. The USAF, NICAP, and GEPAN/SERPA were getting a lot
>of military and pilot cases, scientists, engineers, radar cases,
>and so on, that tend to be higher quality cases with more
>experienced witnesses and better data.

I would tend to agree with you on this. The source of the reports is very significant.

The fact that we get a small percentage of unknowns in our yearly studies cannot be disputed. But why we get that result is a matter of discussion and analysis. We do tend to get lots of civilian and inexperienced witness cases, so the percentage of unknowns will be low. Even the reports made to military institutions fall into this category.

I'm careful to note that my analysis applies to all Canadian UFO reports filed officially in the country in a given year. Comparison with other databases is not valid, on statistical grounds.

Your other point, that of personal bias, is a good one, but I am not working on this on my own. In fact, when we first started the annual study, it was a very complicated process; ten or more researchers sat at a table and gave their evaluations of each case (hundreds) then we discussed them and arrived at a consensus. It took a long, long time.

We've whittled this down somewhat now, but I am not always the only person looking at these cases. Geoff Dittman is working hard to come up with some standardization for the process, too. Ideally, I'd like to get a regular team together each year, but with 700+ or 800+ cases each year, the logistics are difficult. We're working on it.

For now, though, I think we have a good handle on the case evaluations. let's face it; a UFO described as a stationary starlike object in the western sky low to the horizon and observed for several hours will be Jupiter regardless of your bias. A UFO described as a brilliant green fireball zipping down to the Earth and disappearing in a matter of seconds is going to be a bolide, especially if it happens during a meteor shower. And if a witness' description of his or her UFO is incomplete and can't recall the exact date or time, the case can only be labeled as "insufficient information." Those are about 75% of the types of reports we get.

Great discussion, though; let's keep it going.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Brits Jeering Extradition

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 07:40:55 -0400
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 07:40:55 -0400
Subject: Brits Jeering Extradition

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/68oqp8>

Tuesday, September 9, 2008

Brits Jeering Extradition
By Billy Cox

Gary McKinnon, the computer geek who attained notoriety for hacking U.S. military and NASA files in search of classified UFO data in 2001-2002, just lost his final appeal in the European Court of Human Rights. That means he's headed for America, where McKinnon is charged with inflicting nearly \$1 million in damages to government property.

According to News.scotsman.com, the 42-year-old Glasgow native is "a broken man" over the prospects of spending decades in American prisons. Even though an excitable federal prosecutor described McKinnon as "the biggest military computer hacker of all time", don't expect this case - and the larger issue it raises about U.S. involvement with in UFOs - to hold the MSM. After all, Britney Spears is losing weight.

But that doesn't mean the extradition isn't creating a row in the UK, and you can almost hear the jeers at:

<http://news.scotsman.com/uk/UFO-hacker-is-broken-man.4451456.jp>

Some verbatim excerpts (with apologies to the English language):

"These idiot Americans should bl**dy well give this guys a medal, he single handed exposed thier flaws and made them look stoopid, big deal, they should have then employed him thus enabling their "top Secrets" to remain in safe hands."

"(Americans) employed Nazi scientists, why can't they give this man a job."

"I went to the protest yesterday because I am very concered at the continued erosion of our rights as British citizens, Successive goverments have sold out our rights to the EU and to the USA. This in effect is yet another treason against the crown as defined by the Treason felony act of 1885 more info here:

<http://www.iits.dircon.co.uk/newalliance/constlaw.htm>"

"Scotland, stay proud and protect democracy and not the real losers!"

"What's even more amazing is that Gary managed to find what he was looking for under the influence of cannabis. NASA and the Pentagon must be embarrassed by their ridiculous lack of security."

"Back in 2003 the British asked for two US A-10 pilots to attend

a Coroners inquest (not a trial) into the friendly fire death of a British Soldier (Lance-Corporal Matthew Hull). Then there was the friendly fire deaths of Flight Lieutenants Kevin Main and David Williams a Tornado crew shot down by the Americans, also the news reporter Terry Lloyd, whom US marines shot dead during the invasion of Iraq in 2003. How about the eight lads in the first gulf war? That's just a few mate but on all occasions the Americans have refused to co-operate in all the inquests by not making their people appear to answer questions. That's just answer questions, not stand trial. Now I know this hacking is a civilian thing mate but co-operation should work both ways."

Appears extradition has touched a nerve in the Isles.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 08:46:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 09:51:07 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>List:

>I really hate to wade into this again, but here goes nothing...

>Don Ledger noted:

>>You, myself and a few others have been making the point for some
>>time that the "thrown bone" of 5 percent unexplained is not
>>supportable. Never has been in the cases I've personally come
>>investigated. I suspect that investigators and to some extent
>>researchers have grabbed onto the admitted 5 percent allowed by
>>some nebulous authority. Ufology saw this as a thin wedge and
>>proof of true unknowns. On the other hand however that authority
>>could claim that there wasn't enough detail to prove that they
>>were IFOs.

>I know that Brad and others have attacked me for daring to
>publish our results showing that only a small percentage of UFOs
>are high-quality unknowns, but to quote Stan Friedman, it seems
>to be a matter of: "I've made up my mind, don't bother me with
>the facts."

>The reality is that when we started doing our case-by-case
>analysis many years ago, I was actually surprised that when we
>actually looked at each case in the files, the percentage of
>high-quality unknowns was really not very high. In fact, the
>percentage ranged between 2 and 10 per cent. Overall, on first
>pass, the percentage of unknowns from the raw data was about 15
>per cent, but when we sat down and went through the cases, we
>could whittle that down to a smaller number of "good cases" each
>year.

>Take a look at our studies available online at:

>survey.canadianuforeport.com

>[I think the reason why the Condon Report had more than 50 per
>cent unknowns is because they seemed to only publish details on
>well-investigated cases. (One case in particular that I have
>studied and written about extensively, the Falcon Lake case, is
>Case 22 in the Report, and I note in my lectures that it's listed
>as "unexplained.")]

>I'm working with Geoff Dittman now on a 20-year longitudinal
>analysis of Canadian UFO reports. It's been two decades since we
>began compiling case data and publishing the annual Canadian UFO
>Survey as of next year, and I am going back to combine all the
>years' data into one file for a thorough analysis. (This is a
>difficult job for many reasons I can talk about later.) I started
>with the 1989 reports and began sorting through them one by one.
>No matter what the source: military, police, UFO groups, NUFORC,
>Vike, or UFOROM, the majority of reports are simple lights in the
>sky, stars, planets, fireballs, meteors, aircraft and balloons.
>Only a small percentage each year are unknowns, and only a

>smaller number are "good" cases.

>How, then, do we reconcile the difference between the perceived
>impression that the percentage of unknowns must be higher than 5
>per cent with the result of looking at the actual data?

>First of all, I must say that I have great respect for Don
>Ledger. He has been invaluable in helping me with UFO case
>investigation in the Maritimes year after year. I cannot disagree
>with his view that the percentage of unknowns within cases he
>deals with is higher than 5 per cent.

<snip>

Chris, I'm not sure why you felt that you had to defend the annual report from what I wrote. But since you brought up the 5% figure again let me ask this; out of the last survey can you explain to me how you could even come up with a percentage? You are not going to tell me that just you and Geoff investigated over 700 cases in one year and then made your determination, are you? That would be impossible. That's over a case a day each. And they aren't streaming into your hands early on. I suspect that there is a dirth of reports that are sent to you toward the end of the reporting year.

As for my stance, I'm going on 50 odd cases over ten years or so and even then I'm pressed for time-as you know. Dave Rudiak pretty much summed up my thinking on this issue in his email. Could be my outer limit of 30 percent is high but 20-25 percent, in my estimation, is very comfortable.

I disagree that the cases Condon's Committee investigated were pulled from the best. I don't think he would have allowed that. It would be interested to know just how he arrived at what cases would be investigated. Shag Harbour came from APRO. In hindsight, it seems to me Condon himself would have preferred the cases that APRO and NICAP wouldn't touch with a 10 foot pole.

As David has already alluded to, we have our own ways of determining what constitutes cases. I determine myself what I think is a UFO report and what are curiosities. The latter are of no interest to me. The police often get complaints [non UFO related] from their communities about various happenings that are not investigated. They know what the problem is, realize that the complaint isn't worth investigating, and devote themselves to real problems. Their determination.

Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes it because they can slide it by their readers without making themsleves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government [military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a pitifully low number... it's just right.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Shag Harbour Funding Grant

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:21:09 -0300
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 08:46:23 -0400
Subject: Shag Harbour Funding Grant

Some of you may be aware that this year the Candian Feds granted the Shag Harbour UFO Incident Society Festival \$2,000.00 to stage this event in order to bring in the tourist dollars - which are now getting to be a necessity since the Atlantic fishery is now suffering from the decline of fish stocks.

Note: For the American readers et al, there is a Canadian Federal election coming up in mid-October.

On Saturday Sept.6, CTV News Net apparently aired a piece by some Federal Liberal member who put this minicule grant at the top of his list of how the Conservative Government is wasting taxpayers dollars. The 4-5 million that Quebec city gets each year for its winter carnival and the celebration this year of Quebec City turning 400 years-old were fogotten. Also forgotten were the millions doled out for the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto and the Film festival happening now. The Calgary Stampede was also forgotten.

The Liberals have also forgotten about the hundreds of millions [about 900 million] of dollars they gave to the phoney promoters in Montreal when they were in power in an attempt to buy the Quebec vote.

It just goes to show you that how silly the UFO phenomena stigma is and how it can be used to sway voters. It worked against a Presidential hopeful in the United States and I guess they are picking up on that in Canada.

If anyone can find the transcript of this report I would appreciate a copy.

I'm betting that next year this money will not be forth coming. Barring that the media release announcing the grant and the festival a week before the evnt did generate stories in both the National Post in Toronto and La Presse in Montreal.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 21:39:52 EDT
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 08:47:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 14:40:29 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 12:37:05 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>>The archeological team (and presumably Barney Barnett)
>>>found the site, with craft and bodies, probably on Monday
>>>morning .

>><snip>

>>By the way, I lived in Roswell and learned of the story before
>>any of the Roswell researchers came along and still remain open
>>minded about it... the core witnesses are difficult to brush
>>aside... It is likely that this information came to me through
>>Emily Simms family (guessing?).

>>When I first learned about the case, alien bodies were
>>recounted. However, I remain objective and resolutely in the
>>middle despite learning this from my brother's teacher at
>>school. I can >understand how Edgar Mitchell could have
>>heard similar accounts.

>Viktor,

>I am glad to learn that you, too, heard in Roswell of a UFO crash
>with alien bodies in the area of Roswell. That makes one more
>indirect witness after hundreds of others.

>Do I understand you correctly?

>>Barney Barnett had nothing directly to do with the Roswell
>>site.

>>I interviewed ~450 people on the Plains of St. Augustine in the
>>mid 1990's. Any one who tells you differently was just
>>reasonably projecting with less information available. Barney's
>>Secretary (O.T.) had worked for Barnett in 1946(?) and this was
>>her first job (17). It was then she was told of this incident
>>in her first two weeks there. John Greenwald's son told me that
>>unlike J. F. "Fleck" Danley, his father went to the site after
>>Barney came into the office and then watched it get carted
>>away.

>>He did not tell Moore earlier since he was a Bureau of Land
>>Management director. John's son identified the site for me by
>>topographic map (he was a aerial cartographer). Their was NO

>>fence south of the road going from Datil to Horse Springs and
>>Alice Knight said Barney had to go through a fence/gate to get
>>to the crash site. This places it north of the road in
>>agreement >with Greenwald's son's testimony/site location.

><snip>

>So, if I understand you well again, Barnett would have seen a UFO
>crashed , not near Roswell in 1947, but in the Plains of San
>Agustin 1946.

Hi Gildas,

Yes, that is where the evidence currently resides. William Leed went to see Barnett in the 1960's because he was told that this person actually saw a real UFO with Alien Bodies. Tracking down Leed's background associations is a good lead for others to follow with. I could never get over to see him and he would not reveal the names of the officials (two?) who told him this. A nice place for some one to pick up and continue researching. Perhaps he has told Stan something? I aptly tied to get Stan to engage him on this particular issue several times!

>><snip>

>>Roswell site (Foster Ranch):

>>I had Bill Brazel locate the Foster Ranch crash site on
>>topographic map (yes no one had done that earlier) before he
>>died. He and his son were very helpful. Bill would only tell
>>me >it was a bunch of Foil and wood-like fragments...
>>Aluminum foil had just come on the market and most people had
>>familiarity with heavier Tin Foil only. If the Al foil had been
>>reinforced with cloth on one side it would have been harder
>>to tear and most likely these pieces would have survived
>>longer (Bill collected them over a period of two years).

>snip>

> have read almost all the books on Roswell, including the
>keptical ones, and I have written one too, by the way (480 pages
>in French).

>bout balsa wood sticks, I recommend the book of engineer Robert
>alganski "The Roswell debris field" (FUFOR, 2002) and his
>Article "The glue explanation just won't stick" (IUR, Winter
>997-1998). I glued myself a balsa wood stick, let it dry for a
>night, and verified for myself how easy it was to break it. Just
>try it. No, it does not make it!

I have and since I apply it correctly, a complete thicker (see below for variant) exterior coating adds structural stability by creating a tubular exterior sheath membrane - a coating adding higher tensile strength. That is why a simple windshield coated on the inside with nothing more than a thin sheet of plastic film suddenly becomes bullet proof - preventing the glass from separating - supplying a counter gathering/absorbing force over a larger surface area. If you only coat one side, apply it too thinly/inconsistently, or not on all sides, it will not behave accordingly. In addition, you can't have the wood absorb all the glue - and, a simple weather proof seal was likely added in accordance with it's outdoor application - prior to applying the incidental glue: This also reduces the amount of glue necessary to achieve the same effect. The fact that they said it would not dent is some proof that it was thick or non-absorbed. Remember, you are asking me to excuse their word choices and their description (Like Balsa) in exchange for an alien space craft. Evan Mac Brazel uses these words (colored foil). At some point occam's razor intercedes. A good ground investigator who has dust on his pants, sweat dripping down his brow, and the voices of many witness buzzing around in his head will come away with more than what you can read in a book - leaving a more weighty experience that breaths life into words.

>And, BTW, as for the flowered tape, the Mogul 4 balloon train
>(the only one with radar targets and flowered tape) was never
>launched. Brazel probably found a couple of balloons with radar
>target, sometime in June - they were launched every day in June
>in White Sands by the NYU team - but it had nothing to do with
>the debris field that he discovered at the beginning of July.

>Gildas Bourdais

Yes, there were many Balloon launches and you can't just assume an exact date if you engage in counter arguments. If they are recalling the wrong materials, they are certainly describing the remains of them correctly. But, now getting to the crux of it: one core witness brought these materials home for his son to inspect and he too describes materials consistent with those offered up by the ranch-ended witnesses, each describing what can easily be characterized as the same remnant balloon apparatus materials. If you dismiss one you have to dismiss the other, etc. They are ranked in similar groups. Because the materials are pervasively described and attach themselves like tags, it becomes difficult to draw a line and make a strong argument that these materials here are different than those materials there, especially if they have the same attributes. On balance we must chagrin and then ask ourselves... can they be that wrong? Or, is it just some hilarious coincidence... maybe even nothing ?

We can't have it all one way and this illustrates why we must have a pro and con accounting of the facts - because, after a while, one side begins to loom too largely from the hype. And, now you've asking me to ignore how the scales actually tip in front of me - someone who actually got off his butt, investigated, and actually lived there at one time. It's a hard sell. I do have a very open mind but I have an obligation to a well balanced view of the facts. I'm actually listening to the witness testimony more than you are (not literally you) - not trying to fit it into a box that doesn't necessarily have the right shape. And, I'm actually providing areas for continued research as a result... perhaps, showing some hopeful paths to resolution.

In another part of the galaxy...

Dismissing Roswell does not remove it's significance and influences as already transformed in the society. This will have little impact. How often does the truth really matter any ways... (making a prediction for later)

Best, and no offense...

Viktor Golubik
An Inconvenient Investigator

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:43:14 +0200
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 08:48:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 14:20:41 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>The Barney Barnett story relates to the area West of Socorro, and
>very close to the Plains of San Augustine, if not in them. This
>is nowhere near Roswell, NM; however, Barnett's name often comes
>up in Roswell discussions and Stanton Friedman is one who
>believes that part of the craft responsible for the Roswell event
>crashed in the Plains. If memory serves, the Barnett story is
>part of his evidence in support of that site. This is, of course,
>one of four major sites identified as where the main craft came
>down (as opposed to the debris field that Marcel saw).

>All I can say is that there are a lot of anecdotal tales being
>promoted with regard to Roswell, and while interesting, they
>haven't led to any resolution and often muddied the waters even
>more. I find it interesting that most of the researchers that
>have spent time investigating the Roswell event haven't rushed to
>accept the newer testimony and information that seems to be
>trickling out via certain researchers. Part of this is
>personality based, and I don't believe most researchers are
>willing to compromise their own theories to make them fit with
>the theories of others. I'm also not convinced that any amount of
>information or evidence would help to get the general public
>really interested in Roswell as a real event at this point.

Steve,

We all know that there has been, and still is, some competition
between researchers. That's not a bad point since they agree on
some fundamentals of the story, at least. It gives it more
strength, actually.

If I understand you well, you seem to use the possible
dissensions as an argument to put in doubt the new testimonies
brought in the book of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt, "Witness to
Roswell", without naming it. Have you read the book? Have you
discussed it with the authors? Well, I have, and my opinion is
that it is an important book.

Last year, in Roswell, they were at the panel of the Museum,
together with Stan Friedman and Dr Marcel Jr. This year, some of
the new witnesses have been interviewed positively on several TV
programs (Si Fi channel, CNN Larry King Live) as well as the
authors. Yes, their book has drawn some interest, and the
publisher has asked them now for a new edition.

If there is no other reaction on this list, I will feel sorry for
it, more than for the authors.

Gildas Boudais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:50:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:50:00 -0400
Subject: Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter

Source: The Heral Sun - Vicoria, NSW, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/65krjk>

September 10, 2008

Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter
Staff writer

Robbie Williams appears to have finally crossed the line that separates eccentricity from madness: he insists he's been visited by a UFO.

And as if that wasn't bizarre enough, the singer said his close encounter occurred in a recording studio - just after he had laid down a track about, yep... UFOs.

Williams said a weird black light flew into his recording studio in Los Angeles and out again as he watched stunned, The Sun reported.

He said: "I had just finished writing a song called Arizona, which is about alien abduction, when there was this glow. It was magic."

Could it get any weirder? Of course it could, this is Robbie Williams we're talking about... now he plans to go out on a jet ski to look for UFOs reported to have landed in the sea.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:51:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:51:00 -0400
Subject: Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind

Source: The South Bergenite - Rutherford, New Jersey, USA

<http://www.southbergenite.com/NC/0/1703.html>

September 10, 2008

Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind
by Daniel O'Keefe

These shots of a supposed UFO over the meadowlands on the night of Aug. 28 are taken from a video posted on youtube by Radio Irish, which received them from a Sebastian Steinberg of East Rutherford. Experts point to the red and blue lights on the side and the blinking light on top as all signs that whatever it is and wherever it's from, it's in conformance with FAA aircraft lighting regulations.

Followers of the X-Files are familiar with the saying, "The truth is out there."

Well, some are saying it was out there the night of Thursday, Aug. 28, over East Rutherford. A video of an unidentified flying object spotted by East Rutherford resident Sebastian Steinberg and posted on YouTube by Radio Irish, a local radio station run by Rutherford resident Sean McCarthy, has some believing there was a UFO in our midst for a brief period last week.

McCarthy said Steinberg submitted, via e-mail, only the video, which he said was filmed in East Rutherford, and his e-mail address, but no further information. McCarthy's attempts to contact Steinberg haven't yet been returned.

The footage, which was taken at night and never brings the object into focus for long, shows a long rounded object apparently moving slowly through the sky. There's a blinking light on top of it, blue and red lights on the sides, some sort of glow at the bottom and possibly writing along its side. It was spotted moving from west to east over the meadowlands.

"It's a blimp," said Will Roseman, the mayor of Carlstadt and a pilot himself. "It's definitely a blimp. You can tell it's a blimp or a plane from the light." Roseman said planes are required to have a red light on their portside and a green light on their starboard side, which the UFO in question evidently has. He also noted that there is a blinking light at the top of the aircraft, indicating that it's moving at a low rate of speed.

"I highly doubt that UFOs would adhere to FAA aircraft lighting regulations," said Roseman.

McCarthy's commentary on the video also mentions people reporting a strange noise coming from the object. Roseman explained that blimp propellers can make a strange, deep sound when heard from below.

"There are no little green men in this case," said Shea Oakley,

the executive director of the Teterboro Aviation Hall of Fame. "It's a blimp." Oakley agreed with Roseman's assessment and verified the typical lighting patterns. He also noted that the glow towards the bottom of the object is most likely the scrolling text that can sometimes be seen on the bottom of recent blimps.

The Giants were playing a preseason game against the New England Patriots on the night of Aug. 28, so it would have been likely there was a blimp in the sky over the game. Nevertheless, FAA spokesman Jim Peters refused to confirm whether there was a blimp overhead that night.

Roseman said he's familiar with the confusion blimps can cause at night. He personally recounted from when he was getting his pilot's license: He and another pilot were flying at night as part of their training and suddenly they couldn't see anything in front of them. They quickly realized that a blimp had risen up in front of their field of vision, but at night all they could detect was the sudden disappearance of what they had been seeing before.

The National UFO Reporting Center lists 905 UFO reports for New Jersey and eight reports specifically for the South Bergenite area, with three in East Rutherford, two in Rutherford and three in Lyndhurst.

When Orson Welles' broadcast his famous War of the Worlds program aired in 1938, the spaceships were said to have landed in Grover's Mill, now part of West Windsor Township in central Jersey. But many recall evacuating the Meadowlands because Welles' description of place where the landing took place was wetlands and marsh. The broadcast, which famously caused panic among many listeners, described the alien tripods as traveling towards and eventually attacking New York, releasing poison gas and firing heat rays as they went.

See the UFO video here.

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Why Would Aliens Visit Stratford?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:52:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:52:00 -0400
Subject: Why Would Aliens Visit Stratford?

Source: The New Haven Register - New Haven, Connecticut, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/6f9wzh>

Monday, September 8, 2008

Confused By The Lights: UFO Sightings Plentiful, But Why Would Aliens Visit Stratford?

By Abram Katz
Register Science Editor

The aliens traveled from a distant galaxy recently to spend a few hours watching the Connecticut shoreline from a set of three silent orbs.

So believe a few who say they observed and photographed the airborne shapes. Something about the Nutmeg State appears to be a cosmic draw.

Loretta Parisi of Meriden saw five dots in formation leaving clouds of smoke. "This is one of the strangest things I=92ve ever seen," she said.

Others saw planes skywriting a promotion for a casino. That could clear up one mystery, perhaps.

Parisi said she never saw airplanes. Just lines of smoke.

Did anyone get a clear photo of extraterrestrial aerospace design? No.

A review of UFO reports past reveals many blobs of light, featureless dots and other photos that show funny looking clouds. The clouds are usually in focus, but the blobs and dots rarely are.

They also are photographed and videotaped, for the most part, with hand-held cameras, since their schedules are erratic. You just never know when an intelligent object from light-years away will arrive to check out Milford waterfront property, or leave trails of smoke, or hover around Earth for some inexplicable reason.

Hence, there are hundreds of unfocused, shaky images of undefined blobs posted all over the Internet =97 hardly convincing evidence of visitors from outer space.

"This kind of stuff doesn=92t impress me in the least. You can create your own photos with layer upon layer and you can make anything look real," said James Fulmer, earth scientist and astronomer at Southern Connecticut State University.

In a recent posting at www.ufostalker.com, an Orange resident wrote of seeing odd orbs of lights off beaches in Milford and Stratford and that, to be "honest, (he=92s) not sure what any of us

saw, but we know it wasn't normal."

Many UFO sightings come from a planet, but not from another planet.

Venus, always one of the brightest objects in the sky, is often mistaken for a "mother ship."

Many of these reports are result of a physiological phenomenon called autokinesis, which does not involve bending spoons or flying. Autokinesis occurs on dark nights when few objects are visible to provide comparisons.

A fixed light watched for a prolonged period can appear to move. It's an illusion, but explains many UFO reports.

Look at the red blinking light atop an antenna tower, and after a while it will start to travel. A light bulb turns into a visitor from Alpha Centauri.

Autostasis is just the opposite. A moving object seems to stand still. That would explain the sudden starting and stopping of blobs or ships.

Another common optical illusion is mistaking the motion of a car or train for the apparent motion of an object in the sky. This is why the moon seems to chase you occasionally.

Marc D'Addio, the local Earthling who saw the lights over Long Island Sound off Milford, is not convinced by mundane explanations.

"I have five other people who were with me to confirm (what we saw) as well as a friend who saw them from a different locations the same night. We have no idea what they were. ... There's no way they're any airplane or helicopter. They're virtually silent," D'Addio wrote in an e-mail.

Silent, however, just means sound waves didn't reach ears, Fulmer said. A passenger jet that passes at high altitude is also inaudible, but it's making a lot of noise.

Which brings us to small objects that are close but appear to be far away, and distant large objects that seem close, such as Venus.

What else could be at work? Kites, balloons, airplanes, model airplanes, blimps, lenticular clouds, reflections, mirages, fireworks, birds, insects, parachute spiders, planes flying in formation, helicopters, meteors, ball lightning, hoaxes, doctored photos '97 and none of the above, which no one can explain.

Even trained observers are notoriously bad at estimating speed, size and altitude. Over the years, reports have included observational conclusions unquestioningly.

For example, in March 1985, some unidentified people in Derby and Ansonia reported seeing a brightly lit aircraft with four or five white lights making an "X." What they really saw was four or five lights, which they assumed must be a flying machine.

A "diamond-shaped craft" delineated by lights, could be an airplane, ultralight plane or four bright stars.

"You need a report from someone who can't afford to look like a fool," Fulmer said. Few people want to appear foolish, so almost all reports are made by unidentified people.

"There are aliens out there," Fulmer said. "But we're a grain of sand on a beach," one of countless unexceptional solar systems in the Milky Way galaxy.

How and why aliens would select one grain of sand over another, we don't know.

Abram Katz can be reached at akatz.nul or 789-5719.

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

See :

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 05:50:22 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 09:53:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:57:18 -0300
>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

<snip>

>I'm reminded of some person who several years ago claimed to have
>worked for - I believe - a shriff's department or for the armed
>services who claimed that this was an ongoing covert study being
>done to determine the spread or pattern of some biology or
>radiation throughout North America. I'm beginning to wonder if
>there wasn't some truth to this theory. But it's in the dim
>recesses of my memory so I can't even begin to imagine where I
>read this report. Perhaps other might recall.

There was a made-for-TV movie from about 15 years ago that had
this theme. The makers may have acquired the idea from a report
similar to the one you mention or the movie may have inspired a
coloring of some event.

Either way, both alien - off-earth - and the opportunistic cover it
provides for such illegal covert activity by our very own kind
can be parallel realities. One possibility being true does not
eliminate others being even equally so.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter

From: Dave Haith <visions1.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 15:21:15 +0100
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 12:56:47 -0400
Subject: Robbie Williams Tells Of Alien Encounter

This Herald Sun story is obviously taken from an interview done by the AboveTopSecret team when they met Robbie at James Gilliland's ranch.

Here's the link and Robbie's interview is probably halfway through.

He does tell this story but at greater length and in much fuller detail than the giggle-factor report in the Ozzie paper.

<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread389179/pg1>

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 11:30:55 -0400
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 12:58:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:43:14 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 14:20:41 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>Steve,

>We all know that there has been, and still is, some competition
>between researchers. That's not a bad point since they agree on
>some fundamentals of the story, at least. It gives it more
>strength, actually.

>If I understand you well, you seem to use the possible
>dissensions as an argument to put in doubt the new testimonies
>brought in the book of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt, "Witness to
>Roswell", without naming it. Have you read the book? Have you
>discussed it with the authors? Well, I have, and my opinion is
>that it is an important book.

>Last year, in Roswell, they were at the panel of the Museum,
>together with Stan Friedman and Dr Marcel Jr. This year, some of
>the new witnesses have been interviewed positively on several TV
>programs (Si Fi channel, CNN Larry King Live) as well as the
>authors. Yes, their book has drawn some interest, and the
>publisher has asked them now for a new edition.

>If there is no other reaction on this list, I will feel sorry for
>it, more than for the authors.

Gildas,

I'm not sure what kind of reaction would you expect? Roswell, as
a topic, has become very tired and worn out for most researchers
and you seem to assume that another witness with another good
story to tell will make a difference. My impression is that
Roswell has become so muddled in poor information and conflicting
data that holding a rational discussion of the timeline would
probably result in thousands of hours of debate and angst.

There are some who would probably not give Don Schmitt the time
of day or believe one word of anything he put on paper, and this
results from their feeling betrayed in trusting him in the past.
This type of emotional reason has no basis in whether his
information is good or not, but if he said the Sun would rise in
the morning, then some might begin to fear that it would not.

But let's look at how the Walter Haut death bed statement was

received by most researchers. One would have thought that this statement would have had some impact with Roswell Researchers, but the information wasn't really new to insiders and statements were interesting but not likely to sway those who weren't already believers. Again, personalities became a factor with the refusal to release the video tape of Haut making statements about what he saw, and most of the (historic) Roswell researchers acknowledged the Statement and moved on. It had little impact and if a statement from a military person at the scene isn't enough to get people involved in this, I'm not sure what will. Unless you're really just trying to target the UFO community, which was at least aware of it.

You do realize that there is an Annual event at Roswell and you can almost always find Friedman, Marcell Jr. and others in attendance (for obvious reasons), along with newer witnesses as they become identified. So I guess I have to ask how many witnesses you think that it will take to make a difference and get the general public interested in this case? CNN's Larry King and the Sci-Fi channel are both into this for ratings, and I hope that isn't the last best hope the field has in getting the word out. I appreciate the exposure, but neither have had much impact with the general public in the US.

Yes, I would be the first to admit that I'm becoming more cynical in my view of UFO research as it exists today. You made an interesting comment that researchers "agree on some fundamentals of the story" of the Roswell incident, but I'd be hard pressed to list very many that have general universal acceptance. We've had a few more witnesses come out of the woodwork due to the good efforts of researchers, but does that make a real difference? If it hasn't thus far, what would? I think this is the quandary that some researchers find themselves in.

Good luck in your quest.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:51:34 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 13:01:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>Chris, I'm not sure why you felt that you had to defend the
>annual report from what I wrote. But since you brought up the 5%
>figure again let me ask this; out of the last survey can you
>explain to me how you could even come up with a percentage? You
>are not going to tell me that just you and Geoff investigated
>over 700 cases in one year and then made your determination, are
>you? That would be impossible. That's over a case a day each. And
>they aren't streaming into your hands early on. I suspect that
>there is a dirth of reports that are sent to you toward the end
>of the reporting year.

Don and List:

Well, I thought it was clear that we don't personally investigate each case because we're not physically able to do so. That's why we ask for case details from those who actually receive the reports. But since there's really very little investigation going on (a phone call to a witness 2000 miles away isn't really investigating), we are relying on the evaluations of those receiving or posting the reports. In addition, our experience in dealing with case investigation and interpretation allows us to evaluate the case data that we do get. (I make this a bit more clear in my response to Dave Rudiak.)

If the 5% makes any sense at all, it may be that only about 5% of all cases are well-investigated through in-person witness interviews and site visits. This is appallingly low, but it's a consequence of the sparsity of investigators across the country.

It's not an ideal situation, but it's the best we can do at the moment. It's very possible that the lack of good investigation may lead to a low percentage of unknowns, but I doubt it. The reason is that when in-depth investigation does occur, it very often results in showing the flaws in a report and leads to an IFO designation. I think that almost all the cases we were able to investigate well so far this year turned out to have explanations. the last video case we we got, just a few weeks ago, was definitely Jupiter.

>As for my stance, I'm going on 50 odd cases over ten years or so
>and even then I'm pressed for time-as you know. Dave Rudiak
>pretty much summed up my thinking on this issue in his email.
>Could be my outer limit of 30 percent is high but 20-25 percent,
>in my estimation, is very comfortable.

Well, in my own experience, somewhat more than 50 in ten years, the ratio is much, much less. It may be a matter, as Dave suggests, of differing evaluation criteria, or it could be something else. I know that after reading report after report of stationary lights in the sky, green fireballs and UFOs with strobes flying near airports, it's not that hard to see which ones are likely IFOs and which ones bear further consideration.

>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this
Indeed. I hate getting wet.

>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>themsleves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government
>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>pitifully low number... it's just right.

I think you meant "not right".

I don't see it as convenient at all. In fact, it would be much better if it was either 1% or 50%. One per cent could definitely be noise in the data. And 50% would allow ufologists to wave data in the faces of skeptics and claim victory. The 5% figure makes ufologists work for it. It's not easy at all.

Oh, and IMHO, you're one of the best Canadian ufologists, ever.

Chris

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 10](#)

Re: Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 13:18:27 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 13:39:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind

>Source: The South Bergenite - Rutherford, New Jersey, USA

><http://www.southbergenite.com/NC/0/1703.html>

>September 10, 2008

>Close Encounters Of The Wrong Kind
>by Daniel O'Keefe

>These shots of a supposed UFO over the meadowlands on the night
>of Aug. 28 are taken from a video posted on youtube by Radio
>Irish, which received them from a Sebastian Steinberg of East
>Rutherford. Experts point to the red and blue lights on the side
>and the blinking light on top as all signs that whatever it is
>and wherever it's from, it's in conformance with FAA aircraft
>lighting regulations.

<snip>

This case was likely a blimp. However, I do not think that using
camouflage such as lights that follow our regulations or some
type of holographic projection system that would make a vessel
look like one of our planes is outlandish.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 16:42:41 -0400
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 08:38:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this
>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>themselves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government
>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>pitifully low number... it's just right.

Maybe when a way to express not conventionally explainable cases
is needed to make a point, an actual number should be used, not
a percentage?

For example, "4,000 physical trace cases" is pretty darn potent
in terms of persuasive value.

Eleanor White

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 02:12:08 -0300
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 08:42:31 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 05:50:22 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2008 14:57:18 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

><snip>

>>I'm reminded of some person who several years ago claimed to have
>>worked for - I believe - a sheriff's department or for the armed
>>services who claimed that this was an ongoing covert study being
>>done to determine the spread or pattern of some biology or
>>radiation throughout North America. I'm beginning to wonder if
>>there wasn't some truth to this theory. But it's in the dim
>>recesses of my memory so I can't even begin to imagine where I
>>read this report. Perhaps other might recall.

>There was a made-for-TV movie from about 15 years ago that had
>this theme. The makers may have acquired the idea from a report
>similar to the one you mention or the movie may have inspired a
>coloring of some event.

This wasn't a TV movie. In this case it was a verified
person-gave his name and was approachable- who posted to this
list. I believe he was a Sheriff [can't be sure] who had been in
the Army-air division-who made the claim.

I just threw it out there to see if anyone remembered. It's
likely in the archives but I don't know what I'd use for key
words. Sheriff, cattle mutilations Errol?

Not really one of my interests these days.

Don Ledger

[See:

<http://tinyurl.com/5eowly>

for search on above criteria --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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 08:46:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 21:39:52 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>About balsa wood sticks, I recommend the book of Robert
>>Galganski "The Roswell debris field" (FUFOR, 2002) and his
>>article "The glue explanation just won't stick" (IUR, Winter
>>997-1998). I glued myself a balsa wood stick, let it dry for a
>>night, and verified for myself how easy it was to break it. Just
>>try it. No, it does not make it!

>I have and since I apply it correctly, a complete thicker (see
>below for variant) exterior coating adds structural stability by
>creating a tubular exterior sheath membrane - a coating adding
>higher tensile strength. That is why a simple windshield coated
>on the inside with nothing more than a thin sheet of plastic film
>suddenly becomes bullet proof - preventing the glass from
>separating - supplying a counter gathering/absorbing force over a
>larger surface area. If you only coat one side, apply it too
>thinly/inconsistently, or not on all sides, it will not behave
>accordingly. In addition, you can't have the wood absorb all the
>glue - and, a simple weather proof seal was likely added in
>accordance with it's outdoor application - prior to applying the
>incidental glue: This also reduces the amount of glue necessary
>to achieve the same effect. The fact that they said it would not
>dent is some proof that it was thick or non-absorbed. Remember,
>you are asking me to excuse their word choices and their
>description (Like Balsa) in exchange for an alien space craft.
>Evan Mac Brazel uses these words (colored foil). At some point
>occam's razor intercedes. A good ground investigator who has dust
>on his pants, sweat dripping down his brow, and the voices of
>many witness buzzing around in his head will come away with more
>than what you can read in a book - leaving a more weighty
>experience that breaths life into words.

Viktor,

May I suggest that you read the book by Dr. Marcel Jr, published
last year, The Roswell Legacy?

See, page 56, the reproduction of his father's diploma of from
the Radar Training school, obtained in 1945.

Here is Dr Marcel's comment:

"Given his extensive training and familiarity with the technology of
the day, the later assertion made by some that my father confused
UFO debris with a radar target is ludicrous."

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Photos Pit Trent Family Vs. Newspaper

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 10:02:47 -0400
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 10:02:47 -0400
Subject: Photos Pit Trent Family Vs. Newspaper

Source: KATU-TV - Portland, Oregon, USA

<http://www.katu.com/news/28222454.html>

September 11, 2008

[Photos & video at site]

Fight Over UFO Photos Pits Family Versus Newspaper

By Dan Tilkin
and KATU Web Staff

McMINNVILLE, Ore. -- Two shots of a flying saucer over McMinnville are some of the most debated pieces of Oregon history.

Paul and Evelyn Trent took the pictures in 1950, and now their children are trying to get the negatives returned.

But the negatives are in the hands of the McMinnville News-Register newspaper, who believes they should be part of a permanent historic display in Yamhill County.

The story of how this fight developed begins on the Trent Farm more than 50 years ago.

Evelyn Trent was feeding rabbits, saw something strange in the sky and hollered for her husband, who grabbed his camera and started shooting. And then the saucer was gone.

The photos were printed in the local newspaper, which sold thousands of copies across the country.

Critics have long said that the Trents pulled off one of the most elaborate hoaxes in UFO history - that they took a pie plate or a hub cap and dangled it from power lines that run in front of the property.

The Trents always maintained they saw something. But the ridicule took a toll on the family.

"We were the alien family," said daughter Tammie Gochenour. "That's all that was talked about was the alien family."

When her parents died in the mid-1990s, the location of the negatives was a mystery. Daughter Linda Sayler eventually discovered they had been in the hands of navy physicist and UFO investigator Bruce Maccabee since 1974.

He told KATU he had called the Trents and asked to borrow the negatives so many years ago, implying that he would return them in a few weeks. But it took him longer than that - '96 and he ended up keeping them for 25 years.

Maccabee agreed to return the negatives, and Sayler thought it

would be safer if he sent them to the News-Register newspaper to pass on to her.

That was 2001, and she's been trying ever since to get the newspaper to give them back.

Phil Bladine ran the paper when the photos were first published. A letter from 1970 shows he helped get the negatives back from United Press International when they disappeared the first time.

Bladine is also the man who lent the negatives to Maccabee with the permission of the Trents three decades ago.

The fact that Bladine had the negatives to lend is the crux of why the newspaper now wants to keep them.

The newspaper argues in a letter sent to the family in 2004 that Paul Trent left the negatives in Bladine's hands "with the indication that he wanted nothing more to do with them."

The letter states the newspaper "believes that the negatives should become part of a permanent historic display in Yamhill County, with a mediated settlement as to access and other rights."

That's even after Maccabee made it clear in an e-mail that he "sent the negatives to Phil Bladine under the assumption that he would return the photos to the Trent children" and they should be returned to the family.

"The Trents' children are clearly the rightful owners since Mr. and Mrs. Trent never signed any documents giving the rights to anyone else," Maccabee told KATU.

Phil Bladine suffered a stroke several years ago and passed away this spring.

When KATU tried to talk to his son Jeb, who is the current publisher of the newspaper, he declined an interview due to the possibility of legal proceedings related to the UFO photographs.

"We maintain our belief that the negatives should become part of a permanent historic display in Yamhill County," Jeb Bladine wrote in an e-mail to KATU.

The Trent children said they don't have money to file a lawsuit and feel it is wrong to be forced to negotiate over something they feel clearly belongs to the family.

"We're not going to take them and try to make millions off them," said daughter Tammie Gochenour. "We just want to put them in like a safety deposit box, and have them locked up so we know where they're at."

"It's just something that belongs with the family," daughter Linda Sayler 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Second UFO Alert In Derry

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 10:10:47 -0400
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 10:10:47 -0400
Subject: Second UFO Alert In Derry

Source: Derry Today - Derry, Northern Ireland

<http://tinyurl.com/656ya5>

11 September 2008

Second UFO Alert In Derry

Saucer-Shaped Object Spotted Over River Foyle

By Laurence McClenaghan

A Pennyburn man has contacted the Journal reporting to have seen an unidentified flying object over the River Foyle on Monday night.

He said he saw a saucer-shaped object "the size of a people carrier" flying above the river near the Fort George site at around 10.10pm.

"I was looking out my bedroom window when I noticed an object in the air. It seemed to be hovering over the Foyle River. It was about 80 feet in the air and it had a red orange glow from it.

"Then within seconds it moved very fast to the right, in the direction of the city. It then speeded up and disappeared.

"I was all excited, calling my sisters to come and witness what I seen. I didn't believe it at first and I came downstairs and to tell my mum and dad about what I saw."

The man said his mother recalled a Journal article about a UFO sighting in the Prehen area of Derry in May.

He sent an email to the Journal, giving his name and contact number, wondering if anyone else had seen the object.

"Strange to say the least, has anybody else seen anything????"

The man has now asked not to be identified after the reaction from people he's spoken to about the sighting.

"It hasn't been overwhelmingly supportive," he said. "I don't want people to think I'm mad. But I know what I saw, it was definitely there. It began moving fast and got even faster - it was only there for a few seconds."

Did you see the UFO? Contact:

martin.mcginley.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

From: **Ed Gehrman** <egehrman.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 07:51:54 -0700
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:07:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 02:12:08 -0300
>Subject: Re: Mystery Of Mutilated Cattle Spooks People

>I just threw it out there to see if anyone remembered. It's
>likely in the archives but I don't know what I'd use for key
>words. Sheriff, cattle mutilations Errol?

Hi Don,

Was it Ted Oliphant?

<http://4dreamland.com/sndoff07.html>

He thought that the mutilations were to study Mad Cow Disease and the spread of the so-called "prions".

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:57:40 -0300
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 15:08:21 -0400
Subject: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:51:34 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>Chris, I'm not sure why you felt that you had to defend the
>>annual report from what I wrote. But since you brought up the 5%
>>figure again let me ask this; out of the last survey can you
>>explain to me how you could even come up with a percentage? You
>>are not going to tell me that just you and Geoff investigated
>>over 700 cases in one year and then made your determination, are
>>you? That would be impossible. That's over a case a day each. And
>>they aren't streaming into your hands early on. I suspect that
>>there is a dirth of reports that are sent to you toward the end
>>of the reporting year.

>Don and List:

>Well, I thought it was clear that we don't personally investigate
>each case because we're not physically able to do so. That's why
>we ask for case details from those who actually receive the
>reports.

Okay, then you are relying on the original
researcher/investigator. And I understand how most of these are
simply phone calls and taking down the witnesses statement. From
that perspective that leaves much to be desired as to
information. For one thing are the questions asked the right
questions and what's the background of the investigator?

But since there's really very little investigation going
>on (a phone call to a witness 2000 miles away isn't really
>investigating), we are relying on the evaluations of those
>receiving or posting the reports. In addition, our experience in
>dealing with case investigation and interpretation allows us to
>evaluate the case data that we do get. (I make this a bit more
>clear in my response to Dave Rudiak.)

>If the 5% makes any sense at all, it may be that only about 5% of
>all cases are well-investigated through in-person witness
>interviews and site visits. This is appallingly low, but it's a
>consequence of the sparsity of investigators across the country.

The whole thing also hangs on how many cases were reported in the
first place. because a person doesn't make a report does not mean
it didn't happen [tree falling in forest example]. Stan uses a
1:10 ratio for reporting - one in ten reports and I tend to agree
with that. if that's the case - and I forget the actual number of
reports you had in last year's survey but 760 odd sticks in my
mind] the there might have been 7,600 sightings in Canada last
year. Extrapolate the 10% rule re Canada's population versus the
American population and you have 76,000 cases in the US. I've
asked Stan's question to groups myself and get approximately the
same results. So really we are talking 5% or my 25% unknowns of

an unknown number.

If this sounds convoluted it's because it probably is.

>It's not an ideal situation, but it's the best we can do at the
>moment. It's very possible that the lack of good investigation
>may lead to a low percentage of unknowns, but I doubt it. The
>reason is that when in-depth investigation does occur, if very
>often results in showing the flaws in a report and leads to an
>IFO designation. I think that almost all the cases we were able
>to investigate well so far this year turned out to have
>explanations. The last video case we we got, just a few weeks
>ago, was definitely Jupiter.

We are spread so thin in Canada that we have to pick and choose.
So I pick and choose pilot cases. I think I'm on pretty good
ground here. For one thing they make note, as a matter of course,
details that the general public completely disregard. Pilots are
the achille's heel of the debunkers and they attack them often
for that reason.

>>As for my stance, I'm going on 50 odd cases over ten years or so
>>and even then I'm pressed for time-as you know. Dave Rudiak
>>pretty much summed up my thinking on this issue in his email.
>>Could be my outer limit of 30 percent is high but 20-25 percent,
>>in my estimation, is very comfortable.

>Well, in my own experience, somewhat more than 50 in ten years,
>the ratio is much, much less. It may be a matter, as Dave
>suggests, of differing evaluation criteria, or it could be
>something else. I know that after reading report after report of
>stationary lights in the sky, green fireballs and UFOs with
>strobes flying near airports, it's not that hard to see which
>ones are likely IFOs and which ones bear further consideration.

Well all of the above are - I admit - yawnable reports. Mind you
is they are accompanied by unusual behavior then they are worth a
second glance. But even then distance and ability to recognize
know aircraft have to be satisfied too. Military fighters have
lighted strips near the tail [like hash marks] or on the aft
fuselage that are pastel, usually green, and pretty much only
visible between two or more of them while in night formation.
They are LED in nature. They would be very hard to see from the
ground unless up close and then of course you would be deafened
by the jet noise so that mystery would pretty much solve itself.
A witness might see several-many lights in formation very high
up, perhaps brilliantly lit crossing the sky. Mid-air refueling.
If you check it out you will find a sanctioned flightlevel and
airway for that. If you asked for transpondr codes ATC might say
they had one while you say a half dozen were present. That's
because the flight leader in a formation is the only one
squawking code because if everyone did in that close a group
there would be nothing but a jumble of letters and light on the
controller's screen making it impossible to decipher them..

>>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this

>Indeed. I hate getting wet.

>>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>>themselves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government
>>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>>pitifully low number... it's just right.

>I think you meant "not right".

I was thinking of Goldilock's bowl of porriage being "just right".

>I don't see it as convenient at all. In fact, it would be much
>better if it was either 1% or 50%. One per cent could definitely
>be noise in the data. And 50% would allow ufologists to wave data
>in the faces of skeptics and claim victory. The 5% figure makes
>ufologists work for it. It's not easy at all.

Well we have enough to do without fighting 'them' for numbers.

>Oh, and IMHO, you're one of the best Canadian ufologists, ever.

Well right back at ya. Of course with the low numbers in
Canada... big fish - little pond :)

Thanks for the feel-good comment.

Don

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 11](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
Archived: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 15:13:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 21:39:52 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>>About balsa wood sticks, I recommend the book of Robert
>>>Galganski "The Roswell debris field" (FUFOR, 2002) and his
>>>article "The glue explanation just won't stick" (IUR, Winter
>>>997-1998). I glued myself a balsa wood stick, let it dry for a
>>>night, and verified for myself how easy it was to break it. Just
>>>try it. No, it does not make it!

>>I have and since I apply it correctly, a complete thicker (see
>>below for variant) exterior coating adds structural stability by
>>creating a tubular exterior sheath membrane - a coating adding
>>higher tensile strength. That is why a simple windshield coated
>>on the inside with nothing more than a thin sheet of plastic film
>>suddenly becomes bullet proof - preventing the glass from
>>separating - supplying a counter gathering/absorbing force over a
>>larger surface area. If you only coat one side, apply it too
>>thinly/inconsistently, or not on all sides, it will not behave
>>accordingly. In addition, you can't have the wood absorb all the
>>glue - and, a simple weather proof seal was likely added in
>>accordance with it's outdoor application - prior to applying the
>>incidental glue: This also reduces the amount of glue necessary
>>to achieve the same effect. The fact that they said it would not
>>dent is some proof that it was thick or non-absorbed. Remember,
>>you are asking me to excuse their word choices and their
>>description (Like Balsa) in exchange for an alien space craft.
>>Evan Mac Brazel uses these words (colored foil). At some point
>>occam's razor intercedes. A good ground investigator who has dust
>>on his pants, sweat dripping down his brow, and the voices of
>>many witness buzzing around in his head will come away with more
>>than what you can read in a book - leaving a more weighty
>>experience that breaths life into words.

>Viktor,

>May I suggest that you read the book by Dr. Marcel Jr, published
>last year, The Roswell Legacy?

>See, page 56, the reproduction of his father's diploma of from
>the Radar Training school, obtained in 1945.

>Here is Dr Marcel's comment:

>"Given his extensive training and familiarity with the technolgy of

>the day, the later assertion made by some that my father confused
>UFO debris with a radar target is ludicrous."

>Gildas Bourdais

Hi Gildas,

Might I suggest you research the case for four years in first person terms... Might I suggest that you are finally hearing the truth from someone being painfully objective and willing to give you both sides. I'm also still open minded but the scales still tip one way or another... I can also change my mind and very capable of defending the other side of the coin. When I first heard of Marcel's testimony years ago, I recall that he said that he was holding the actual material up and that it had been photographed... In fact, a research group went around trying to convince others that this material in Ramey's office was UFO material.

First:

I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not? I gave him the contact at personnel records center, Robert Todd's number, and McAndrew's. Wonder why other researchers did not try and help him in hard terms? I also defended his father against attacks that went too far! And, still will adamantly! Robert Todd even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at how he really got them) he said he just threw them away. I told Marcel Jr. this as well. He had been trying to get his father's records for some time. Also. NPRC has a record's reconstruction branch too (yes discovered by me as far as R. researchers go) and will try and recover badly burned documents as a result of the huge three day fire they had in the 1970's. In other words, I was very persistent in my search efforts of others. Not knowing whether his father's record's were involved in that fire, etc . .

Second:

He told me it was possible that his father could have been mistaken. I asked him straight up. He was not so confident when I spoke with him - sounding genuinely and objectively reflective (good day/bad day?): Black Bakelite materials, etc., said that remnants might be under the back porch - having been swept off the floor out the door (cemented over). How would I know that unless I spoke with him? Might I suggest that I have never made a penny off my investigation. Might I suggest that I researched the body issue at Roswell more than anyone else - having located and talked with the commander of the hospital and many of the doctors and personnel there. The commander was dying and his niece was hoping he might reveal something. The Air Force didn't even try to find him! He survived the Bataan Death March just as Dorothy Bissell Cox's first husband had which prevented him from having children. The Air Force did not do a great job researching the case and were concerned (I believe) I might embarrass them. As a result, they had to follow in my wake even though they had been doing investigations for three or four years before I'd come along. I located all the missing / surviving nurses and spoke with them including one of the ambulance drivers. By the way, one of the nurses was still living in Roswell before her death in 1994. No one found her and she died before anyone could ask her questions. The Roswell St Mary's Hospital Record's had just been destroyed at that time and very likely may have had record's of Glenn's missing nurse: Her name actually written down on paper. Nuns had worked there and possibly volunteered at the base hospital as well: just following Glenn Dennis suggestions. There were many civilian personnel at the Hospital as well. Who would have thought at the only Atomic Bomb Wing. I actually have a Roswell Year Book given to me by one of the guys I interviewed. I even copied it for David Rudiak. Glenn also told me that he met the commander of the Hospital on a fishing trip near Colorado (if I recall location correctly) and he said he had confirmed his accounting - thus disappointed that he did not assist me with any new revelations). Glenn truly sounded concerned. Now try and tell me I'm not being objective. Glenn had people going in all different directions... and, it was getting terribly frustrating when you are trying to help someone out that much and they are giving you little in return. He could have told me that before?!

Glenn reacted to information but did not provide it convincingly. I had conducted genealogy searches for the nurse as well - actually found a family that might be a match too but they hadn't a daughter yet... 75 year limit on census information, etc. Might be a good thing to revisit now. Glenn also gave me the initial of the "real?" nurse when I confronted him in the end. Thus providing some measure of how much of my time he had been wasting. The initial might suggest one of the nurses that had died but was anything but a nun... Glenn's boss also had much more to do with the base hospital and Glenn simply could be hading out second hand information... yes, tried to find him too. He had died... but maybe his family knows something?

Third:

The material was consistent with remnant Balloon package material regardless of whether I believe it being more exotic. That's the sad truth and I wish it was different. In other words, I do extend the benefit of the doubt always. I'm just willing to put it on a continuum - a spectrum from high to low. Quantum decision making has it's place.

Fourth:

The actual balloon material would have transformed chemically from breaking down - would not resemble the original thus forming some doubts since the combined assemblage would be inconsistent with expectations. Objectively, this is not a Balloon. Thus his remarks are accurate. His observations are accurate. And, not saying anyone is lying either. Just carried away a bit - perhaps speculating himself with his son. Who knows really? I still think these core witnesses are strong in many ways but I'm also willing to tell you what detractions exist... my whole point!

Fifth:

Marcel was never asked how dense the debris field was: That from a Nuclear Physicist who understands what density means? It's the first thing that pops up into my head. He could have asked much better questions across the board. Thusly, this may not have been an issue now

Interestingly, I knew then that Walter Haut had been telling more about his involvement around the town, more than what he had up to then been telling other researchers (more details). So, I think he wanted to present things more consistently from his town friend's perspective before he died. Unfortunately, he was not sounding to convincing as he became older thus as it is in life. Others had done their best in getting him to talk, I'm sure...

I have more... ask me if you want...

Best,

Viktor Golubik

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

See:

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

[[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 12](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 15:31:35 -0400
Archived: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 10:32:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 21:39:52 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>He told me it was possible that his father cold have been
>mistaken. I asked him straight up. He was not so confident when I
>spoke with him - sounding genuinely and objectively reflective
>(good day/bad day?): Black Bakelite materials, etc., said that
>remnants might be under the back porch - having been swept off
>the floor out the door (cemented over). How would I know that
>unless I spoke with him? Might I suggest that I have never made a
>penny off my investigation. Might I suggest that I researched the
>body issue at Roswell more than anyone one else - having located
>and talked with the commander of the hospital and many of the
>doctors and personnel there. The commander was dying and his
>niece was hoping he might reveal something. The Air Force didn't
>evan try to find him! He survived the Bataan Death March just as
>Dorothy Bissell Cox's first husband had which prevented him from
>having children. The Air Force did not do a great job researching
>the case and were concerned (I believe) I might embarrass them.
>As a result, they had to follow in my wake evan though they had
>been doing investigations for three or four years before I'd come
>along. I located all the missing / surviving nurses and spoke
>with them including one of the ambulance drivers. By the way, one
>of the nurses was still living in Roswell before her death in
>1994. No one found her and she died before anyone could ask her
>questions. The Roswell St Mary's Hospital Record's had just been
>destroyed at that time and very likely may have had record's of
>Glenn's missing nurse: Her name actually written down on paper.
>Nuns had worked there and possibly volunteered at the base
>hospital as well: just following Glenn Dennis suggestions. There
>were many civilian personnel at the Hospital as well. Who would
>have thought at the only Atomic Bomb Wing. I actually have a
>Roswell Year Book given to me by one of the guys I interviewed. I
>evan copied it for David Rudiak. Glenn also told me that he met
>the commander of the Hospital on a fishing trip near Colorado (if
>I recall location correctly) and he said he had confirmed his
>accounting - thus disappointed that he did not assist me with any
>new revelations). Glenn truly sounded concerned. Now try and tell
>me I'm not being objective. Glenn had people going in all
>different directions... and, it was getting terribly frustrating
>when you are trying to help someone out that much and they are

>giving you little in return. He could have told me that before?!
>Glenn reacted to information but did not provide it convincingly.
>I had conducted genealogy searches for the nurse as well -
>actually found a family that might be a match too but they
>hadn't a daughter yet... 75 year limit on census information,
>etc. Might be a good thing to revisit now. Glenn also gave me the
>initial of the "real?" nurse when I confronted him in the end.
>Thus providing some measure of how much of my time he had been
>wasting. The initial might suggest one of the nurses that had
>died but was anything but a nun... Glenn's boss also had much
>more to do with the base hospital and Glenn simply could be
>hading out second hand information... yes, tried to find him too.
>He had died... but maybe his family knows something?

Viktor,

This is most interesting, but hard to read, and I'm not sure I entirely follow all of what you're saying here. Could you please break future posts into shorter paragraphs? I urge other contributors, guilty of the same, to try to remember that paragraphs exist for a reason: to aid readability and reader comprehension of the points being made.

Also:

One of my sons is named Evan. It rhymes with Kevin. "Evan", which you use as adverb and adjective, is spelled "even" Rhymes with Steven.

Jerry Clark

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 12](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 20:58:37 +0100
Archived: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 10:33:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 10:51:34 -0500 (CDT)
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>The whole thing also hangs on how many cases were reported in
>the first place. because a person doesn't make a report does not
>mean it didn't happen [tree falling in forest example].
<snip>

And the inevitable 'filtering' can either leave a 50% or so
unexplained rate, or nit-pick and 'explain away' all but 5% or
less.

Reports, whether of 'crime' or any other phenomena, are
statistically worthless - due to changing social factors in the
agencies collecting and filtering the reports.

Cheers

Ray

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 12](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
Archived: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 10:40:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>Viktor,

>>May I suggest that you read the book by Dr. Marcel Jr, published
>>last year, The Roswell Legacy?

>>See, page 56, the reproduction of his father's diploma of from
>>the Radar Training school, obtained in 1945.

>>Here is Dr Marcel's comment:

>>"Given his extensive training and familiarity with the technolgy of
>>the day, the later assertion made by some that my father confused
>>UFO debris with a radar target is ludicrous."

>Hi Gildas,

>Might I suggest you research the case for four years in first
>person terms... Might I suggest that you are finally hearing the
>truth from someone being painfully objective and willing to give
>you both sides. I'm also still open minded but the scales still
>tip one way or another... I can also change my mind and very
>capable of defending the other side of the coin. When I first
>heard of Marcel's testimony years ago, I recall that he said that
>he was holding the actual material up and that it had been
>photographed... In fact, a research group went around trying to
>convince others that this material in Ramey's office was UFO
>material.

Viktor,

This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
real debris. And so did General DuBose.

The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the
photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a
hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had
recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition
versions.

That claim was published on UFO Updates on June 15, 1998:

"Jesse Jr., Again Sees Symbols From Roswell Crash".

The next day, Michael Lindemann, of CNI News, sent a message of

refutation entitled "Jesse Jr Dissociates Himself From Johnson".

He wrote:

"Jesse Marcel has emphatically denied seeing anything in the photos except weather balloon material. I've been in repeated touch with Marcel over the last couple of days and I have his written statement".

Sometime later I decided to write myself to Jesse Macel, and he confirmed that to me, in a message of July 12:

"As far as I am concerned, the photographs do not contain anything other than what appears to be debris from a balloon and a radar reflector. I do not see anything exotic in the photos, and certainly not see any symbols".

I met with Dr Marcel at two conferences, in Brasilia in 1997, and in Roswell last year. He has never changed his opinion that the debris he saw was extraordinary, and certainly not balloon debris.

>First:

>I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his >father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not?

I recall that he was very upset that Robert Todd had obtained the military records of his father when he could not, and used them to attack his father, in addition to that.

>I gave him the contact at personnel records center, Robert Todd's >number, and McAndrew's. Wonder why other researchers did not try >and help him in hard terms? I also defended his father against >attacks that went too far! And, still will adamantly! Robert Todd >even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law >releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at >how he really got them) he said he just threw them away.

Thank you for this information, showing the disgusting behavior of Robert Todd, which does not surprise me at all.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:22:21 EDT
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 09:30:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 15:31:35 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 21:39:52 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 16:07:38 +0200
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>Viktor,

>This is most interesting, but hard to read, and I'm not sure I
>Entirely follow all of what you're saying here. Could you please
>break future posts into shorter paragraphs? I urge other
>Contributors, guilty of the same, to try to remember that
>Paragraphs exist for a reason: to aid readability and reader
>Comprehension of the points being made.

>Also:

>One of my sons is named Evan. It rhymes with Kevin. "Evan", which
>you use as adverb and adjective, is spelled "even" Rhymes with
>Steven.

>Jerry Clark

Thanks Jerry, I will strive to do better in the future and agree
with your recommendations.

Think of this as someone just jotting down some notes or comments
on the fly. If you'd like any clarifications, please ask. I find
that it is not always necessary to make a life's statement just
to get some information across - I'm merely writing to Gildas as
quickly as my limited time permits me. If he has any problems,
I'm sure he will alert me to them.

Best

Viktor Golubik

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Cattle Mute In Missouri

From: **Brian Adams** <ufosource.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 10:47:42 -0500
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 09:34:51 -0400
Subject: Cattle Mute In Missouri

<http://www.ky3.com/news/local/27934754.html>

The link above is for cattle mute news story and video on KYTV in Springfield, Mo. Very interesting that the rancher says he's become frightened because the perpetrator(s) have not been caught or even caught in the act of the surgical removal of cow's mouth, jaw, udders and rectum. The elderly rancher in Norwood, Mo is definitely sensing that ET or nonhuman intervention with his cattle has been occurring over the past decade.

Brian Adams
ufomig.bravehost.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 12:02:57 -0400
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 09:35:18 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Jesse Marcel's military records have come up in this discussion and I have to say that his file was apparently not involved in the St. Louis fire, but the Records Center will use that excuse to not send any of the file's contents.

Jesse's military file was obtained by myself and others and I've yet to find out if there is an 'official' copy of it with some sort of documentation as to what it contains. There are a half dozen sets of Marcel's records in the hands of researchers, and I believe the fact that I have a set was brought up with Jesse Jr. when I met with him in 1997 in Roswell.

When I made my initial request I believe that McAndrews had the file and was using it while he attempted to interview others and find some explanation for the Roswell event. He was seen with it in his hands about the same time I got a response from the NRC that the file had been destroyed <g>. I appealed and they sent the full file when someone brought it back.

The issue of Jesse's file is an interesting one, but not really relevant.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 09:42:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<sigh> Here we go again!

>>I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his
>>father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not?

>I recall that he was very upset that Robert Todd had obtained
>the military records of his father when he could not, and used them
>to attack his father, in addition to that.

Viktor;

Robert Todd just tried to verify the claims made by Marcel to Moore and Pratt about his military service. Some of these claims did not hold up when compared to his records, so now Bob's research has been somehow been construed as an "attack". I suppose that pointing out that it was Jesse Marcel, not Bob, who made the clearly false claims and exaggerations won't appease those that still need to consider Jesse's story sacrosanct.

>>Robert Todd
>>even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law
>>releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at
>>how he really got them) he said he just threw them away.

Whoa, now! Bob Todd was able to obtain Marcel's records only when he amended his original FOIA application to exclude all medical records.

Bob never had Marcel's medical records.

The only people St. Louis would ever release those to is direct kin. Passing around these kinds of self-serving falsehoods is, to put it mildly, very bad form.

>Thank you for this information, showing the disgusting behavior
>of Robert Todd, which does not surprise me at all.

Gildas;

Would it surprise you that the behavior you alluded to is all a lie?

Regards

Bruce Hutchinson

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

ABC Examines Evidence For UFOs & Aliens

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:45:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:45:00 -0400
Subject: ABC Examines Evidence For UFOs & Aliens

Source: ABC News - New York, New York, USA

<http://www.abcnews.go.com/Primetime/story?id=3D5790432&page=3D1>

Sept. 12, 2008

Could So Many UFO Witnesses Be Right?

Primetime Examines The Evidence For UFOs And Aliens

For decades, millions of people around the world have reported seeing UFOs hovering in their skies. It is a mystery that science has been unable to solve, and the phenomenon remains largely unexamined. Much of the reporting on this subject holds those who claim to have seen UFOs up to ridicule.

"UFOs: Seeing is Believing" takes a serious look at the phenomenon in today's world. The 90-minute special includes interviews with scientists searching for proof of life beyond earth and UFO witnesses who claim aliens are already here. Building on the original Peter Jennings report in 2005, David Muir reports on new sightings, as well as NASA's current search for life on Mars.

UFOs: Seeing is Believing to be broadcast in HDTV, airs on a special edition of Primetime, Tuesday, September 16 from 9:30 - 11:00 p.m. ET.

The program follows the entire scope of the UFO experience, from the first famous sighting by Kenneth Arnold in 1947 to the present day. Muir reports on a recent UFO sighting in Stephenville, Texas, where multiple witnesses reported seeing enormous lights moving in strange configurations on the evening of January 8, 2008. He interviews some of the most credible witnesses of the sighting and a radar expert who evaluated their claims and found something surprising in the data. Sophisticated animations approved by the eyewitnesses allow viewers to get a feel for the experience first hand.

The special draws on interviews with police officers, pilots, military personnel, scientists and ordinary citizens who give extraordinary accounts of encounters with the unexplained. While professional skeptics about UFOs speak out, including scientists who are leading the search for life forms elsewhere in the universe. The special also examines the most recent advances in the search for life on other planets. This past summer, NASA's Phoenix Mars Lander, a robot that tests and analyzes soil on the planet, found conclusive evidence of water ice on Mars. You'll hear from scientists on the project about the real possibility of finding life on Earth's next-door neighbor.

ABC News explores the facts behind the mystery of the incident at Roswell, New Mexico, where, in 1947, the story goes, the U.S. Government collected the wreckage from a crashed flying saucer. And you'll hear from the people who claim they've been abducted by aliens.

Among the UFO cases presented:

Minot Air Force Base, October 1968 -- Sixteen airmen on the ground and the crew of an airborne B-52 witness a massive unidentified object hovering near the base.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1997 -- Thousands witness what many believe was a huge triangular craft moving slowly over the city.

St. Clair County, Ill., January 2000 -- Police officers in five adjoining towns all independently report witnessing a giant craft with multiple bright lights moving silently across the sky at a very low altitude. Today, if you report a UFO to the U.S. government, you will be informed that the Air Force conducted a 22-year investigation which ended in 1969 and concluded that UFOs are not a threat to national security and are of no scientific interest.

But leading theoretical physicist Michio Kaku told ABC, "You simply cannot dismiss the possibility that some of these UFO sightings are actually sightings from some object created by an advanced civilization because =85 on the off chance that there is something there, that could literally change the course of human history."

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 16:39:48 EDT
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:48:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 11:02:49 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>Viktor,

>>>May I suggest that you read the book by Dr. Marcel Jr, published
>>>last year, The Roswell Legacy?

>>>See, page 56, the reproduction of his father's diploma of from
>>>the Radar Training school, obtained in 1945.

>>>Here is Dr Marcel's comment:

>>>"Given his extensive training and familiarity with the technology of
>>>the day, the later assertion made by some that my father confused
>>>UFO debris with a radar target is ludicrous."

>>Hi Gildas,

>>Might I suggest you research the case for four years in first
>>person terms... Might I suggest that you are finally hearing the
>>truth from someone being painfully objective and willing to give
>>you both sides. I'm also still open minded but the scales still
>>tip one way or another... I can also change my mind and very
>>capable of defending the other side of the coin. When I first
>>heard of Marcel's testimony years ago, I recall that he said that
>>he was holding the actual material up and that it had been
>>photographed... In fact, a research group went around trying to
>>convince others that this material in Ramey's office was UFO
>>material.

>Viktor,

>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>the debris photographed in General Ramey's office were not the
>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

I'm aware of the debate to some degree and sought clarifications
from it's origins. I recalled this from much earlier: Marcel saying,
or being quoted as saying, that the actual stuff was photographed
and that he was holding it. The point of this was to demonstrate
that there are earlier sources - that this does not solely revolve
around Johnson and Marcel's son, but from an earlier time period.

The sum total impression often masks the underlying movement capability of the individual facts and details.

>The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the >photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a >hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had >recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition >versions.

>That claim was published on UFO Updates on June 15, 1998:

>"Jesse Jr., Again Sees Symbols From Roswell Crash".

>The next day, Michael Lindemann, of CNI News, sent a message of >refutation entitled "Jesse Jr Dissociates Himself From Johnson".

>He wrote:

>"Jesse Marcel has emphatically denied seeing anything in the photos >except weather balloon material. I've been in repeated touch with >Marcel over the last couple of days and I have his written >statement".

>Sometime later I decided to write myself to Jesse Macel, and he >confirmed that to me, in a message of July 12:

>"As far as I am concerned, the photographs do not contain >anything other than what appears to be debris from a balloon and >a radar reflector. I do not see anything exotic in the photos, >and certainly not see any symbols".

>I met with Dr Marcel at two conferences, in Brasilia in 1997, and >in Roswell last year. He has never changed his opinion that the >debris he saw was extraordinary, and certainly not balloon debris.

>>First:

>>I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his >>father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not?

>I recall that he was very upset that Robert Todd had obtained >the military records of his father when he could not, and used them >to attack his father, in addition to that.

>>I gave him the contact at personnel records center, Robert Todd's >>number, and McAndrew's. Wonder why other researchers did not try >>and help him in hard terms? I also defended his father against >>attacks that went too far! And, still will adamantly! Robert Todd >>even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law >>releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at >>how he really got them) he said he just threw them away.

>Thank you for this information, showing the disgusting behavior >of Robert Todd, which does not surprise me at all.

Jaded as he was, Robert Todd was being himself; He did, at least, acknowledge that he had them. But I asked the right question too. Unlike other researchers that coddled him in fear of his tongue (or, fear of not gaining access to his document empire), can't fathom the meaning of being true to one's self.

As you can tell, I'm never shy about saying whether or not I was talking with McAndrew. (Kevin actually spoke with him too). I'll will personally talk to any one because I'm a researcher willing to learn as much as you can. Wow, what a concept! They called me after seeing my ad in the "Army Nurse Association News Letter" with a circulation of about 2,500. As I said earlier, they were following in my wake. I did not directly cooperate, making them, instead, go find the nurses on their own - just to prove my point and to rub it in a little :) He was just a person following orders... had to make him earn his pay too.

Interestingly, once they had called me, my viewing privileges, previously granted by the NIH (Not the Air Force), were pulled. In the following week, I was about to personally view 60,000, nurse program, sign-up cards I'd located at Suitland. I had spent considerable time finding them and their owners. It was apparent to me then that FOIA offices may be able to alert other FOIA officials in some networked communication capacity; McAndrew, evidently, trying to discover where I was currently at... in my efforts.

Not to give the wrong impression, I'd also told McAndrew, over the telephone, after their dummy dropping explanations first appeared in print, that it revealed a lot of research incompetence. Evidently, they'd previously been prepared to provide this one simple answer and not too much else. One funny but true anecdote was that Phil Klass had also told them it was a joke many months before it's release. I guess Phil didn't have too much clout :) They should have listened to him, apparently. Evidently. they were going for dramatics and not subtle arguments.

The Air force did not want to be in a position to call witnesses liars, instead relying on Robert Todd and Pflock to do that more complex segment for them (my opinion). Not that Pflock nor Todd did not genuinely believe in their own views. The intensity of the moment had simply brought everyone in.

I often discover that publishing is not about truth but about the appearance of it. This is also true of most scientific papers which I find to be about 50% junk when in efforts to reproduce similar results. Missing variables are "missing" their due appearance and rightly hint at the reproducibility failures: When they're missing, they also are hard to notice! As a result, looking for the absence of information and determining it's relevance, is equivalent in it's own strength - able to counter some of the more direct propositions being made. Just as it is in any research endeavor.

Despite all this, I'm on balance, negative on Roswell (who can claim they know the truth) having gone into it self aware of the psychological traps of one's own research initiatives and beliefs - steering clear of it's consequences and trying to be fair to the facts as possible. I, instead, found value in other adjunct benefits of the chase: I became very good at locating people, genealogical work, government document searches, and had my own personal view of the AF 'faux pas' and their powers of direct/indirect influence.

Viktor Golubik

BTW - I can change my views at any moment since my balance has always been free to move. New evidence, or new ways of looking at it, can change old perspectives.

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:51:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 15:37:54 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2008 12:10:34 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>Dave Rudiak noted:

>>May I suggest that part of the reason for these wide differences
>>is a matter of different databases. People are comparing apples
>>and oranges. The USAF, NICAP, and GEPAN/SERPA were getting a lot
>>of military and pilot cases, scientists, engineers, radar cases,
>>and so on, that tend to be higher quality cases with more
>>experienced witnesses and better data.

The impropriety of mixing together high quality cases with low quality cases is my whole point. Moreover you go beyond just mixing these apples and oranges, you actively discriminate against UFO Unknowns. You claim in your Canadian UFO Survey that your two decade average of Unknowns is 13% but that it is less than 1% if only high-quality Unknowns are considered. This is grossly discriminatory and misleading. You are comparing high quality with low quality as if they are comparable statistical populations. They are not properly comparable, as Hynek pointed out in The Hynek UFO Report, where he said poor cases should be excluded from all statistics.

What percentage of all high quality cases are Unknowns? You don't tell us. Your UFO Survey doesn't tell us.

Exclude all low quality cases first then tell us how many or what percentage are Unknowns. Exclude low quality IFO's and leave only high quality IFO's. I think all Insufficient Data cases are by definition low quality, so those will all be excluded. Then and only then figure the ratio of high quality Unknowns to high quality IFO's. I am sure the Unknowns percentage would go up if not skyrocket.

If one makes this kind of comparison with the early Project Blue Book statistics, one finds the proportion of good Unknowns to total good cases is roughly 71%. Project officers made sure to use every trick in the book to whittle this down, first by never comparing good to good. They inflated the IFO numbers by including all Possible and Probables, which should have been all discarded as Insufficient Info. Eventually, in future years they got the annual percentage of Unidentifieds down to 5% or less.

Instead of rejecting this Blue Book trick some researchers continue to use the trick themselves to artificially reduce the percentage of Unknowns. Stop aiding and abetting the debunkers! Stop calling every sighting report you receive a "UFO report" when even the witnesses almost never slap the "UFO" label on their own sightings (unless tricked or misled by investigators or reporting agencies).

Stop evading and ignoring Hynek's rule requiring that a "UFO" label must not be applied until a scientifically competent screening has eliminated IFO and conventional explanations.

A few years back I discovered in the Condon Report that the CU Project had succeeded in correlating Prairie Network meteor camera photos with 22 UFO cases they had in the Project database. But 16 of the cases remained Unexplained, or a shickingly high 73%. This was covered up by masking the data in a load of confusion and never explaining what it meant and never calculating any statistics -- because it would have looked very bad.

Here was objective scientific data from photographic instrumentation networks confirming the existence of an unexplained UFO phenomenon.

Something like these Colorado Project statistics must have been in physicist Joseph Rush's mind when he wrote in his confidential memo to Condon that they had more Unexplained than Explained cases, i.e., more than 50% Unknowns.

When poor quality cases are eliminated, and objective criteria are used to screen UFO cases before calling them "UFO" cases, then the vast majority will remain Unknowns after investigation ("investigation" goes beyond preliminary "screening" and usually involves direct contact with witnesses, etc.).

This Hynek screening is easy to do, contrary to the debunkers who falsely claim that there is so little difference between IFO's and UFO's that even "experienced" UFO investigators cannot tell the difference between IFO and UFO.

The UFO Unknowns are not statistical "outliers" or flukes as debunkers claim. Such high quality UFO's do not fall apart on investigation and turn into IFO's. In fact, it's the IFO's that turn into UFO Unknowns, such as the RB-47 case, seemingly so well explained by Philip Klass. His IFO explanations exploded under intensive investigation and his data, when corrected, actually reinforced and strengthened the unexplainability of the UFO event.

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](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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Cattle Mute Interview With Raul Oscar Chaves

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:05:07 -0400
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 14:46:21 -0400
Subject: Cattle Mute Interview With Raul Oscar Chaves

The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
September 13, 2008

Cattle Mutilations: An Interview with Raul Oscar Chaves

<http://inexplicata.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Glubik <diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 10:52:42 EDT
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 14:49:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 12:02:57 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Jesse Marcel's military records have come up in this discussion
>and I have to say that his file was apparently not involved in
>the St. Louis fire, but the Records Center will use that excuse
>to not send any of the file's contents.

>Jesse's military file was obtained by myself and others and I've
>yet to find out if there is an 'official' copy of it with some
>sort of documentation as to what it contains. There are a half
>dozen sets of Marcel's records in the hands of researchers, and I
>believe the fact that I have a set was brought up with Jesse Jr.
>when I met with him in 1997 in Roswell.

>When I made my initial request I believe that McAndrews had the
>file and was using it while he attempted to interview others and
>find some explanation for the Roswell event. He was seen with it
>in his hands about the same time I got a response from the NRC
>that the file had been destroyed <g>. I appealed and they
>sent the full file when someone brought it back.

>The issue of Jesse's file is an interesting one, but not really
>relevant.

Hi Steven, thanks ...

Yes, this is how the NPRC works, never take a no as a given and
be persistent. McAndrew also had the Hospital Morning Reports
After three attempts, I finally told them where they were
(McAndrew) and only then did I receive them (had to).

I'd done this intentionally to demonstrate that McAndrew did, in
fact, control them (was he aware of this?).

That, unlike what the NPRC states, people can walk off with them
so to speak, remove, or sequester them... You would think that
the Pentagon would have the clout to do so. Well, yes, they do.
But, I just wanted to prove that... and I did.

Unlike, Robert Todd or McAndrew who would have told you that it
was impossible! Well, so much for Todd's investigative abilities.
McAndrew was beside himself :)

Viktor

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 08:46:28 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 14:59:37 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>They are not properly comparable, as Hynek pointed
>out in The Hynek UFO Report, where he said poor cases should be
>excluded from all statistics.

Dr. Hynek's history is replete with arrogant assertions such as this. Assertions, that if you take carefully apart, don't hold up to scrutiny. His performance record on this score hardly makes him the definitive point of reference on how investigations and their patterning into study should take place.

If ufologists are as selective as this mandate implies, then the discovery of new witnesses and new details on any case that has been deemed, minor, come to a pre-ordained resistance unfair to both those witnesses and to anyone interested in clarity.

Because it is abundantly clear, many published ufologists can easily be led around by the nose with the same foredrawn conclusions as conventional science and media.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 13](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 18:38:31 +0200
Archived: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 15:16:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><sigh>Here we go again!

>>>I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his
>>>father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not?

>>I recall that he was very upset that Robert Todd had obtained
>>the military records of his father when he could not, and used
>>them to attack his father, in addition to that.

>Viktor;

>Robert Todd just tried to verify the claims made by Marcel to
>Moore and Pratt about his military service. Some of these claims
>did not hold up when compared to his records, so now Bob's
>research has been somehow been construed as an "attack". I
>suppose that pointing out that it was Jesse Marcel, not Bob, who
>made the clearly false claims and exaggerations won't appease
>those that still need to consider Jesse's story sacrosanct.

Bruce,

Again, this question of Marcel's records has been thoroughly
discussed. I suggest reading the book of Kevin Randle "The
Roswell Encyclopedia" (2000). His nine pages article on Marcel Sr
has clarified it completely, it seems to me. I quote page 248:
"There is nothing in the Marcel record, at this point, to allow
us to brand Marcel a liar. There are disagreements between what
he allegedly said to Pratt, how Pflock interpreted those
comments, and what is in the record. There are even discrepancies
between what is in Marcel's personnel file and other records in
which he is mentioned. But none of these discrepancies are of
much consequence and can be explained as simple mistakes in
Pratt's transcript of the military record or even Marcel's
memory."

>>>Robert Todd
>>>even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law
>>>releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at
>>>how he really got them) he said he just threw them away.

>Whoa, now! Bob Todd was able to obtain Marcel's records only
>when he amended his original FOIA application to exclude all
>medical records.

>Bob _never_ had Marcel's medical records.

>The only people St. Louis would ever release those to is direct
>kin. Passing around these kinds of self-serving falsehoods is, to
>put it mildly, very bad form.

>>Thank you for this information, showing the disgusting behavior
>>of Robert Todd, which does not surprise me at all.

>Gildas;

>Would it surprise you that the behavior you alluded to is all a
>lie?

Of course, I don't know if Todd had, or not, Marcel's medical records. Viktor said so, and I just take note that you deny it.

However, I have a personal reason to talk of Robert Todd that way.

I exchanged several letters with him in 1994. As I dared to express disagreements on Roswell, politely, he became very angry and wrote some insulting letters to me, that I would not dare to quote here.

I informed him that I was going to pass copies privately to several researchers, and he was mad again but I did it.

BTW, Karl Pflock, with whom I also corresponded at the time (always courteously), was eager to have copies, which I also sent to him.

I recall that Richard Hall, to whom I had sent them, exposed them in UFO Magazine.

Yes, Bob Todd displayed disgusting behavior. There are facts which are inconvenient to believe but which are true!

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 14](#)

Was Stephenville UFO National Security Threat?

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 15:03:55 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 07:54:37 -0400
Subject: Was Stephenville UFO National Security Threat?

Posted at American Chronicle

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/73833>

Was The Stephenville UFO A National Security Threat?
Franklin D. Fields

September 12, 2008

Stephenville, Texas attracted worldwide attention earlier this year (Jan, 08) after residents sighted an unidentified flying object (UFO) that some say was a mile long. By news accounts, there were more than 30 residents to specifically report the sighting. It was front-page headlines in a large number of news forums. Many of the witnesses were interviewed on national television programs such as CNN=B4s Larry King Live.

All of the witnesses were credible and none were shown to be perpetrating a hoax. They might have been mistaken, but that seems unlikely since so many people saw the same object. Also, other evidence is available to corroborate their story. There was obviously something flying over Stephenville that might be a national security threat. Why will our government not take this incident seriously?

Steve Allen, a 50-year-old pilot, said that the object was "a mile long and half a mile wide" and that "I don't know if it was a biblical experience or somebody from a different universe or whatever but it was definitely not from around these parts." There is no disputing that Mr. Allen is a credible witness who saw a strange craft and then reported it to authorities. The U.S. Air Force was made aware of the sighting, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) knows about it and even Homeland Security was contacted. However, no official Federal Government Agency has looked into the matter or conducted an official investigation, why not?

It may seem impossible to some, but what if it was a space craft from another world? What if it was an advanced Chinese or Russian secret spy aircraft? It was seen flying in the direction of President Bush=B4s Ranch, maybe it was conducting surveillance work of some kind. Our government should conduct an investigation into the incident and let us know what is going on. The citizens of Stephenville and the American public deserve nothing less.

The Mutual Unidentified Flying Object Network (MUFON) sent a group to investigate and when they arrived in Stephenville their team of six was overwhelmed by residents who wanted to give testimony. MUFON should be commended for what they did, as a private organization staffed only with volunteers, they gave willingly of their time and collected some very compelling data.

One of their reports titled "Special Research Report Stephenville, Texas" was produced primarily by Glen Schulze and Robert Powell. These two men conducted an extensive detailed analysis of the FAA radar data and have shown that there was a real physical object that was witnessed on January 8, 2008. In

addition to the witnesses and the radar data, there are video recordings and even a police radar gun was used to track the object. This case should have our government=B4s attention.

An argument could be made that the UFO was a secret military aircraft and the government is not telling us for national security reasons. That is a reasonable point, there is good justification to believe that the U.S. has developed classified aircraft but of course that brings up additional questions and concerns. For example, what is a mile long secret government aircraft doing flying over small town America and why is our government hiding advanced technology when it could be used for a variety of commercial purposes?

This object could hold a stationary position and then accelerate to incredible speeds in the blink of an eye. It made no noise and witnesses were adamant that no plane could have caught this object when it shot out of the atmosphere. If this was a secret U.S aircraft we may have a larger national security concern. Our government should show us the civility to at least act like they are interested. After all, whatever this craft was, it could have been and still might be a real threat to our national security.

Franklin D. Fields, Jr. served as a U.S. Army Officer and is a graduate of the Army's Command and General Staff College. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal while a Army unit commander in Iraq. His civilian education includes a Juris Doctor Degree from the University of Florida. Frank currently works as an attorney and lives in Florida.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 14](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 15:16:31 -0400
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 08:27:23 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 18:38:31 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>However, I have a personal reason to talk of Robert Todd that
>way.

>I exchanged several letters with him in 1994. As I dared to
>express disagreements on Roswell, politely, he became very angry
>and wrote some insulting letters to me, that I would not dare to
>quote here....

>Yes, Bob Todd displayed disgusting behavior. There are facts
>which are inconvenient to believe but which are true!

I have met some peculiar and unpleasant people in my years in ufology, but Todd set new standards in obnoxious behavior. "Rude" and "disgusting" barely get there. There was a disturbing element of hysteria, even emotional disorder, to Todd's level of vitriol. Just about any letter or mailing I received from him -- each gave one the impression that the author was about to combust spontaneously any second now -- got a quick scan before it failed my life's-too-short test.

Naturally, given his infantile inability to keep his emotions in any check at all, it was hard to take his judgments about anything or anybody seriously. Yet he did have a small personality cult around him, and after my encyclopedia was published, I was attacked for paying insufficient to Todd's allegedly magnificent contributions. Genuinely puzzled, I asked what they were. The only coherent answer I received was from somebody who told me that more than anybody, Todd had figured out how to work the FOIA system in pursuit of UFO-related documents.

For all I know, that may be true. And in that case, it's too bad that it was he, and not some more sober and dispassionate individual, who was able to bring valuable material to light. A restrained and objective analyst Todd was not.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 14](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 16:26:10 EDT
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 08:44:07 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2008 13:27:24 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><sigh> Here we go again!

>>>I interviewed Marcel Jr. twice and assisted him in getting his
>>>father's records which Robert Todd had gotten but he could not?

>>I recall that he was very upset that Robert Todd had obtained
>>the military records of his father when he could not, and used
>>them to attack his father, in addition to that.

>Viktor;

>Robert Todd just tried to verify the claims made by Marcel to
>Moore and Pratt about his military service. Some of these claims
>did not hold up when compared to his records, so now Bob's
>research has been somehow been construed as an "attack". I
>suppose that pointing out that it was Jesse Marcel, not Bob, who
>made the clearly false claims and exaggerations won't appease
>those that still need to consider Jesse's story sacrosanct.

Thanks Bruce, (Like I said before I'm just here telling both the
pros and cons about Roswell research)

You can characterize someone's zeal, hatred, and derogatory
comments "in and out of print" as an attack. Todd was just being
himself and had a lot of pent-up emotions, rightly or wrongly.
I'm not trying to overstate things; Just telling you like it was.
I'm sure various people had seen different aspects of the same
events.

>>>Robert Todd
>>>even had Marcel's medical records which was against privacy law
>>>releases at the time - when I challenged him on this (hinting at
>>>how he really got them) he said he just threw them away.

>What, now! Bob Todd was able to obtain Marcel's records only
>when he mended his original FOIA application to exclude all
>medical records.

This is nonsensical If you ask for such records they know not to
include them! You don't state the obvious, please! Unless, there
is more to this:

Bob Todd told me point blank that he received them but threw them

away! I challenged him on it!

Well, why did he tell me then?

Because he knew I was talking with McAndrew and could not lie about it! And, now I'm here to tell you about it.

I can only surmise that this was nothing more than a ploy to hide the facts later - to make Todd/AF look less vulnerable and law abiding - as though he was not being shown any special favoritism.

And, clarifying upon what I'd stated before, my interest in the case was much more than about Roswell. I was naturally interested in how the AF was conducting themselves as well.

The Air Force asked me for my cooperation too, but I had the presence of mind to request that in writing. No surprise that I never received such reassurances. Therefore, I could rightly point to a reason for not cooperating (they wanted much of my Medical Squad photos, personal documents, interactions with the Hospital Commander, etc.).

Who would want to carry that burden anyway! I simply have no problem with sharing the truth with anyone as long as no one fools with it. By making such a request from them demonstrates that I was only serious in a truthful exchange - from the beginning. I was hoping not to have to get involved in any way! I couldn't trust the outcome nor did I feel it could possibly be balanced and in line with my own investigative approach. I didn't want to be used by the AF either - as I was plainly seeing what was being done with the Todd affair - behind the scenes.

Besides, I was merely investigating Roswell because I had heard rumors before any of the Roswell investigators had come along. It was much more of a personal quest.

The AF could count on Todd to do certain things for them - so, no big deal in why this came about... Todd was merely being true to himself and stuck by his views backed by his documented findings.

>Bob _never_ had Marcel's medical records.

This is incorrect by Todd's own admissions to me. And, I'm sure Marcel Jr. was quite upset after I told him what Todd had and therefore supplied great motive for Todd/AF to hide this fact! They must have gotten an ear full from him.

"So, Todd, just make a request where you state that you don't want the medical records with your request... for all to see. Use that request instead of the other one."

This is an obvious ploy! And, I'm getting quite a kick out of this, thanks :) So, it was seen too... great. That makes it more obvious... and, hilarious!

Now, getting back to my main theme:

Isn't it nice to be able to get both sides of this; Only then can our signal to noise ratio be at it's best - getting the pros and cons of an investigative effort is the reason for why I've been jotting down my thoughts and findings here.

>The only people St. Louis would ever release those to is direct >kin. Passing around these kinds of self-serving falsehoods is, to >put it mildly, very bad form.

Exactly

>>Thank you for this information, showing the disgusting behavior >>of Robert Todd, which does not surprise me at all.

>Gildas;

>Would it surprise you that the behavior you alluded to is all a lie?

No, not a lie per se. Todd was merely being himself and the AF was exploiting that fact. Todd, evidently, solved Roswell with the Module Balloon theory and he was in his element. Thanks also to Moore and other early Roswell investigators for their accurate description of the Mogul balloon train and end-product material

descriptions.

>Regards

>Bruce Hutchinson

Best,

Viktor

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 14](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 03:24:41 EDT
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 08:44:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: James Horak <jchorak7441.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 08:46:28 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>They are not properly comparable, as Hynek pointed
>>out in The Hynek UFO Report, where he said poor cases should be
>>excluded from all statistics.

>Dr. Hynek's history is replete with arrogant assertions such as
>this. Assertions, that if you take carefully apart, don't hold up
>to scrutiny. His performance record on this score hardly makes
>him the definitive point of reference on how investigations and
>their patterning into study should take place.

You call an anti-poor quality position an "arrogant assertion" so
that makes you a defender of poor quality UFO cases, i.e.,
sloppy, incompetent, superficial case work. What does that say
about you?

Hynek's performance record on individual UFO cases has nothing to
do with his performance on the scientific aspects of case
investigation methodology and application of scientific
principles to establish a UFO science. Your argument is an ad
hominem smear, which will only fool the ignorant who might think
that if Hynek did not do so well on investigating cases then he
can say nothing valid about methods of scientific investigation,
i.e., that a theorist is disqualified unless he is an expert
experimenter too.

Hynek did more than anyone else to establish a UFO science,
seconded only by Jacques Vallee and James McDonald.

>If ufologists are as selective as this mandate implies, then the
>discovery of new witnesses and new details on any case that has
>been deemed, minor, come to a pre-ordained resistance unfair to
>both those witnesses and to anyone interested in clarity.

No one said anything about not investigating poor-quality cases.
Every UFO investigator has to triage his cases, decide which ones
merit or don't merit further effort. Just don't contaminate UFO
statistics with bad data from poor quality cases. If
investigation turns a lousy case into a good case then great!
Then and only then should it be included in the statistical
database.

Speaking of being "unfair" to witnesses you apparently would slap
"UFO" labels on every report that came in even if the witness had
been careful to use neutral terms such as "object" or "light."
Again that speaks volumes about your methodology.

Evidently you prefer to have databases contaminated with murky,
confused insufficient Data cases. So much for "clarity".

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > 2008 > Sep > Sep 14

RAF Radar Chief Saw UFO Fleet

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 09:45:00 -0400
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 09:45:00 -0400
Subject: RAF Radar Chief Saw UFO Fleet

Source: The Scotman - Edinburgh, Scotland

<http://tinyurl.com/64eybt>

14 September 2008

RAF Officer Breaks 37-Year Silence On Ufo Radar Mystery
By Marc Horne

IT IS a close encounter of the official kind. A former RAF officer has claimed that UFOs are real and may have invaded UK airspace, branding official resistance to such theories as "stupid and arrogant".

Wing Commander Alan Turner MBE was sworn to secrecy after he tracked a series of unidentified objects soaring over southern England at incredible speeds.

But now the airman, who was honoured by the Queen for his years of distinguished service, has broken his silence and spoken publicly for the first time about his extraordinary experience.

Turner, 64, a former head of air traffic control at RAF Lossiemouth, insists it is "stupid and arrogant" to rule out the existence of extra-terrestrials and is open to the suggestion that he witnessed craft from another world.

But the Ministry of Defence stressed last night there were "realistic explanations" for such reports.

The incident, which has baffled and haunted Turner for decades, took place at RAF Sopley on the south-west coast of England in the summer of 1971.

At the time he was Duty Military Supervisor and had the responsibility of monitoring the skies on radar screens for potential Soviet incursions.

On the day in question, Turner and his 13 colleagues were alarmed by a sudden and unexpected development.

He said: "I can clearly remember people shouting: 'What the hell is that?' I got to a console and people were loudly telling me to look to the east of Salisbury Plain.

"Twenty miles east of the eastern extremity was a series of returns, or radar blips, which were appearing in that position. There were five of them initially. Then six and then seven all following the same track.

"They were tracking south-east, each exactly six to seven miles apart and moving at exactly the same speed. At about 40 miles from the point they appeared on radar, they disappeared, to be followed almost immediately by a replacement at the point of origin.

"The objects were about 3,000ft above ground level when they first appeared and climbed so rapidly that, by the time they disappeared from radar they were in excess of 60,000ft.

"To climb to such a height in only 40 miles was beyond the ability of almost any fighter aircraft at that time."

In a bid to solve the mystery Turner diverted an RAF Canberra jet, which was returning from West Germany, to intercept the intruders.

"When the pilot got within a mile or so of one particular blip, he reported, in a very agitated voice, that his radar had picked up something on his port side that was 'climbing like the clappers'. Neither the pilot nor his navigator made any visual contact with whatever it was."

Within days, Turner was summoned into the Squadron Leader's office and questioned by two men, who wore civilian clothes and were not identified, about the incident.

"I, along with all the others who were in the room on that day, were told in no uncertain terms not to relate what we had seen until cleared to do so."

Turner, who was awarded the MBE in 1984 and retired from the force in 1995, has been assured that there were no training operations, classified or otherwise, going on at the time and there were no weather balloons or probes in the area.

"I have no idea what they were, but I certainly wouldn't rule out the possibility that they were UFOs. There is certainly a chance that we have been visited by extra-terrestrials," he said. "It is terribly arrogant and silly to think that we are alone in the universe."

He feels the time is right to end his silence and has accepted an invitation to be the keynote speaker at an international UFO conference in Pontefract, Yorkshire, next month.

"I have spoken to three ex-Air Force mates, who held senior positions, and they have seen similar things, but did not report them as they felt their personal integrity would be questioned. That is why I kept quiet for so long, but I know what I saw."

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 14](#)

Re: Destiny Lies With The Stars?

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 10:37:18 -0400
Archived: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 10:55:31 -0400
Subject: Re: Destiny Lies With The Stars?

>From: Ed Gehrman <egerman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2008 15:40:40 -0700
>Subject: Destiny Lies With The Stars?

>Source: Wired Magazine - New York, New York, USA

>http://www.wired.com/science/space/news/2008/08/space_limits

>08 2008

>Rocket Scientists Say We'll Never Reach the Stars

>Many believe that humanity's destiny lies with the stars. Sadly
>for us, rocket propulsion experts now say we may never even get
>out of the Solar System.

<snip>

>But alternative-propulsion systems? They are not in short supply
>in people's imaginations, but most fail the test of reality,
>Marcus Young, a researcher at the U.S. Air Force Research Lab's
>Advanced Project Group, told conference attendees. Young and his
>team surveyed ideas for launch vehicles that could be
>accomplished in the next 15 to 50 years and found most to be
>unworkable.

<snip>

>As for interstellar travel, even the realists are far from giving
>up. All it takes is one breakthrough to make the calculations
>work, Frisbee said.

>"It's always science fiction until someone goes out and does it,"
>he said.

Hi Everyone!

Science, or our current level of understanding and knowledge, is not absolute but an evolutionary process slowly working its way to the truth. Since science is not absolute, scientists look silly whenever they make absolute statements such as "mankind will never travel to the stars" or "ETs do not exist".

After reading this article about the humbling conclusion rocket scientists reached at a recent conference, I was reminded of how even so-called experts such as U.S. Admiral William Leahy who was involved in the nuclear bomb project was quoted as saying "The bomb will never go off. I speak as an expert in explosives" just before the world detonated its first nuclear bomb.

A space scientist colleague at York U. who has studied UFO sightings and is a member of the "invisible college" may not only have discovered out just how flyings saucers work but may have also have figured out a way of how we can indeed reach the stars in our lifetime.

Last summer he and I drove to the annual meeting of the Society for Scientific Exploration in Michigan where this scientist/inventor publicly presented his findings for the first time. He demonstrated his flying saucer propulsion technology based on "ET" science to the amazed delegates, including Dr. Bob Woods and the curious local media who interviewed both of us.

At this year's SSE meeting in Colorado this scientist/inventor formally presented the gravito-inertial effect that he obtained which he further tested and verified in the lab over the past year. He calls this effect "Stimulated Anomalous Reaction to Gravity" or SARG. Fearing that this little known new space propulsion technology would be suppressed, my colleague applied for a Canadian patent with the title "Method and Apparatus for Spacecraft Propulsion with a Field Shield Protection" and asked me to share his findings freely and widely.

Details of his patent application can be found on his website www.helical-structures.org (click on SARG gravito-inertial effect). What is described here is the physics; techniques used and the propulsion systems for two different types of UFOs.

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 > 2008 > Sep > Sep 15

Shag Harbour UFO Festival In Review

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 00:33:05 -0400
Archived: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 00:33:05 -0400
Subject: Shag Harbour UFO Festival In Review

Source: There'd Be UFOs Here... Blog

<http://cuun-ca.blogspot.com/>

Friday, August 22, 2008

[Panel photo at site]

Shag Harbour UFO Festival In Review August 9 - 10, 2008

The festival weekend began with a yard sale at 9am at the Shag Harbour Post Office, where Cindy and Dale Nickerson (the organizers of the festival) are employed. This was followed with the opening of the Shag Harbour Incident Museum at 10am. Following this, at 11am, a bar-b-que hosted by the local firemen at the Post Office which was attended by a young crafter, Jillian Kendrick, who had some of her work entitled "Sea Glass Items" on display in the community.

At 1pm, David M. Cvet, a UFO researcher and diver who specializes in searching for underwater evidence in support of UFO incidents and "cold UFO cases" was on hand at the UFO Centre met with visitors, fielding numerous questions by curious visitors, and who reviewed the Shag Harbour incident with the visitors. Later that afternoon, a group of locals and witnesses along with David gathered at the UFO Rest Stop, adjacent to the area where witnesses originally experienced the incident in October 1967. David continued with fielding questions regarding the incident, as well as Laurie Wickens, one of the witnesses of the 1967 incident. Later that evening, dinner was served at the firehall, providing an opportunity for the visitors to meet with Saturday's speakers, which included Don Ledger, Chris Styles, Carl Feindt, Michael Macdonald and Stanton Friedman.

The lectures on Saturday attended with up to 40 individuals, began with Chris Styles presenting a variety of updates with respect to his work on researching the Shag Harbour Incident. Updates includes his writing a new book on the subject which includes more details and evidence collected since the last book. His lecture was followed with Carl Feindt's presentation on a review of fascinating water-related UFOs, and some of the proposed physics behind the phenomena.

Stanton Friedman presented various details on Ufology and the science of Ufology. After lunch, Michael Macdonald presented a film he's working on which presented compelling stories of abductees, and how their lives were changed as a result of their abductions. This was followed by a presentation by Paul Kimball and his film on the ten best UFO cases ever. The last presenter, Don Ledger presented details on the UFO phenomena in Nova Scotia. At the conclusion of the presentations, a panel comprised of the presenters fielded questions from the audience.

The UFO festival was successful in conveying the current and active work being done in Ufology in Canada, and spectators were given the opportunity to discuss this subject with experts in the field. It is hoped that any revenue generated during this

festival will facilitate the construction of the Shag Harbour Incident Museum's permanent home.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 15](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
Archived: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 00:41:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Viktor,

>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>the debris photographed in General Ramey's office were not the
>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
was that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the
>photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a
>hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had
>recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition
>versions.

Conclusions reached by the RPIT were in no way dependant on
Bond's version of events.

We went to great lengths in our own independant historical
research and in the process turned up one or two completely new
contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as
saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it
is".

Bond made a fair number of statements, particularly early on which
were based on "assumptions" which he believed at the time were
correct. Some of this information we now was wrong ie.. Bond
believed he _must_ have met Marcel in Ramey's office even if he
didn't recall him, after all he took his photo.

In all the years I knew Bond he always stated to me that he had
no concious memory of Marcel in Ramey's office, "yet he must have
been there because I took his picture". Well we now know why Bond
had no memory of Marcel, because our analysis of the FW pictures
shows the 2 Marcel pictures were _not_ taken by Bond. The image
analysis indicates a completely different lens was used from that
used to take the Ramey/DuBose images. (Bond's own hat can be seen
in the background of one of the Ramey images he _did_ take those)
There are also several other physical indicators in the Marcel
images that place them apart from the 4 Ramey/DuBose images,
different film batch, different film holders and different
processing marks. No, Bond did not remember Marcel because he
never saw him or took his picture while he was in Ramey's office
that July afternoon.

Neil

One of the founder members of the RPIT and I'd like to think,

friend of the late James Bond Johnson...

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 15](#)

9/11's Potemkin Village

From: **Franklin D. Fields**<fields.nul>
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 23:01:43 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 00:42:11 -0400
Subject: 9/11's Potemkin Village

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/5ncgjm>

Thursday, September 11, 2008

9/11's Potemkin Village
By Billy Cox

As the nation pauses for 9/11, let us also remember that, despite billions of dollars invested in a new security bureaucracy, American airspace is no more secure today than it was seven years ago.

Federal Aviation Administration radar records indicate that the U.S. Air Force was powerless to stop a mysterious aerial incursion from surging toward President Bush's ranch in Crawford, Tex., in January. The 77-page analysis posted by the Mutual UFO Network in July has been neither challenged nor rebutted by military officials. Nor have any scientists emerged to take issue with any of the technical points raised by the MUFON study.

Nor have government authorities bothered to refute last year's study assembled by the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena. That 155-page report described how a UFO parked itself over the United Airlines terminal at Chicago's busy O'Hare International for 18 minutes while ground crews watched the object burn a circular hole in the cloud cover upon its departure.

Our government's refusal to acknowledge these meticulously detailed reconstructions, along with the media's failure to press for answers, creates a vacuum that can only be filled by vigilant taxpayers demanding accountability from this Potemkin Village. Maybe the citizens of Arizona are best positioned to elevate this conundrum into what it's been all along - a political issue.

Long before the Phoenix Lights incident drew international attention in 1997, Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater made repeated and now well-publicized attempts to flesh out the UFO mystery. But not even the lion of modern conservatism could get past the locked doors of Gen. Curtis LeMay, the former Air Force Chief of Staff.

Several months after countless Arizonans were startled by the massive UFO cruising their skies 11 years ago, Goldwater's successor, John McCain, defended the military cover story that warplanes were conducting routine maneuvers that night in a letter to a constituent - at:

<http://tinyurl.com/5rgcx5>

"I believe that these exercises, culminating in the release of many flares simultaneously, provide a reasonable explanation for the appearance of the peculiar lights that evening."

Several years later, however, when asked at a press conference

about UFOs, McCain wasn't laughing. See:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-4686586251683588658>)

"I think it's of great interest. I would point out to you that there was a case a couple of years ago in Arizona of some lights that were seen over Arizona and that has never been fully explained."

So which is it? What does McCain know?

In 2007, fellow Republican Fife Symington, the former Arizona governor who initially ridiculed the Phoenix Lights, admitted he'd seen the damned thing himself. He called it "enormous. It just felt otherworldly. In your gut, you could just tell it was otherworldly."

It's time for the "maverick" Presidential candidate to figure out what's going down in his own back yard. There's never been a better moment for the folks who put McCain in office to demand a little more straight talk at the next town hall forum.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 15](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
Archived: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:12:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>Viktor,

>>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>>the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
>>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

Neil, and all,

I have not seen that video but I have, like everyone, the
affidavit of General DuBose, who said:

"The material shown in the photographs taken in Gen. Ramey's
office was a weather balloon. The weather balloon explanation for
the material was a cover story to divert the attention of the
press".

I urge you, and Viktor Golubik, Bruce Hutchinson, and Steven Kaeser
as well, to buy a balsa wood stick 8 mm thick, add any amount of
glue that you like to it, and see for yourself how easy it is to
break it. It is a very cheap and simple experiment.

A ten-year-old child can do it.

May I repeat again that Major Marcel had a diploma of radar
school (reproduced in the book of his son) and that, of course,
he knew very well that sort of radar equipment. And, again,
Mogul 4 was never launched, and therefore never landed on the
Foster ranch.

I was hoping to have a discussion on the Roswell time line,
following the important book of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt, but
all I see, so far, is a repetition of the usual, tired arguments
against Roswell. This is very disappointing.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See :

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 15](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:38:07 -0300
Archived: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:19:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 16:42:41 -0400
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

><snip>

>>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this
>>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>>themsleves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government
>>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>>pitifully low number... it's just right.

>Maybe when a way to express not conventionally explainable cases
>is needed to make a point, an actual number should be used, not
>a percentage?

>For example, "4,000 physical trace cases" is pretty darn potent
>in terms of persuasive value.

I missed this one Eleanor; sorry.

Physical trace cases are not UFO reports [Unidentified Flying
Objects]. They are assumed to be grounded objects that have left
traces and usually after the fact without the actual object being
seen to make the traces in many cases. If anything they might
verify the object's presence if the witness saw it land. The
evidence left at a crime scene is not a description of the
criminal but might and can be connected to the criminal after the
fact.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:12:36 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 09:35:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>What percentage of _all_ high quality cases are Unknowns? You
>don't tell us. Your UFO Survey doesn't tell us.

Sure it does. The data is right there. That's why we provide it; to allow anyone to do more analysis.

But thank you for requesting further analysis. So here it is:

>Exclude _all_ low quality cases first then tell us how many or
>what percentage are Unknowns.

<snip>

>I'm sure the Unknowns percentage would go up if not skyrocket.

It does go up, of course. When you take out all the cases for which we don't have good information, the percentage of Unknowns goes up because one can't consider a poor-quality cases an Unknown. At best, it would be a "Possible."

I'll pull out the data for you:

When considering only higher-quality Unknowns (using a Reliability level of 7 or more), here's the breakdown for 2007:

Reliability	Number	Unknowns	Percent
7	68	21	30
8	24	8	33.3
9	3	1	33.3
Total	95	30	31.6

So in this analysis, Unknowns comprise about 30% of the high-quality cases. I gather this is more like you're wanting it to be.

Right?

My point of the smaller but still significant percentage of Unknowns in the total database is to show that the good cases stand out, even when looking at all cases that are reported as UFOs but are obviously IFOs.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

PRG Update - September 15, 2008

From: **Paradigm Research Group** <PRG.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 13:34:30 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 09:48:57 -0400
Subject: PRG Update - September 15, 2008

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

PRG Update - September 15, 2008

PRG Speaking/Presentation Schedule

Sedona Talk Radio - September 18, 5 pm MT
Culture of Contact Conference - October 16-18
Crash Retrieval Conference, Las Vegas - November 7-9
Sedona, AZ Lecture (Sedona Dream Theater) - November 11

PRG executive director, Stephen Bassett, will present at the Sedona Dream Theater on November 11 after his lecture at the Crash Retrieval Conference in Las Vegas, November 7-9. Appearing with him will be recording artist, Vyktoria Pratt Keating. He will also be a guest of Louise Aveni on Sedona Talk Radio Thursday, September 18, 5 pm MT, 7 pm EST. Stephen will also be part of the Culture of Contact event at the Lowe's Theater in Jersey City, NY.

Sedona Talk Radio w/ Lousie Aveni:
<http://sedonataalkradio.com//content/view/76/137>
Culture of Contact Conference:
<http://cultureofcontact.squarespace.com>
Lowe's Theater:
<http://tinyurl.com/5t6uha>
Crash Retrieval Conference:
www.ufoconference.com
Sedona Dream Theater:
www.sedonatheater.com
Vyktoria Pratt Keating:
www.vyktoria.com

Important Notice

PRG will launch a major new initiative on October 1 with media appearances, a website and national press releases. This is the most important and potentially most impacting project by PRG since it was founded in 1996. PRG expects to book approximately 100 media interviews between October 1 and November 31 in support of this effort and will call on its entire research, activist and media network to help with the project.

X-Conference 2009
www.x-conference.com

The following speakers are slated to participate in X-Conference 2009: Jeff Peckman, Art Campbell, Richard Dolan, Cheryll Jones (Host), Stephen Bassett (Moderator). Many more will be announced in the coming months. Conference and hotel registrations are being taken now. Info at the website.

Exopolitics World Network (EWN) and United States Network (EUSN) News

www.exopoliticsworld.net
www.exopoliticsunitedstates.net

- A new site is pending for Mexico - webmaster Enrique Valencia Saldana.
- A new site is in development for Washington, DC - webmaster Ryan Dickover.
- Exopolitics Sweden has been relaunched.
- Webmasters of several European EWN sites are planning a summit, possibly in Italy, to discuss the state of exopolitics in Europe.
- Plenty of countries and states need sites. Interested webmasters can contact PRG.nul

ABC News UFO Special - Tuesday, Sept 16, 9:30 - 11 pm EST
<http://tinyurl.com/4bj7k4>

Three years after ABC News aired Peter Jennings Reporting UFOs: Seeing is Believing the other shoe has dropped. ABC will air the follow-up to this news special this Tuesday. PRG is intrigued by: 1) the timing - airing the program in the heat of the presidential campaign, 2) the headline for the promo on the ABC News website - Could so many UFO witnesses be right?, 3) the choice of witnesses and cases selected, and 4) the inclusion in the promo article of video links to Dr. Edgar Mitchell and the Stan Romanek alleged alien video.

This special is not being aired in a vacuum. PRG is tracking the media coverage of the UFO/ET/Exopolitics issues more closely than any other organization in the country. The recent increase in media coverage over the past 48 months has been extraordinary. PRG has now archived over 2500 relevant mainstream news articles going back to the 1940s, nearly 800 for 2008. The overwhelming majority of these are neutral or supportive toward the issues.

There have been several recent news cycles which centered on the activities of Jeff Peckman and on statements by Dr. Edgar Mitchell. These cycles generated scores of mainstream news articles and numerous television segments - all of which are being carefully archived at:

www.paradigmresearchgroup.org/Opening_Page.html.

The Rocky Mountain News has done 16 articles relating to the work of Peckman who made it onto Late Night with David Letterman where he and his work were treated with respect within the comedic context of the program. This is quite significant. A policy change is taking place within editorial offices across the nation.

Stephenville, TX Case Continues
www.ufocasebook.com/2008b/faacomplaint.html

A Stephenville, Texas official, Mark Murphy, has filed complaints with the FAA and the DOT (pursuant to 14 CFR 13 on air safety) on behalf of himself, his family, and his constituents as an elected representative regarding the events which took place over Stephenville, Texas on the evening of January 8, 2008. Mr. Murphy requested a reprimand of the USAF for large scale military operations in a populated area without notification of local authorities. City officials are supposed to be notified when such events are going to take place. No such notification was given prior to the F-16s flying over the city.

McKinnon Case Continues
www.vnunet.com/vnunet/news/2225136/mckinnon-supporters-cause-home

Computer hacker, Gary McKinnon, has reached the end of the line in his appeal effort. Extradition to the United States is pending.

UFO Sighting Compilation Video
www.youtube.com/watch?v=uScExDsEbTI

Proprietary rights and access issues aside, this is an outstanding effort to make a powerful statement. It is simply not possible to understate the potential political and social

impact of the YouTube era where hundreds of millions of people can create video footage of power and quality easily and record and post events immediately after their occurrence.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:16:27 -0700
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 09:49:19 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>>the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
>>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>>The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the
>>photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a
>>hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had
>>recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition
>>versions.

>Conclusions reached by the RPIT were in no way dependant on
>Bond's version of events.

>We went to great lengths in our own independant historical
>research and in the process turned up one or two completely new
>contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as
>saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it
>is".

>Bond made a fair number of statements, particularly early on which
>were based on "assumtions" which he believed at the time were
>correct. Some of this information we now was wrong ie.. Bond
>believed he _must_ have met Marcel in Ramey's office even if he
>didn't recall him, after all he took his photo.

>In all the years I knew Bond he always stated to me that he had
>no concious memory of Marcel in Ramey's office, "yet he must have
>been there because I took his picture". Well we now know why Bond
>had no memory of Marcel, because our analysis of the FW pictures
>shows the 2 Marcel pictures were _not_ taken by Bond. The image
>analysis indicates a completely different lens was used from that
>used to take the Ramey/DuBose images.(Bond's own hat can be seen
>in the background of one of the Ramey images he _did_ take those)
>There are also several other physical indicators in the Marcel
>images that place them appart from the 4 Ramey/DuBose images,
>different film batch, different film holders and different
>processing marks. No, Bond did not remember Marcel because he
>never saw him or took his picture while he was in Ramey's office
>that July afternoon.

>Neil

>One of the founder members of the RPIT and I'd like to think,
>friend of the late James Bond Johnson...

Neil, List,

I was never an official member of RPIT but worked with Neil and various other members on a number of occasions.

The conclusion I reached after reviewing the group's research is that the material on General Ramey's rug is a mixture of radar reflector (not an ML307) and some of the debris brought from the Foster ranch, and a few pieces of a balloon. There is debris that shouldn't be there if it were only an ML 307 and balloon.

One problem with the ML307 contention is the folding of the foil-paper material. I was re-reading The Roswell UFO Crash by Kal Korff and I noticed the photo of the ML 307 he used to demonstrate his theory of the Roswell event. He compares it to the FW photos and indicates that the photo of the ML307, supplied by the U.S. Air Force, and the debris on Ramey's rug are "identical". They aren't. The Air Force ML 307 is folded and glued paper to paper while the debris is all glued foil to foil.

The specifications of the ML307 call for paper to paper gluing. The only similarities I find between the Ramey rug debris and the ML307 are the paper-backed foil and triangular shape.

If the radar reflector isn't an ML 307, then the Mogul explanation should crumble. There were other radar reflectors in use at the time so maybe some attempt should be made to see if there is a match to one of those.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 20:11:18 +0100
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 09:59:43 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

Hello List,

How come mainstream 'science' abandons its own rules when it comes to UFO/ET research?

The first operation in quantitative science - as established by Bacon & Descartes and many since - is to collect all instances without passing judgement or ruling any out.

The second step is a quantitative analysis; often called applying the 'Laws of Large Numbers'.

The final step, if wanted, is a qualitative or 'ontological' comparison of results (1) with results (2), to check if there are any obvious discrepancies. Incidentally, this is how you can find out if your local politicians/police/ colleges are honest or corrupt (which is maybe why it's so often ignored or deprecated by politicians/local gov't/police etc).

The above is a bit simplified - se:

www.perceptions.couk.com/answers1.html#method for details

Bacon & Descartes actually said the first rule of science is to clear the mind of all assumptions - so you can't pass judgement or rule cases out.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 15:41:46 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 11:01:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:38:07 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 16:42:41 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this
>>>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>>>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>>>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>>>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>>>themselves look "foolish" [their impression]. The government
>>>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>>>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>>>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>>>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>>>pitifully low number... it's just right.

>>Maybe when a way to express not conventionally explainable cases
>>is needed to make a point, an actual number should be used, not
>>a percentage?

>>For example, "4,000 physical trace cases" is pretty darn potent
>>in terms of persuasive value.

>I missed this one Eleanor; sorry.

>Physical trace cases are not UFO reports [Unidentified Flying
>Objects]. They are assumed to be grounded objects that have left
>traces and usually after the fact without the actual object being
>seen to make the traces in many cases. If anything they might
>verify the object's presence if the witness saw it land. The
>evidence left at a crime scene is not a description of the
>criminal but might and can be connected to the criminal after the
>fact.

>Don Ledger

Whoa, Don! Where did this come from? I am among the researchers
who have cited dozens, or hundreds, of physical trace cases in
which the UFO that left the traces was seen! One famous exmample,
of course, is Socorro, New Mexico, 1964.

In The UFO Evidence, Vol. II, I have a large section on
Environmental Effects beginning on page 260, including a table
of 48 physical trace cases. Pretty much all of them were
visually observed objects. Some of the physical traces were more
impressive than others, but there is no question that many
physical trace cases are, indeed, UFO cases...and especially
significant ones at that.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 17:19:55 -0300
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 11:02:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:38:07 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 16:42:41 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 09 Sep 2008 19:02:14 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

><snip>

>>>Anyway, I don't really want to get into a pissing war about this
>>>but it just seems to me that 5 percent is just too convenient all
>>>the way around. The media like it, the government likes it, many
>>>reaserchers like it; each for their own reasons. The media likes
>>>it because they can slide it by their readers without making
>>>themsleves look 'foolish' [their impression]. The government
>>>[military, etc,] likes it because it's a percentage that is small
>>>enough to be ignored. Researchers like it because they have a
>>>foot in the door with the media and the government [the thrown
>>>bone] and it's not too controversial. Even though it's a
>>>pitifully low number... it's just right.

>>Maybe when a way to express not conventionally explainable cases
>>is needed to make a point, an actual number should be used, not
>>a percentage?

>>For example, "4,000 physical trace cases" is pretty darn potent
>>in terms of persuasive value.

>I missed this one Eleanor; sorry.

>Physical trace cases are not UFO reports [Unidentified Flying
>Objects]. They are assumed to be grounded objects that have left
>traces and usually after the fact without the actual object being
>seen to make the traces in many cases. If anything they might
>verify the object's presence if the witness saw it land. The
>evidence left at a crime scene is not a description of the
>criminal but might and can be connected to the criminal after the
>fact.

Ted Phillips latest number of over 3000 physical trace cases
from 90+ countries no longer includes cases in which UFOs were
not seen. He has gone over his filesto keep only the best
cases.. We spoke in Tinley Park last month.

It is those crop circle cases where no UFO is seen.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 15:16:16 -0700
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 11:03:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>>the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
>>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>>The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the
>>photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a
>>hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had
>>recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition
>>versions.

>Conclusions reached by the RPIT were in no way dependant on
>Bond's version of events.

No, RPIT reached its own bogus conclusions based on its own
bogus line of reasoning, such as the debris in Ramey's office
being from a real flying saucer, instead of an obvious rubber
weather balloon and torn up radar target made of balsa wood and
foil/paper.

>We went to great lengths in our own independant historical
>research and in the process turned up one or two completely new
>contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as
>saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it
>is".

Ignoring the many other newspaper quotes where Ramey (and also
Dubose) immediately tab it as a weather balloon/radar target.

I'll cite just four examples here (there are more). Science
reporter Dick Pearce of the San Francisco Examiner (who knew
Ramey), reported calling Ramey directly within an hour of the
press release and Ramey describing a weather balloon and radar
target to him (just like the ones they sent up everyday from
Oakland, CA, wrote Pearce):

"Within an hour telephone lines into sparse New Mexico were
jammed. ...Surmising that the find had been flown to Brig. Gen.
Roger M. Ramey, commanding general of the Eighth Air force at
Fort Worth, Tex., The Examiner telephone him.

(First to reach him, The Examiner got a complete description of

the "disc" from him, together with his expressed suspicion that it was just part of a weather balloon. His description tallied with that of radar reflectors sent up with weather balloons every day at Oakland.

(As a result the Examiner was able to give a prosaic name to the Army's saucer long before the Army itself corrected the boner of its public relations officer at Roswell.)

A weather officer attached to the base weather station at Fort Worth finally was called in, took one look at the tangled mess of aluminum foil, strings and wood and made a definite identification."

http://www.roswellproof.com/SFExaminer_July9.html

Or how about the Fort Worth Star-Telegram story:

Here is the San Francisco News article, evening of July 8 (before weather officer Newton had been brought in to officially ID):

http://www.roswellproof.com/UP_SFNews_July8.html

"...in Fort Worth, Brig. Gen. Roger B. Ramey, commanding general of the 8th Air Force, said he believed the object was the "remnant of a weather balloon and a radar reflector." General Ramey said part of a weather balloon was found nearby when the object was picked up on a New Mexico ranch about three weeks ago. 'The object is in my office right now and as far as I can see there is nothing to get excited about.' General Ramey informed Army Air Force national headquarters the object was "of very flimsy construction - almost like a box-kite."

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 22:45:44 EDT
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 11:04:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>Viktor,

>>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>>the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
>>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>idea a switch was made involving the debris.
I would like to see that video and would like to know who was doing
the interview because this is at odds with what DuBose said on video
tape when interviewed by Stan Friedman and Don Schmitt. And it is
at odds with what others such as Billy Cox, Don Ecker and Kris Palmer
(of Unsolved Mysteries) learned when they spoke to DuBose.

Billy Cox, writing for Florida Today at the time, interviewed
DuBose for an article he wrote in the November 24, 1991 edition
of the newspaper. Cox reported that DuBose told him essentially
the same story that he told us. Here was a disinterested third
party reporting on the same set of circumstances, but he didn't
get Shandera's version of the events.

In a letter dated September 30, 1991, Cox wrote, "I was aware of
the recent controversy generated by an interview he (DuBose) had
with Jaime Shandera, during which he stated that the display
debris at Fort Worth was genuine UFO wreckage and not a weather
balloon, as he had previously stated. But I chose not to
complicate matters by asking him to illuminate what he had told
Shandera; instead, I simply asked him, without pressure, to
recall events as he remembered them... he seemed especially
adamant about his role in the Roswell case. While he stated that
he didn't think the debris was extraterrestrial in nature
(though he had no facts to support his opinion), he was
insistent that the material that Ramey displayed for the press
was in fact a weather balloon, and that he had personally
transferred the real stuff in a lead-lined mail pouch to a
courier going to Washington ...I can only conclude that the
Shandera interview was the end result of the confusion that
might occur when someone attempts to press a narrow point of
view upon a 90 year old man. I had no ambiguity in my mind that
Mr. DuBose was telling me the truth."

Cox isn't the only one to hear that version of events from
DuBose. Kris Palmer, a former researcher with NBC's Unsolved
Mysteries reported much the same thing. When she spoke with

DuBose, he told her that the real debris had gone on to Washington in a sealed pouch and that a weather balloon had been on the floor in General Ramey's office.

But the most enlightening of the interviews comes from Don Ecker formerly of UFO magazine. Shandera had called Ecker, telling him that he would arrange for Ecker to interview DuBose. Ecker, however, didn't wait and called DuBose on his own. DuBose then offered our version of events. When Ecker reported that to Shandera, Shandera said for him to wait. He'd talk to DuBose.

After Shandera talked to DuBose, he called Ecker and said, "Now call him." DuBose then said that the debris on the floor hadn't been switched and that it was the stuff that Marcel had brought from Roswell. It should be pointed out here that Palmer called DuBose after all this took place. Without Shandera there to prime the pump, DuBose told our version of events. It was only after close questioning by Shandera could that version be heard. It is not unlike a skillful attorney badgering a witness in a volatile trial. Under the stress of the interview and the close questioning, the witness can be confused for a moment. Left alone to sort out the details, the correct version of events bubbles to the surface.

A much longer version of this discussion can be seen in the July 2007 article about Klass and Shandera published on my blog:

www.KevinRandle.blogspot.com

>>The photographer Bond Johnson and the group RPIT claimed that the >>photos showed the real debris. But Bond Johnson was caught with a >>hand in the bag of lies, when he claimed that Jesse Marcel Jr had >>recognized hieroglyphs in them when he sent him high definition >>versions.

>Conclusions reached by the RPIT were in no way dependant on >Bond's version of events.

>We went to great lengths in our own independant historical >research and in the process turned up one or two completely new >contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as >saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it >is".

Please point us to those interviews. I have seen nothing to suggest that Ramey was ever confused about the situation or that he told anyone anything other than it was a weather balloon, which, of course, doesn't mean it isn't out there, only that I have yet to see it.

>Bond made a fair number of statements, particularly early on which >were based on "assumptions" which he believed at the time were >correct. Some of this information we now was wrong ie.. Bond >believed he must have met Marcel in Ramey's office even if he >didn't recall him, after all he took his photo.

The pictures have the look of those taken by Johnson... and, more importantly, one of them was in the Star-Telegram archives suggesting it came from the newspaper and Johnson was the only reporter from that newspaper to go out there.

>In all the years I knew Bond he always stated to me that he had >no concious memory of Marcel in Ramey's office, "yet he must have >been there because I took his picture". Well we now know why Bond >had no memory of Marcel, because our analysis of the FW pictures >shows the 2 Marcel pictures were not taken by Bond. The image >analysis indicates a completely different lens was used from that >used to take the Ramey/DuBose images.(Bond's own hat can be seen >in the background of one of the Ramey images he did take those) >There are also several other physical indicators in the Marcel >images that place them appart from the 4 Ramey/DuBose images, >different film batch, different film holders and different >processing marks. No, Bond did not remember Marcel because he >never saw him or took his picture while he was in Ramey's office >that July afternoon.

This doesn't explain who took the photographs and Johnson insisted that only he had been out there taking pictures even after he was shown the picture of Irving Newton that was clearly taken by someone else at a different time. Please explain how the negatives got into the Fort Worth Star-Telegram files.

Krandle

www.KEVINRandle.blogspot.com

BTW - If the material in Ramey's office is the stuff brought from Roswell, then we can pack our tents and go home because that is a balloon and radar reflector. You can even see the balloon envelope behind Ramey.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

On The Eve of Disclosure

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 12:05:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 12:05:00 -0400
Subject: On The Eve of Disclosure

Source: American Chronicle - Beverly Hills, California, USA

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/74244>

September 15, 2008

The Truth Is Out There: On The Eve of Disclosure
by
Glenn Gould

Many who research the phenomenon associated with unidentified flying objects and the probable extraterrestrial nature of some such events feel that there has been an unnecessarily high level of secrecy and deception. While some governments have released information about their several UFO experiences, the United States has been annoyingly obtuse about its participation in these events. Recently, highly credible associates of the government have spoken out in agreement with the UFO community that the truth should be revealed and a full disclosure be made of the details of these events and related programs.

There is a growing movement to encourage full disclosure by assembling a preponderance of testimony from highly credible witnesses and participants. The Disclosure Project, whose spokesman is Dr. Steven Greer, is a movement whose proponents envision a utopian disbursement of extraterrestrial technology that would ultimately redefine human civilization. Reasoning that were enough credible witnesses to come forward, authorities would then be constrained to admit what they have been keeping secret for decades. While a technological windfall would undoubtedly solve a number of human problems, particularly those involving energy, some believe the cost of free energy would be far too expensive to bear.

Behind the veil of national security, governments have continued work on the general issue of UFOs and extraterrestrial contact. Artifacts and other physical evidence have been amassed for at least six decades. Many "scientific breakthroughs" are attributable to these strokes of fortune. The controlled release, to private corporations, of some of these technological bonuses permeates our culture today, and has become so mundane that we believe there is nothing improbable about their existence. But the psychological conditioning which has been present for three generations has predisposed the majority of us to dismiss the topic from serious consideration.

Some corporations connected with technology distribution projects blatantly advertise their association with ET technology, using it as a marketing tool. Due to the inundation by the media of all things ET, in movies that mitigate the topic through desensitization, and in journalism that demeans alleged contact, the public is largely confused and ambivalent regarding the subject. As researcher Jim Marrs has stated, acceptance of the subject matter is based more upon one=B4s existing paradigm, or point of view, than upon the merit or credibility of specific ET events or testimony.

When considered objectively, the open acknowledgement of any ET liaison with our government would mean its sure and unequivocal demise, either from internal strife and rebellion or from the inevitable collapse of the values associated with its standing as a sovereign nation. Since energy (i.e. petroleum and coal) is currently such a valuable commodity, and the dollar is tied to it as the basis for the valuation of petroleum, any energy source that jeopardizes that status quo is something our government cannot allow. But that evaluation is not based upon selfish desire alone. We have all mutually agreed to allow our government to protect our way of life.

The government equivocates acquiescence to the release of the truth of its alien involvement and the subsequent acceptance of alien assistance and technology with allowing communism to spread. While these two concepts have nothing in common, we have tasked our government to protect us and they are doing that job.

Given the magnitude of the potential collapse of the American (and global) financial empire, brought about by an uncontrolled release of technology to the public, and the subsequent demise of our nation, it is inconceivable that anyone who has sworn to protect the country from all enemies, foreign or domestic, would wish any facts to surface, nor any technology release, without careful control. And it is logical, within that paradigm, that alien technology would be commandeered as much as possible for national security applications, rather than for public consumption.

If we begin to see that keeping secrets from us, according to their view, was in our best interest, then we can understand why the truth of our government's dealings with ET over the years has been handled the way it has been. We as a people have insisted, albeit indirectly, that they do so.

Many who doubt the existence of such conspiracies point to the overwhelming level of confidence needed for a large number of people to actually keep a secret. How could so many people be involved and not leak something? Those involved patriots are actually behaving in a patriotic fashion, keeping the truth from us to protect our freedoms and way of life. But some who have felt less inclined to keep secrets have leaked things for years.

Most participants are on a "need to know", compartmentalized knowledge level of security. In other words, many high level participants have only a small section of the puzzle. The big secrets and the big picture are kept even from them.

And what are the big secrets?

One program the government struggled with involved human genetics and was called Project Garnet. This study revealed information that was so unbelievable that the program was allegedly completed, having "determined all that was necessary" for it to accomplish. Another study, and field of investigation, was religion. Among the classified documents given to alleged participants were papers that described the purpose of religion, and the corresponding effect it has on humanity. The big secrets are to humanity as ET technology is to human finances. An in-depth revelation of this aspect of ET association would mean a complete overhaul of our perspectives as nations and peoples, faiths and beliefs.

The truth, which would be given to humanity, would be non-bunkable, irrefutable and provable, repeatable and reproducible. The evidence and proofs would make it impossible to deny any aspect of the revelation and it would be internally consistent, corroborating and supportive evidence for all subsequent revelations. Our cultures worldwide would topple like houses of cards. But not without an unimaginably violent period of denial our human psychologies require.

There will hardly be a future wherein humanity, as we know it, will step out in some kind of Gene Rodenberry Star Trek utopian vision. If that were to happen, we would more likely be like the Ferengi than the crew of the Enterprise. Of course we love the Ferengi, as they are so much like us. But that is not a good thing =96 it is simply the misplaced high self-esteem we have as a species.

Humans would not do as well, behaving as we do, in interstellar

space as we have done on earth. We will unavoidably pick a fight with the wrong people and cause ourselves no end of sorrow. So on that note, let us thank our government for protecting us from this tragedy for so long.

Another big secret is that as it is here, it is out there too. Where we are the neighborhood bullies, pillaging the planet, exploiting everything in our paths, driving to extinction species of animal and vegetable, performing genocide on our brothers, there are those out there of a similar mindset, but with much greater and more bizarre appetites. In fact, some of our ET visitors are worrying the other folks in the neighborhood. Due to its association with ET, our government is conscious of this and has particularly tried to avoid further contact with those types. We need to appreciate the basic distrust our governments inculcate, rather than being open to anyone and anything coming our way.

Our governments know that they are completely helpless in providing protection from this celestial enemy =96 and have allegedly acquiesced to many agreements with those who can offer some protection. This bit of information would only serve to further reduce any government=B4s effectiveness by admitting its inability to provide and necessity to accept outside help for our security. This is tremendously embarrassing for a world super-power to confess. It is also destabilizing.

In our government=B4s view, stabilization is essential =96 keeping things the way they are. Stabilization is the organizational counterpart to homeostasis in living organisms. After all, that is what we expect from them. We do not want to go to bed in one system only to wake up in a totally different political or economic system. We want our property to retain its value, our money to remain liquid, our values to be firm. We would not want radical change =96 even if it were to mean perfect social equality.

In the end the probability of disclosure depends on at least two things. First, we, as a people (humans), need to decide if chasing money for a few decades and dying on Social Security (or its international equivalent) really makes sense. Can we take a real, objective look at our lives and determine whether what we have been doing is not just some form of psychosis or not? Can we continue to define our existence by consumption and obeisance to the old social norms or is there really something else for this divine human animal? Disclosure will change all that and render meaningless what we have all worked for. Humans will not be the same again. And there will be no going back. Once that genie is loosed, it will not go easily back into its bottle. By the natural course of disclosure, our world political and economic systems will evolve and become something quite unrecognizable from what we have today. The first will be last and the last first, so to speak. Are we really ready for that? Or is that slim chance we may win the Wall Street lottery enough to continue our support of oppressive dehumanizing economic systems?

Secondly, if we are ready for it, then how do we vouchsafe personal freedom to those who have kept the secrets from us for so long? Undoubtedly, there have been nefarious deeds done in the name of national security. People have been maimed, maddened, economically destroyed and professionally discredited, and killed as well. There are many crimes against humanity that, revealed, will become collateral damage for any real disclosure movement. Good people have worked hard in keeping this business classified and have done some things we cannot simply, as a people of law, "raise our eyebrows" concerning. Without an ironclad amnesty policy and national and international laws governing the release of previously classified information related to any extraterrestrial issue, very few people will ever let their cats out of the bag. We need to be prepared to pardon all actions related to keeping secret what happened in the past. All actions. Even hideous and unforgivable atrocities against whole nations, or cities and portions thereof, need to be pardoned. No recriminations for their actions to date.

Changing the way humans have thought since the middle of the second millennium is an unimaginably difficult task. Our faith in finance surpasses all religions in its permeation of our cultures =96 it is a world religion of its own. There are far too many human individuals and nations involved for a homogenous

understanding of a completely new meaning of life to evolve. Abandoning our instinct to collect and amass provision is probably not going to happen without a change to our actual genetic structure. In addition, the inculcation of the injunction to "turn the other cheek" and to absolutely forgive people for their sins is completely beyond the reach of us humans. We would walk on water easier than forgiving all wrongs done to us. An open and full disclosure of the truth of alien intervention, both past and present, depends on at least two things which are simply not currently within the pale of human emotion.

[Thanks to Frank Fields 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 15:26:19 +0100
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 12:06:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Neil, and all,

>I have not seen that video but I have, like everyone, the
>affidavit of General DuBose, who said:

>"The material shown in the phtographs taken in Gen. Ramey's
>office was a weather balloon. The weather balloon explanation for
>the material was a cover story to divert the attention of the
>press".

Gildas,

I too have a copy the affidavit but the video interview post-
dates this by several years and was I believe made around 12
months before his death.

>I urge you, and Viktor Golubik, Bruce Hutchinson, and Steven Kaeser
>as well, to buy a balsa wood stick 8 mm thick, add any amount of
>glue that you like to it, and see for yourself how easy it is to
>break it. It is a very cheap and simple experiment.

>A ten-year-old child can do it.

A number of people involved with the RPIT have gone to extream
lengths in recreating an ML307 from the original Army Signal
Corp drawings originally published in 1944 and ammended a few
times before the events of 1947. Ed has mentioned his part in
this in a separte posting and one of the 1st things this
highlighted was that if the debris in the FW images was an
ML307 it was incorrectly constructed!. As Ed mentions in an
ML307 the paper backed foil must not be glued foil to foil
but rather paper to paper. The the foil seen in the FW images
if it is assumed to be that from an ML307 could only have been
glued foil to foil to appear as it does in the photographs,
this is totally at odds with the original engineering drawings
and would not be acceptable, the foil to foil joints would just
fall appart in practice.

A further point should there have been any confusion as to
whether the debris was an ML307 or not could have easily been
resolved by Ramey sending out to the field and having a
reflector provided to compare against. The following morning
FWAAF staged a weather balloon launch for the press(I have the
FW Star Telegram pictures) of a weather balloon with ML307
reflectors attached, they used them on a daily basis at the
base.

>May I repeat again that Major Marcel had a diploma of radar
>school (reproduced in the book of his son) and that, of course,
>he knew very well that sort of radar equipment. And, again,
>Mogul 4 was never launched, and therefore never landed on the
>Foster ranch.

I agree here, Marcel went on 2 or 3 radar courses between 1941

and 1945 and attained high marks in the subject, he was also a ham radio operator from the late 30's and would have known the "nuts and bolts" of the subject anyway without the courses.

>I was hoping to have a discussion on the Roswell time line,
>following the important book of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt, but
>all I see, so far, is a repetition of the usual, tired arguments
>against Roswell. This is very disapointing.

Best Regards

Neil

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:26:52 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 12:07:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Ed Gehrman <egerman.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:16:27 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>Neil, List,

>I was never an official member of RPIT but worked with Neil and
>various other members on a number of occasions.

>The conclusion I reached after reviewing the group's research is
>that the material on General Ramey's rug is a mixture of radar
>reflector (not an ML307) and some of the debris brought from the
>Foster ranch, and a few pieces of a balloon. There is debris
>that shouldn't be there if it were only an ML 307 and balloon.

>One problem with the ML307 contention is the folding of the
>foil-paper material. I was re-reading The Roswell UFO Crash by
>Kal Korff and I noticed the photo of the ML 307 he used to
>demonstrate his theory of the Roswell event. He compares it to
>the FW photos and indicates that the photo of the ML307,
>supplied by the U.S. Air Force, and the debris on Ramey's rug
>are "identical". They aren't. The Air Force ML 307 is folded and
>glued paper to paper while the debris is all glued foil to foil.

>The specifications of the ML307 call for paper to paper gluing.
>The only similarities I find between the Ramey rug debris and
>the ML307 are the paper-backed foil and triangular shape.

>If the radar reflector isn't an ML 307, then the Mogul
>explanation should crumble. There were other radar reflectors in
>use at the time so maybe some attempt should be made to see if
>there is a match to one of those.

I believe you'll find little argument that the material that was
photographed was material substituted for the actual debris,
which is what several witnesses have testified to. But, the
question raised is whether or not there was any actual debris
from the Corona crash site. I don't have an answer or strong
opinion on that; but, the MOGUL argument will survive as a
skeptical solution to the Roswell incident either way, IMO.
Let's keep in mind that the Air Force alleged that the material
was a "Weather Balloon" and not a "MOGUL Balloon" (although the
actual differences were more quantity of material, as opposed to
the type of material or its construction).

Given that the photos were actually staged, who knows what
material they brought in to be photographed as Jesse Marcel Sr.
smiled and kept quiet.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Bruce Hutchinson** <bhutch.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:32:44 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 12:08:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 16:26:10 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Viktor, List:

(Sorry this was delayed - Ike kept me a little busy over the weekend)

>>What, now! Bob Todd was able to obtain Marcel's records only
>>when he amended his original FOIA application to exclude all
>>medical records.

>This is nonsensical If you ask for such records they know not to
>include them! You don't state the obvious, please! Unless, there
>is more to this:

Oh there is... there is! The folks at the NPRC are just like any other bureaucratic organization the world over. If you do not explicitly detail exactly what you are looking for, they tend to politely blow you off. Which, when you stop and think about it, is as it should be. Otherwise, you are asking them (the NPRC folks) to be mind-readers, and creatively adapt to less than accurate requests. Not a good strategy when you are dealing with potentially sensitive data.

Prior to Todd's success, other attempts had been made to get Marcel's files. They were all unsuccessful except for Mark Roedinger, who managed to get only 12 pages. The reason they all failed was that they all asked for the entire file, which would have included medical records. Todd, who by this time had been using FOIA for 20 years, realized that although, by law, the records of a deceased person is technically open to anyone, the NPRC was still denying access to medical records to all but next of kin. So he asked for all except the medical, and his request was granted.

>Bob Todd told me point blank that he received them but threw them
>away! I challenged him on it!

>Well, why did he tell me then?

Anyone that knew Bob Todd knows that he had a very short temper, especially when accused of dishonesty. I suspect that if you were confrontational with him, and convinced of Bob's alleged duplicity with the AF, he very well could have made such a remark, just to piss you off.

However, I have seen the documentation of his requests and the responses from NPRC, and these letters prove beyond any doubt that the records Bob received did not include medical records of any kind.

>I can only surmise that this was nothing more than a ploy to hide
>the facts later - to make Todd/AF look less vulnerable and law
>abiding - as though he was not being shown any special
>favoritism.

This is the Sour Grapes distortion that has been passed around
now for years, even though it is not true. I doubt my saying
that will change your mind, just as Bob's denials were ignored
when he was alive, but nevertheless, the facts speak for
themselves, even though you choose to ignore them.

But, all this is basically a red herring. Regardless what you
believe about Bob Todd and his method of obtaining the records,
this does not change the fact that Marcel's file is now public,
and we all must deal with what they show about what Marcel told
Moore and Pratt.

Regards,

Bruce Hutchinson

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:44:25 -0400
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:10:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 20:11:18 +0100
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>How come mainstream 'science' abandons its own rules when it
>comes to UFO/ET research?

>The first operation in quantitative science - as established by
>Bacon & Descartes and many since - is to collect all instances
>without passing judgement or ruling any out.

>The second step is a quantitative analysis; often called
>applying the 'Laws of Large Numbers'.

>The final step, if wanted, is a qualitative or 'ontological'
>comparison of results (1) with results (2), to check if there
>are any obvious discrepancies. Incidentally, this is how you can
>find out if your local politicians/police/ colleges are honest or
>corrupt (which is maybe why it's so often ignored or deprecated
>by politicians/local gov't/police etc).

>The above is a bit simplified - se:

>www.perceptions.couk.com/answers1.html#method for details

>Bacon & Descartes actually said the first rule of science is to
>clear the mind of all assumptions - so you can't pass
>judgement or rule cases out.

Hi Ray,

You are correct, but I have to ask where we find pure science
being conducted these days? Even University research
departments rely on private funding and research is often
targeted to achieve a goal.

I guess I find that most scientists I know are single tracked
and unlikely to take on new interests. Most are also part of a
scientific establishment and have a bureaucracy to deal with
that limits their ability to act out of step. But probably the
most telling problem is a general lack of curiosity, if it would
complicate their life.

Pure science gave way to scientific societies that were formed
to organize and compile knowledge, often forcing common beliefs
and accepted theories. But this is like the goal of a pure
democracy, which is technically unworkable in today's world
(since a pure democracy would require mandatory participation).
Philosophers created simple, basic ideas and concepts at a time
before the industrial revolution, but they've been overshadowed
by technology and sociological pressure.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Ed Gherman** <egherman.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 09:34:00 -0700
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:27:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 22:45:44 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>BTW - If the material in Ramey's office is the stuff brought from
>Roswell, then we can pack our tents and go home because that is
>a balloon and radar reflector. You can even see the balloon
>envelope behind Ramey.

Kevin,

When Mac Brazel changed his story and began describing sticks
and foil, the cover-up began. Jesse brought brown paper covered
packages to FW.

The packages were prepared by the spooks in Roswell and the
contents are shown in the various photos taken in Ramey's
office.

Yes there are balloon fragments and parts of a badly torn radar
target but there are other unidentified objects on the carpet,
scattered among the debris.

The spooks prepared the packages before hand. Jesse didn't
realize that a switch had been made. He was just a dupe.

I don't know who knew what or why, or how and I don't think
anyone else does, either.

But the photos of the debris should be re-examined, and every
piece of it accounted for. The Mogul theory relies on the debris
being the wreckage of an ML307.

If it's not a Mogul train, then what is 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:46:55 +0100
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:30:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 22:45:44 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Kevin,

>>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>I would like to see that video and would like to know who was doing
>the interview because this is at odds with what DuBose said on video
>tape when interviewed by Stan Friedman and Don Schmitt. And it is
>at odds with what others such as Billy Cox, Don Ecker and Kris Palmer
>(of Unsolved Mysteries) learned when they spoke to DuBose.

I will try to dig this out and find out some more details.

>>We went to great lengths in our own independant historical
>>research and in the process turned up one or two completely new
>>contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as
>>saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it
>>is".

>Please point us to those interviews. I have seen nothing to
>suggest that Ramey was ever confused about the situation or that
>he told anyone anything other than it was a weather balloon,
>which, of course, doesn't mean it isn't out there, only that I
>have yet to see it.

The quote comes from a Reuters news report datelined Washington
9th July and the printed copy was found in a NewFoundlands paper
of the 10th July.

The meat of which is as follows:

"Before Brigadier General Rameys broadcast Major Edwin Kirtan,
duty officer at Eighth Air Force headquarters at Fort Worth,
quoted him as saying 'it looks like a hexagonal object covered
with tinfoil or other shining material suspended from a balloon
of about twenty feet diameter. It is possibly a weather balloon
flown at the highest altitude but none of the army men at this
base recognize it as an army type balloon.'"

The article continues with the Newton identification of the
debris as a weather balloon.

But as I pointed out in my previous post FWAAF had on base both
"weather balloons" and ML307 targets and used them daily. Ramey
above states they could not identify the debris as such. Also
why could they not identify simple "tinfoil"?, and describe the

material as "other shining material"?. The ML307 used very ordinary aluminium foil all be it paper backed.

>>Bond made a fair number of statements, particularly early on which >>were based on "assumptions" which he believed at the time were >>correct. Some of this information we now was wrong ie.. Bond >>believed he must have met Marcel in Ramey's office even if he >>didn't recall him, after all he took his photo.

>The pictures have the look of those taken by Johnson... and, >more importantly, one of them was in the Star-Telegram archives >suggesting it came from the newspaper and Johnson was the only >reporter from that newspaper to go out there.

They indeed look like "press" photographs AND were in the Star Telegram archives but they were taken with different lens (Bond only had the 1 and changing a lens on a SpeedGraphic was not a minor task like todays cameras) and were taken on a different batch of Ansco film from the Ramey-DuBose images and in at least one of the Marcel images a totally different style of filmholder was used (possibly a military type with ID code). The Marcel negatives were also processed seperately (different handwriting on the negs) in the Star Telegram archives which indicates they were not submitted together with Bonds 4 images You need to examine the whole negatives not just prints, to see these later points.

>>In all the years I knew Bond he always stated to me that he had >>no concious memory of Marcel in Ramey's office, "yet he must have >>been there because I took his picture". Well we now know why Bond >>had no memory of Marcel, because our analysis of the FW pictures >>shows the 2 Marcel pictures were not taken by Bond. The image >>analysis indicates a completely different lens was used from that >>used to take the Ramey/DuBose images.(Bond's own hat can be seen >>in the background of one of the Ramey images he did take those) >>There are also several other physical indicators in the Marcel >>images that place them appart from the 4 Ramey/DuBose images, >>different film batch, different film holders and different >>processing marks. No, Bond did not remember Marcel because he >>never saw him or took his picture while he was in Ramey's office >>that July afternoon.

>This doesn't explain who took the photographs and Johnson >insisted that only he had been out there taking pictures even >after he was shown the picture of Irving Newton that was clearly >taken by someone else at a different time. Please explain how

Bond himself mentioned that on many occasions with a big story the papers in the FW Dallas area ran an informal system where photos were transfered from one paper to another when needed. A bit like the newsfeed "pooling" that goes on today with TV news footage, you don't imagine each station has it's own crew at each of those news stories, nope they "pool" the footage, if a station covers a major story they make it available for other stations to use and in return thay can use footage provided by other stations in the "pool" in their own reports.

Bond himself had transported pictures from the ST to other newspapers by taxi and even by bus. These were usually "spare" shots and not those that were eventually used and published in the home paper. Remember Bonds story where he said he had people calling him asking for pictures?, this informal system I think explains why Bond got those calls asking for spare pictures, he did say he wished he'd taken more.

So does it take a leap of imagination to think that this process would also work in reverse and the ST puts out a call for a photo of this Marcel guy long after Bond, their only photog on duty that night, had left for home?.

I do believe a press conference of sorts did take place and Marcel and Newton had their pictures taken there and the cover story pushed and confirmed by Newton, but this was long after Bond had taken his pictures of Ramey and DuBose earlier that afternoon.

Best Regards

Neil

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:57:20 -0300
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:33:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 17:19:55 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 14:38:07 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>>Physical trace cases are not UFO reports [Unidentified Flying
>>Objects]. They are assumed to be grounded objects that have left
>>traces and usually after the fact without the actual object being
>>seen to make the traces in many cases. If anything they might
>>verify the object's presence if the witness saw it land. The
>>evidence left at a crime scene is not a description of the
>>criminal but might and can be connected to the criminal after the
>>fact.

>Ted Phillips latest number of over 3000 physical trace cases
>from 90+ countries no longer includes cases in which UFOs were
>not seen. He has gone over his filesto keep only the best
>cases.. We spoke in Tinley Park last month.

>It is those crop circle cases where no UFO is seen.

Dick and Stan,

I'm not getting my point across I guess. What I meant was that Unidentified "Flying" Objects are just that. If the thing lands and leaves traces then mores the better for proof that the object was really there. Otherwise we are relying on many other clues to its having been a real object such as the witness's varacity, the number of witnesses, the exclusion of any number of normal phenomenon that could explain the sighting of it while in the air. I am not saying that trace cases involving an UFO landing aren't real anomalies. The initials U.F.O. get bandied about as if it's a make and model.

Suppose a witness comes across an anomalous object, a classic saucer shape sitting on the ground, watches it but gets frightened off by it's very strangenes. But the witness does not see it lift off and fly away. What do you call it then?

Not all trace cases have a flying object componant to them.

I'm not arguing the Socorro case, Dick. It was witnessed on the ground, Samora watched it take off fly away from the area and left traces. One of the best in my estimation. The traces confirmed that something had been there as Lonnie Zamora stated. If you go back and look up my arguments to Rich Renolds back a few years ago when he came up with every stupid scenario in the book-including wayward Lunar [Excursion] Modules which hadn't been built yet-to explain Lonnie's sighting you will see my undeerstanding of the Socorro case.

It is the terminalogy I have issues with once the flying object

has landed.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 16](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 18:31:46 +0100
Archived: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 14:35:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:44:25 -0400
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 20:11:18 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>
>>The first operation in quantitative science - as established
>>by Bacon & Descartes and many since - is to collect all
>>instances without passing judgement or ruling any out.

>>The second step is a quantitative analysis; often called
>>applying the 'Laws of Large Numbers'.

<snip>

>You are correct, but I have to ask where we find pure science
>being conducted these days? Even University research
>departments rely on private funding and research is often
>targeted to achieve a goal.
<snip>

Right Steven,

And that's not science, merely selective commercial or military
exploitation of technology.

So all the claims of 'scientific investigation' or
'impartiality' are so much rubbish - they're still refusing to
look through Galileo's telescope through fear of seeing
'impossible' or 'forbidden' things.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 14:02:45 EDT
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 08:05:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:32:44 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 16:26:10 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Bruce Hutchinson <bhutch.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 15:09:09 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Viktor, List;

>(Sorry this was delayed - Ike kept me a little busy over the
>weekend)

>>>What, now! Bob Todd was able to obtain Marcel's records only
>>>when he amended his original FOIA application to exclude all
>>>medical records.

>>This is nonsensical If you ask for such records they know not to
>>include them! You don't state the obvious, please! Unless, there
>>is more to this:

>Oh there is... there is! The folks at the NPRC are just like any
>other bureaucratic organization the world over. If you do not
>explicitly detail exactly what you are looking for, they tend to
>politely blow you off. Which, when you stop and think about it,
>is as it should be. Otherwise, you are asking them (the NPRC
>folks) to be mind-readers, and creatively adapt to less than
>accurate requests. Not a good strategy when you are dealing
>with potentially sensitive data.

>Prior to Todd's success, other attempts had been made to get
>Marcel's files. They were all unsuccessful except for Mark
>Roedinger, who managed to get only 12 pages. The reason they all
>failed was that they all asked for the entire file, which
>would have included medical records. Todd, who by this time had
>been using FOIA for 20 years, realized that although, by law,
>the records of a deceased person is technically open to anyone,
>the NPRC was still denying access to medical records to all but
>next of kin. So he asked for all except the medical, and his
>request was granted.

>>Bob Todd told me point blank that he received them but threw them
>>away! I challenged him on it!

>>Well, why did he tell me then?

>Anyone that knew Bob Todd knows that he had a very short temper,
>especially when accused of dishonesty. I suspect that if you
>were confrontational with him, and convinced of Bob's alleged
>duplicitousness with the AF, he very well could have made such a
>remark, just to piss you off.

Challenging him doesn't mean that we didn't get along... I was just in a position to ask him the right question at the right time. "Like, sure Todd! You can tell other people what you want but you can't fool me. I've been talking with McAndrew." And, confront doesn't mean brawl :)

>However, I have seen the documentation of his requests and the
>responses from NPRC, and these letters prove beyond any doubt
>that the records Bob received did not include medical records
>of any kind.

Sorry, they did!

>>I can only surmise that this was nothing more than a ploy to hide
>>the facts later - to make Todd/AF look less vulnerable and law
>>abiding - as though he was not being shown any special
>>favoritism.

>This is the Sour Grapes distortion that has been passed around
>now for years, even though it is not true. I doubt my saying
>that will change your mind, just as Bob's denials were ignored
>when he was alive, but nevertheless, the facts speak for
>themselves, even though you choose to ignore them.

I didn't ignore anything and was involved in a this process directly - were you?

Anyway, I wasn't interested in the Marcel Files_at All ! I was researching the body issue. Therefore, this has nothing to do with sour grapes. Also, when I began to talk with war personnel, I soon realized how incorrect some of those files could be with their contents... that such issues exist. If your alive you can correct them. Marcel was not!

I was defending Marcel from Todd's excesses that's all - at a later time - not then. I told Marcel Jr how to get his father's files... from Todd and McAndrew. I just happened to be in the right place at the right time. Wouldn't you have done that if you were talking with Marcel one day and learned of his difficulties? And, you just happened to know who had them?

>But, all this is basically a red herring. Regardless what you
>believe about Bob Todd and his method of obtaining the records,
>this does not change the fact that Marcel's file is now public,
>and we all must deal with what they show about what Marcel told
>Moore and Pratt.

I'm just telling you the truth... records can be obtained in various ways. It doesn't mean they are corrupted or that his methods were bad. Good for Todd!

The Air Force was using him... so what! If Todd didn't realize this, then he's not very bright is he? Besides, anyone who thinks the truth will be revealed to them through FOIA requests alone is grappling with more than I care to deal with.

If you visit archives, you can see a 1,000 times more documents in a single equivalent instance. It gives a better sense on what to ask for, the character and flavor of what you're seeking, direct contact with an Archivist, what's on the withdrawal slips, what's written on the back side, and always includes interesting finds. Not, always possible, of course. And, we can all get lazy in our approach.

Do you think other people can do a better job of researching for you? Again, profoundly flawed thinking! And, do you really think you will get the "Mother Load" when "second pairs" of eyes are protecting such outlets?

In some of my requests, I didn't use the FOIA at first go. I let archive people decide for themselves whether they wanted to go that route. Amazing what you can get without using FOIA in every single_ freaking_request!

I found Top Secret, "Paper Clip Files" of personal letters to Nazis. And, you can find documents that say, " Super Secret" on them. What's that? Such a designation don't exist... but there they are... ridiculous, but true!

I was merely trying to confirm how Todd obtained them and he

told me he he threw the medical records away when he received the whole file. He still got that part of the file regardless of what the FOIA says or when that FOIA was made: Researcher-to-researcher communication.

Viktor

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:19:22 -0700
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 08:08:09 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 15:26:19 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>A number of people involved with the RPIT have gone to extrem
>lengths in recreating an ML307 from the original Army Signal
>Corp drawings originally published in 1944 and ammended a few
>times before the events of 1947. Ed has mentioned his part in
>this in a seperate posting and one of the 1st things this
>highlighted was that if the debris in the FW images was an
>ML307 it was incorrectly constructed!. As Ed mentions in an
>ML307 the paper backed foil must not be glued foil to foil
>but rather paper to paper. The the foil seen in the FW images
>if it is assumed to be that from an ML307 could only have been
>glued foil to foil to appear as it does in the photographs,
>this is totally at odds with the original engineering drawings
>and would not be acceptable, the foil to foil joints would just
>fall appart in practice.

Gentle reader, what is being talked about here? This is more
RPIT nonsense by people who don't understand what they are
talking about.

The balsa wood radar target frame was covered with a foil/paper
laminate, the same stuff that the food industry (companies like
Wrigleys and Hersheys) had used to wrap chewing gum and candy
bars for 30 years prior to Roswell. (So much for the "exotic"
nature of the radar target material.)

All this RPIT nitpicking is over what happened at the edges of
the foil/paper when constructing the radar targets, where they
folded back the material about an inch to create sheaths for the
balsa sticks or reinforced edges.

If they folded the edge with paper sides in, or paper-to-paper,
it was a simple matter to apply glue to the paper to secure the
folded-back edge.

If they folded the edge back foil sides in, or foil-to-foil,
there was a specification that they weren't secured with glue.
(As Neil correctly points out, foil-to-foil gluing doesn't work
well.)

But, folks, this is literally kite-building, not rocket science.
Does it hence become impossible to secure such an edge? No,
that's why they used good old Scotch acetate tape. Just run a
strip along the foil-to-foil edge and suddenly the RPIT
impossible becomes possible.

In addition, they could also do another small fold-back along
the edge do make a paper-to-foil edge, which could be secured
with glue, or if there was a balsa stick inside the foil-sheath,
it too could have beads of glue to attach it directly to the

inner lining of foil.

But the clincher to all this is that the ML307 schematic clearly specifies the existence of the white strip facing out foil-to-foil folded back edges, and they can be clearly seen not only in the Fort Worth Ramey photos, but in other photos of ML307's of the time. E.g., go to my website where I detail how the ML307's were constructed, and down at the bottom are screen captures from a movie showing a contemporary ML307 from various angles.

http://www.roswellproof.com/rawin_construction.html

See, white strips! What RPIT says is somehow impossible is right there under their noses in the photos.

I have pointed these photos out before to the RPIT people on Updates (plus noting that the schematic clearly specifies the existence of these white paper strips with their foil-to-foil edges), and they just continue to ignore the facts.. That's what is truly frustrating with RPIT--they never learn a thing and continue to spout the same old erroneous garbage year after year. They're the flip side of the debunkers, who likewise blithely ignore the facts.

>A further point should there have been any confusion as to
>whether the debris was an ML307 or not could have easily been
>resolved by Ramey sending out to the field and having a
>reflector provided to compare against.

Ramey was already calling it a radar reflector within an hour of when the Roswell base press release hit the AP news wire. That is proven by contemporaneous news stories. (What's funny is that my timeline reconstruction indicates that Marcel didn't even make it to Ramey's office with his Roswell debris until at least a half hour later. Ramey would have had nothing to look at--IF the radar target was really brought by Marcel from Roswell.)

Ramey was also saying early on that the "box kite" in his office appeared to be 25 feet across if reconstructed. Where did he get that number? The ML307's were only 4 feet across. It's like having pieces of a wrecked scooter in front of you and claiming it would be the size of a truck if reconstructed.

Ramey was apparently making it up as he went along. There was nothing in his office yet for him to see and describe.

Here's another dead giveaway. Ramey and his minions were telling Reuters and the FBI early on that the "disc" was "hexagonal" in shape. Where did they get that? Have a look at those ML307 Rawin pictures and ask yourself if you would describe them as "hexagonal."

There are certain angles where a ML307 Rawin will look "hexagonal" in profile, just like a cube will look "hexagonal" in profile if you face a corner towards you and look directly at it. It's an oddball description, but if the target is 1) fully assembled and INTACT, and then looked at 2) directly from either directly above or below from a distance (to eliminate 3D depth), then the target profile could be described as "hexagonal".

In other words, this might be a shape description used by somebody who regularly sent these ASSEMBLED, INTACT targets up attached to weather balloons. As they flew off into the sky while looking up at them from underneath, they would assume a hexagonal outline shape.

But what did Ramey have to look at (assuming he even had one in his office to look at when he was giving this description)? Was the target INTACT. No, the target in the photos was broken and in many pieces, laying flat on his rug. There is no possible way for an ML307 to look "hexagonal" in those circumstances.

Think about that very carefully. Ramey could not possibly come up with a "hexagonal" shape description on his own (unless he was a weather expert himself and intimately familiar with the targets).

Had the weather officer (Irving Newton) seen it and given Ramey the shape description? No, this was before Newton was brought in to make the ID official. Before that Ramey was opining in news articles that he thought it might be a weather radar target, but

would LATER bring in a weather officer to make sure.

Further, Newton, when he was finally brought in was quoted in news stories saying the targets looked like a "six-pointed star" when intact and never used the odd-ball description of "hexagonal" either then or in the present when interviewed.

So this brings us back to Ramey and his use of "hexagonal". The only way he could have come up with that description is if it had been scripted for him. In other words, Ramey knew from the gitgo that this was a radar target because that was the cover story that had been decided upon ahead of time long before the torn-up radar target even showed up in his office. He was informed ahead of time, perhaps by military intelligence, that the targets looked "hexagonal" in shape, and that's what he went with. Ramey could not possibly have figured this out on his own.

By that evening, it was clear that military intelligence/counterintelligence was going with the radar targets to debunk all the flying saucer reports, not just Roswell. See the document found by Project 1947:

<http://www.project1947.com/roswell/wkzo.htm>

A reporter who contacted the Pentagon wrote a telex that reads, "Intelligence Div WashDC suggests saucers are radar target for weather observation purposes."

This was followed the next day by a military debunkery campaign of the saucers, as noted explicitly in the opening sentence of the UP Roswell story:

"Reports of flying saucers whizzing through the sky fell off sharply today as the Army and Navy began a concentrated campaign to stop the rumors."

An essay summarizing the debunking campaign using the Rawin targets and other weather balloon demonstrations, "How the military debunked the saucers after Roswell", can be found at my website:

<http://www.roswellproof.com/militarydebunk.html>

The military continued to use the radar targets as a catch-all explanation for the saucers for at least another two years. They were, e.g., the initial "explanation" for the famous Chiles-Whitted pilot sighting a year after Roswell, and also figured prominently in the Saturday Evening Post debunkery article of May 1949:

"The most common sources of innocent deception in the balloon field are the so-called RAWIN (radar-wind) target balloons. ...At the very time the saucer sightings were at their height [in 1947], the Air Force had just turned over thousands of surplus RAWINS to Weather Bureau stations all over the country, so they were used in greater numbers than ever before."

>The following morning
>FWAAF staged a weather balloon launch for the press(I have the
>FW Star Telegram pictures) of a weather balloon with ML307
>reflectors attached, they used them on a daily basis at the
>base.

Just to nitpick here, the FWAAF Rawin demo was the morning of July 10, not July 9. Nonetheless, the point remains that they had ML307s at FWAAF and were using them at FWAAF and at other bases to debunk the saucers.

Here are the photos of the FWAAF demo.

<http://www.roswellproof.com/FWSTJuly11.html>

Note the radar tracking trailer in the photos, which they also supposedly didn't have. If they didn't have the ML307s or the radar trailer at FWAAF, then they sure brought them in in a hurry for the debunking demo.

>>May I repeat again that Major Marcel had a diploma of radar
>>school (reproduced in the book of his son) and that, of course,
>>he knew very well that sort of radar equipment. And, again,

>>Mogul 4 was never launched, and therefore never landed on the
>>Foster ranch.

Marcel's radar course, at the very end of WWII, is detailed in his military service record. One of his military MOs, in addition to combat intelligence officer and photointelligence officer, was "radar intelligence officer", as also noted in his record.

However, I think the most telling aspects of his service record post-Roswell, in regards to whether he bungled a simple balloon ID, as the debunkers claim, is the high marks and praise he received on his service evaluations afterwards by senior officers: Colonel Blanchard (Roswell base commander), Colonel John Ryan (Ramey's operation officer who replaced Blanchard the following year and eventually became AF Chief of Staff), Colonel Dubose (Ramey's chief of staff, who confirmed Marcel's story of a weather balloon coverup in Fort Worth), and finally Ramey himself.

To cite just Ramey:

http://www.roswellproof.com/Eval_Ramey0848.html

...a year later as Marcel was being transferred to higher intelligence work, Ramey wrote that Marcel's services to his command were "outstanding" (I guess the embarrassment Marcel supposedly caused Ramey and his command no longer counted--Ramey was such a forgiving man), noted he had nobody in his command to replace him (all the other intelligence officers were apparently even more incompetent), and said he thought he was command officer material.

Dubose likewise recommended Marcel attend Air Command and Staff School, apparently to prepare him for a possible future command post.

You won't see any of this in the discussion by the debunkers, however. Robert Todd, e.g., made no mention of Ramey's highly complimentary remarks about Marcel, such as Marcel being "outstanding", instead spinning Ramey's remarks as saying that Marcel's career was "limited".

What Ramey really said (read the actual document) was that Marcel wouldn't make commanding general because he wasn't a rated pilot, but clearly thought he was command grade material, i.e., would make colonel some day.

Marcel had already received an Air Force Reserve promotion to Lt. Colonel the previous Fall--after Roswell--with both Blanchard and Dubose (probably acting on Ramey's behalf) supporting the promotion (maybe a small reward for being a good soldier during Roswell), and Marcel's rank at retirement in 1950 was Lt. Colonel. The Air Force obviously liked to kick their incompetents upstairs.

You can find links to all of Marcel's post-Roswell evaluations (plus commentary as to significance) here:

http://www.roswellproof.com/marcel_evaluations.html

It would take a very, very long article to explain all the various ways that Marcel's military record has been grossly distorted and flagrantly lied about by debunkers like Robert Todd and others. Marcel was being viciously "swift-boated" long before John McCain and John Kerry came along and had their military service lied about. (Remember, they were portrayed as cowards and even traitors. Propaganda can be a very ugly.)

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

ABC Seeing UFOs

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 21:57:20 -0400
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:24:29 -0400
Subject: ABC Seeing UFOs

The show started nicely with the Stephenville case. Too bad they had to spoil it by mixing up the 8:30 triangle/boomerang sightings by hundreds of people and the 10 PM lights that were videoed.

They said the 10 PM lights were seen by thousands.

To the best of my knowledge only a few people have reported the 10 PM lights, mainly the few who videotaped the lights.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

ABC News Primetime: Seeing Is Believing

From: **Stephen Bassett** <PRG.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 05:57:37 -0400
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:27:35 -0400
Subject: ABC News Primetime: Seeing Is Believing

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

PRG Media Notice - September 16, 2008

The ABC Primetime Special UFOs: Seeing is Believing was aired last night. The segment on the Stephenville, TX January 8, 2008 sighting was very respectful to the witnesses. Considerable effort was taken to recreate the sighting graphically and have the various witnesses sign off on the accuracy of the representation. The graphic account was very compelling.

The Phoenix lights events of March 1997 were covered, but in shorthand. But again, the witnesses were treated well. Debunker McGaha was given the opportunity to show his ignorance of the case and the witnesses were allowed to refute his views.

The usual commentary regarding looking for extraterrestrial life and the implications of finding it were included. This is appropriate, if moot, and it was not used to diminish the arguments for an extraterrestrial presence here and now.

The Special placed particular emphasis on the great number of witnesses and the value of witness testimony. This is significant.

Airline pilots from several nations were included, again with excellent graphic representations confirmed by the pilot witnesses. Many witnesses selected were law enforcement personnel. The ridicule factor was addressed in an appropriate fashion in counter point to the seriousness of the eyewitness testimony. Most importantly the Special indicated the ridicule process was an intentional, government induced program which included Project Blue Book.

The Bentwaters case, which has received considerable TV attention of late (thanks to Larry King), was included. Sgt. Pennington and Lt. Col. Charles Halt were compelling as always.

The section on the abduction phenomenon was adequate. The Special did not attempt to make the alternative explanations seem more persuasive than they deserve.

The section on Roswell was thin and leaned a bit toward the government. But that was more than compensated by 1968 B-52 sighting out of Minto AFB.

The tone and structure of the Special was fair, balanced and serious. Outside of any debunker comments there was no attempt to diminish or ridicule the issue or the witnesses.

Michio Kaku is making stronger and stronger statements in support of the ETH with the passage of time.

Military cases, strong witness testimony from pilots, police and credible citizens, no attempt to help the debunkers looks good through editing. This was a solid attempt by ABC News to get on the right side of this issue.

While experts in the field might be frustrated the Special was not more advanced, from the perspective of the general public this was a powerful case for the reality of the extraterrestrial issue. ABC News should be applauded for this production and PRG encourages all to email the network with praise and appreciation for airing this important documentary during the election campaigns when it would have been easy to take a pass and focus on the usual election silliness.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

ABC Crock-Umentary 9-16-8

From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 09:53:24 -0500
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:32:05 -0400
Subject: ABC Crock-Umentary 9-16-8

First Commercial:

Anybody else catch the facile and stealthy injections of plausible deniability from the start? Magaha? Ha, ha... ha.

Second Commercial:

I sense a subsequent shoe its proverbial drop, but what's proffered so far is decidedly underwhelming. I sense an insincere respectful tone.

Third Commercial:

Nothing penetrating here. No spirit or courage either. Forget humility; ABC allows itself the luxury of a baseless doubt, still. Feh.

Fourth Commercial:

Unclog the commo channels huh? Only problem is: the "cure" has no oversight, can be abused is_abused_, shows disrespect for the public it serves and so is disrespected in turn. Ignorance is not bliss.

Fifth Commercial:

Seth Shostak, dissembling commentator on that which he is most ignorant, teams up with a woman purporting to be a lettered astronomer who can't tell a full moon from a UFO on a night flight for which she filed the flight plan. That's wrong on so many levels astonishment is left raped and abandoned.

Sixth Commercial:

This is the expected parade of deluded abduction wack-a-doodles... the misled led by the misleading and so faithfully inspired by the 'mentally ill'. If you don't get the point the obligatory negativists are on hand to drive the point home, for you. Susan Clancy, the incompetent anti-Mack - again - like last year... where is the alternative input of Clancy's intellectual superior? Where is the archived John Mack? Feh.

Flung monkey droppings.

Seventh Commercial:

What a complete waste of time. Obfuscations wrapped in distortions and larded with inaccuracies. What a crock of insipid crap.

Last Commercial:

I can perceive no substantive difference between tonight's

crock-umentary and the mock-umentary of 2005. Contrived swing and a deliberate miss, again.

[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:42:22 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 18:31:46 +0100
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:44:25 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 20:11:18 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>The first operation in quantitative science - as established
>>>by Bacon & Descartes and many since - is to collect all
>>>instances without passing judgement or ruling any out.

>>>The second step is a quantitative analysis; often called
>>>applying the 'Laws of Large Numbers'.

>>You are correct, but I have to ask where we find pure science
>>being conducted these days? Even University research
>>departments rely on private funding and research is often
>>targeted to achieve a goal.

><snip>

>Right Steven,

>And that's not science, merely selective commercial or military
>exploitation of technology.

Yes, the old-fashioned, philosophical definition of "science"
was the search for basic truths and principles of matter,
energy, nature. As Bertrand Russell pointed out a long time ago,
the ends of science have been subverted to the winds of
politics... where the money is to develop a gizmo, all too often
a weapon.

>So all the claims of 'scientific investigation' or
>'impartiality' are so much rubbish - they're still refusing to
>look through Galileo's telescope through fear of seeing
>'impossible' or 'forbidden' things.

I'm not sure what specific claims, and by whom, you are
referring to here. But scientists are not refusing to look
through Galileo's telescope; they simply can't get the funding
to do so. When UFOs were briefly taken seriously worldwide in
the 1960s, scientists came out of the woodwork ready, willing,
and able to study UFOs.

Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair or
accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
scientists as a class.

In fact, "science"; the scientific community; the scientific establishment; etc. so far have been only minimally involved in UFO investigations. Individual scientists who, without investigation, pontificate that UFOs are nonsense deserve strong criticism. But we still badly need for real science to be applied to UFOs.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 20:16:10 EDT
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 17:45:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:46:55 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 22:45:44 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Kevin,

>>>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>>>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>>>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>>>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>>I would like to see that video and would like to know who was doing
>>the interview because this is at odds with what DuBose said on video
>>tape when interviewed by Stan Friedman and Don Schmitt. And it is
>>at odds with what others such as Billy Cox, Don Ecker and Kris Palmer
>>(of Unsolved Mysteries) learned when they spoke to DuBose.

>I will try to dig this out and find out some more details.

Well, that's all well and good, but we still have the problem of
nearly everyone who interviewed DuBose without the Moore/
Shandera influence got a different story than the debris was not
switched. You don't tell us who conducted the interview and
actually when it was conducted, both important facts.

>>>We went to great lengths in our own independant historical
>>>research and in the process turned up one or two completely new
>>>contemporary reports of the events, one of which quotes Ramey as
>>>saying, to paraphrase, "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it
>>>is".
>>Please point us to those interviews. I have seen nothing to
>>suggest that Ramey was ever confused about the situation or that
>>he told anyone anything other than it was a weather balloon,
>>which, of course, doesn't mean it isn't out there, only that I
>>have yet to see it.

>The quote comes from a Reuters news report datelined Washington
>9th July and the printed copy was found in a NewFoundlands paper
>of the 10th July.

>The meat of which is as follows:

>"Before Brigadier General Rameys broadcast Major Edwin Kirtan,
>duty officer at Eighth Air Force headquarters at Fort Worth,
>quoted him as saying 'it looks like a hexagonal object covered
>with tinfoil or other shining material suspended from a balloon
>of about twenty feet diameter. It is possibly a weather balloon

>flown at the highest altitude but none of the army men at this
>base recognize it as an army type balloon.'"

Well, your paraphrase isn't exactly accurate because this doesn't say "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it is". It says that no one at the base recognized it as an army type balloon, which, if it was Mogul would have been the truth. It really doesn't say that they didn't know what it was either. It actually gives us a good description of weather balloon and radar reflector, tells us that it could be a balloon flown at the highest altitude and that no one recognized it as being Army equipment. But they did know that it was a balloon and radar reflector.

>The article continues with the Newton identification of the
>debris as a weather balloon.

And now, later, you tell us that it was identified by someone at the FWAAF in the same article which again argues against your interpretation of that one line because one of the guys there did, in fact recognize it.

I might remind you that Newton told me that he got a call and was to drive to Ramey's office and he was briefed before he walked in that Ramey thought it was a weather balloon but that Newton was to identify it... which suggests that they were preparing the cover story then. Ramey knew exactly what it was but wanted the opinion of someone else to confirm it.

>But as I pointed out in my previous post FWAAF had on base both
>"weather balloons" and ML307 targets and used them daily. Ramey
>above states they could not identify the debris as such. Also
>why could they not identify simple "tinfoil"?, and describe the
>material as "other shining material"?. The ML307 used very
>ordinary aluminium foil all be it paper backed.

Actually, Newton told me they didn't use them daily... he had launched dozens of the balloons and radar reflectors during the invasion of Okinawa but hadn't launched any at Fort Worth... Although winds aloft data was collected in the Dallas/Fort Worth area but that doesn't mean they were launched at the FWAAF but could have been launched at the civilian airport or the weather service office there.

>>>Bond made a fair number of statements, particularly early on which
>>>were based on "assumptions" which he believed at the time were
>>>correct. Some of this information we now was wrong ie.. Bond
>>>believed he must have met Marcel in Ramey's office even if he
>>>didn't recall him, after all he took his photo.

>>The pictures have the look of those taken by Johnson... and,
>>more importantly, one of them was in the Star-Telegram archives
>>suggesting it came from the newspaper and Johnson was the only
>>reporter from that newspaper to go out there.

>They indeed look like "press" photographs AND were in the Star
>Telegram archives but they were taken with different lens
>(Bond only had the 1 and changing a lens on a SpeedGraphic was
>not a minor task like today's cameras) and were taken on a
>different batch of Ansco film from the Ramey-DuBose images and
>in at least one of the Marcel images a totally different style
>of filmholder was used (possibly a military type with ID code).
>The Marcel negatives were also processed separately (different
>handwriting on the negs) in the Star Telegram archives which
>indicates they were not submitted together with Bonds 4 images
>You need to examine the whole negatives not just prints, to see
>these later points.

If we return to the very first interview with Johnson, he said that he only took two photographs because he had but a single film holder with him. Then he decided that he had taken four, based on the composition of the photographs and finally he said that he had taken six which includes the Marcel photographs.

And, if you examine the pictures, you see Ramey's overseas cap and tie on the radiator in the pictures of Ramey, of Ramey and DuBose, and of Marcel. In the picture of Newton, the cap and tie are gone (not to mention the fact that this picture was clearly taken with a different camera), which argues that the first six pictures were taken at about the same time... which also seems to indicate that Johnson took them.

>>>In all the years I knew Bond he always stated to me that he had
>>>no conscious memory of Marcel in Ramey's office, "yet he must have
>>>been there because I took his picture". Well we now know why Bond
>>>had no memory of Marcel, because our analysis of the FW pictures
>>>shows the 2 Marcel pictures were not taken by Bond. The image
>>>analysis indicates a completely different lens was used from that
>>>used to take the Ramey/DuBose images.(Bond's own hat can be seen
>>>in the background of one of the Ramey images he did take those)
>>>There are also several other physical indicators in the Marcel
>>>images that place them appart from the 4 Ramey/DuBose images,
>>>different film batch, different film holders and different
>>>processing marks. No, Bond did not remember Marcel because he
>>>never saw him or took his picture while he was in Ramey's office
>>>that July afternoon.

>>This doesn't explain who took the photographs and Johnson
>>insisted that only he had been out there taking pictures even
>>after he was shown the picture of Irving Newton that was clearly
>>taken by someone else at a different time. Please explain how

>Bond himself mentioned that on many occasions with a big story
>the papers in the FW Dallas area ran an informal system where
>photos were transferred from one paper to another when needed. A
>bit like the newsfeed "pooling" that goes on today with TV news
>footage, you don't imagine each station has it's own crew at
>each of those news stories, nope they "pool" the footage, if a
>station covers a major story they make it available for other
>stations to use and in return they can use footage provided by
>other stations in the "pool" in their own reports.

Yes, they would send pictures but not negatives. What purpose
would be served by giving someone else the negatives?. All they
needed was a print from the negative... if you surrender the
negative, then you have lost the ability to use it yourself and
you don't know what the future might bring. You retain the
negative and give a print to the other newspapers. That they
retained the negatives is proved by the fact that the negatives
were in the envelop at the Archives. (And yes, I know there were
only four negatives in that envelop, but that was after they
were sent to the Archives.)

>Bond himself had transported pictures from the ST to other
>newspapers by taxi and even by bus. These were usually "spare"
>shots and not those that were eventually used and published in
>the home paper. Remember Bonds story where he said he had
>people calling him asking for pictures?, this informal system I
>think explains why Bond got those calls asking for spare
>pictures, he did say he wished he'd taken more.

Yes, they wanted additional shots... not copies of those that he
had already transmitted... exclusive shots and not those available
to everyone else, but he had only taken six... I mean four.

>So does it take a leap of imagination to think that this process
>would also work in reverse and the ST puts out a call for a
>photo of this Marcel guy long after Bond, their only photog on
>duty that night, had left for home?
Again, you don't give up the negatives... do the markings on the
negatives suggest where they might have come from if they were
not taken by Johnson... and remember, he insisted, despite the
evidence that only he had taken pictures in Ramey's office, and
that only he had interviewed Ramey.

>I do believe a press conference of sorts did take place and
>Marcel and Newton had their pictures taken there and the cover
>story pushed and confirmed by Newton, but this was long after
>Bond had taken his pictures of Ramey and DuBose earlier that
>afternoon.

Johnson said, =E2=80=9CNo...=E2=80=9D but then, he couldn't explain the=
other
picture but did say that no one else was there when he was and
there were no press conferences... I think these facts speak for
themselves.

Krandle
www.KevinRandle.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Candian UFO Survet [was: Colorado Project Had More]

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 05:47:42 EDT
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 17:47:00 -0400
Subject: Candian UFO Survet [was: Colorado Project Had More]

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:12:36 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>What percentage of all high quality cases are Unknowns? You
>>don't tell us. Your UFO Survey doesn't tell us.

>Sure it does. The data is right there. That's why we provide it;
>to allow anyone to do more analysis.

No you don't. You provide some of the data (not for 1989 to 1993) but you don't tally up the High Quality case statistics data. The statistics data (the word "data" is plural by the way) are not there. You don't provide it, as apparently you expect people to plow through 7,600 cases to find the High Quality cases, and tabulate statistics on them because you are not that interested in High Quality cases.

You only mention one single year with a figure for high-quality Unknowns (2007), which I had already mentioned in my posting. What did you think I was talking about that was different from that ?? Never mind, that will obviously get nowhere.

My question concerned "all" years in the Canadian UFO Survey. It's a simple and direct question.

Let me rephrase:

What percentage of all High Quality cases in the Canadian UFO survey from 1989 to date are Unknowns? You can't provide that figure because your Survey does not tabulate the data on case quality online, whereas you insinuate that "anyone" can just go and look it up. There is no table with the 1989 to 2007 data quality stats.

As far as I can tell 2005 was the first Survey to give the High-Quality Unknowns percentage, so we only have that figure for 2005 (7%), 2006 (less than 1%) and (2007 (less than 1%). You give no explanation for these figures further on in your posting, where you come up with 30% to 31.6%.

Why didn't you explain this huge discrepancy? As I had said in my posting, your survey was claiming less than 1% High-Quality Unknowns. Now you say 30%. It's your Survey, please explain it!

I'm sorry but this just looks like gobbledygook manipulation of statistics.

You still don't explain why your Unknowns percentage is so much lower than the Condon Report's. Why aren't you doing a better job than the Colorado Project of the 1960's on IFO's vs. UFO's?

Well there is a reason, as I have stated here on UFO UpDates any number of times. You deliberately seek out and inflate your stats with IFO cases. Here is what you say in the 2007 Survey, that in the first few years of the Survey you had essentially no IFO's at all, so then you decided you wanted IFO's for some strange reason:

"Contributors were then encouraged to submit data on all UFO reports they received [meaning IFO's], so that a more uniform assessment and evaluation process could be realized."

So you deliberately sought out IFO reports to pad and line and artificially inflate your statistics. This is how you managed to accumulate 7,600 mostly Poor Quality cases. You don't do any legitimate scientific control studies of the IFO case sample with the UFO case sample (I shudder to think how you would contaminate each sample with indeterminate, insufficient data cases). Judging from your posted comments (below) on 2007, as a guess I would say you have less than 1,000 High Quality cases out of about 7,600 cases since 1989, so the remaining 6,600+ would be Poor Quality.

You should get the Poor Quality cases out of your statistics as Hynek urged so many years ago (1976 in The Hynek UFO Report, p. 259), saying:

"Insufficient Information cases should [be] excluded from statistical computations altogether."

That does not mean burn them, destroy them, or shred them. The Poor Quality reports remain in the files, just should not be in the statistics.

There are many indicators of the poor quality of the vast majority of your 7,600 reports. You have almost 40 reports where you don't even know the Province! How are those valid cases and not garbage reports with Insufficient Data? You have about 50 reports without even the Month known! God only knows how many cases have the Month but are missing the Date.

You have over 100 cases where you can't even make a Modified Hynek Classification of the events! How is that even possible?

Further tables are limited to 2007 only, in the 2007 Survey and do not summarize all cases from 1989.

So for 2007, we find that almost 100 of the 836 cases have no times or hours. Almost half these cases have no time Durations (about 366 of them)! Your Survey claims that "The duration of a sighting is one of the biggest clues to its explanation." Well if you don't have a Duration then you have by your own admission Insufficient Information for "clues to ... explanation."

You have 436 single-witness cases out of 836, or over half of your 2007 data set, another strong indicator of Poor Quality cases. Hynek would eliminate virtually all single-witness cases unless there were good scientific reasons for retaining them.

Some 382 of the 836 reports are Point Source cases, another strong indicator of Poor Quality. Over 100 additional cases do not even have a Shape reported! How is it even possible to have no Shape?? What on earth could be reported without a Shape?? What is being reported in those cases?? What kind of "UFO" or "IFO" has no Shape?? Why do you have such reports in the first place?

You don't even have an Angular Size category of data. Angular Size and Duration are the two primary factors that determine the amount of visual data a human witness receives from a sighting and you don't even collect the Angular Size data!

And you also shamelessly inflate your statistics with astronomer reports of meteor fireballs, on the flimsy excuse that you need them for explaining UFO reports. You never answer why you need to contaminate the statistics with meteor reports, when you can simply keep the meteor reports on file. Keeping the meteor reports on file for investigative purposes does not force you to add them to your statistics.

>But thank you for requesting further analysis. So here it is:

>>Exclude _all_ low quality cases first then tell us how many or
>>what percentage are Unknowns.

<snip>

>>I'm sure the Unknowns percentage would go up if not skyrocket.

>It does go up, of course. When you take out all the cases for
>which we don't have good information, the percentage of Unknowns
>goes up because one can't consider a poor-quality cases an
>Unknown. At best, it would be a "Possible."

>I'll pull out the data for you:

>When considering only higher-quality Unknowns (using a
>Reliability level of 7 or more), here's the breakdown for 2007:

>Reliability	Number	Unknowns	Percent
> 7	68	21	30
> 8	24	8	33.3
> 9	3	1	33.3
>Total	95	30	31.6

>So in this analysis, Unknowns comprise about 30% of the high-
>quality cases. I gather this is more like you're wanting it to
>be.

You don't explain why your 2006 and 2007 Surveys claim the High
Quality Unknowns were less than 1% of High Quality reports.

>Right?

>My point of the smaller but still significant percentage of
>Unknowns in the total database is to show that the good cases
>stand out, even when looking at all cases that are reported as
>UFOs but are obviously IFOs.

The Unknowns do not "stand out" if they are less than 1% of them!!

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](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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:38:13 +0200
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 17:48:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:19:22 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 15:26:19 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>A number of people involved with the RPIT have gone to extrem
>>lengths in recreating an ML307 from the original Army Signal
>>Corp drawings originally published in 1944 and ammended a few
>>times before the events of 1947. Ed has mentioned his part in
>>this in a seperate posting and one of the 1st things this
>>highlighted was that if the debris in the FW images was an
>>ML307 it was incorrectly constructed!. As Ed mentions in an
>>ML307 the paper backed foil must not be glued foil to foil
>>but rather paper to paper. The the foil seen in the FW images
>>if it is assumed to be that from an ML307 could only have been
>>glued foil to foil to appear as it does in the photographs,
>>this is totally at odds with the original engineering drawings
>>and would not be acceptable, the foil to foil joints would just
>>fall appart in practice.

>Gentle reader, what is being talked about here? This is more
>RPIT nonsense by people who don't understand what they are
>talking about.

Thank you David, for explaining so clearly what some people have
been confused about for so many years.

I'd like to add just this: it would have been a total idiocy to
mix elements of a flying saucer to the debris of balloon and
radar target and having excellent, detailed photographs made of
them by the press. On the other hand, such a claim is good to
keep messing up Roswell.

<snip>

>It would take a very, very long article to explain all the
>various ways that Marcel's military record has been grossly
>distorted and flagrantly lied about by debunkers like Robert
>Todd and others. Marcel was being viciously "swift-boated" long
>before John McCain and John Kerry came along and had their
>military service lied about. (Remember, they were portrayed as
>cowards and even traitors. Propaganda can be a very ugly.)

Thank you again, to you and Kevin, for your convincing defense
of Marcel's memory.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:25:00 +0100
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 17:49:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:19:22 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 15:26:19 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>A number of people involved with the RPIT have gone to extrem
>>lengths in recreating an ML307 from the original Army Signal
>>Corp drawings originally published in 1944 and ammended a few
>>times before the events of 1947. Ed has mentioned his part in
>>this in a seperate posting and one of the 1st things this
>>highlighted was that if the debris in the FW images was an
>>ML307 it was incorrectly constructed!. As Ed mentions in an
>>ML307 the paper backed foil must not be glued foil to foil
>>but rather paper to paper. The the foil seen in the FW images
>>if it is assumed to be that from an ML307 could only have been
>>glued foil to foil to appear as it does in the photographs,
>>this is totally at odds with the original engineering drawings
>>and would not be acceptable, the foil to foil joints would just
>>fall appart in practice.

<snip>

>Gentle reader, what is being talked about here? This is more
>RPIT nonsense by people who don't understand what they are
>talking about.

>The balsa wood radar target frame was covered with a foil/paper
>laminate, the same stuff that the food industry (companies like
>Wrigleys and Hersheys) had used to wrap chewing gum and candy
>bars for 30 years prior to Roswell. (So much for the "exotic"
>nature of the radar target material.)

>All this RPIT nitpicking is over what happened at the edges of
>the foil/paper when constructing the radar targets, where they
>folded back the material about an inch to create sheaths for the
>balsa sticks or reinforced edges.

<snip>

David,

This is far from nit-picking, and you shouldn't have had to
patch up a busted foil-to-foil joint because there should not
have been one, and that's the whole point.

The Army Signal Corp specified in their Engineering Drawings
exactly how they required the ML307 built, one of the
requirements being no foil-to-foil joints. A manufacturer
producing these for the military who did not conform to the
original design specification would not have their work
accepted. Foil-to-foil joints were unacceptable because the foil
was impervious to the liquid glue specified and so a joint made
in that fashion would be physically very very weak.

If you follow the engineering drawings and build a sample ML307 with them, you do not get any foil-to-foil joints, it has been done with a scale model.

I've mentioned the balloon launch that took place on July 9th at FWAAF, if you check the ML307 seen in these photo's it conforms exactly as it should do to the Signal Corp Engineering drawings, ie there are no foil-to-foil joints to be seen. Can I also mention that the ML307 used back in 1947 is not the version of the ML307 that many people think about, ie the one Charles Moore has. That I believe is an ML307C, the version in use in 1947 was the earlier version B. The ML307 had a complete redesign in 1951 with the C version, one of the comments made regarding the C version in "Origins of the ML-307B/AP Pilot Balloon Targets" was that the C version was far more "ruggedized". Comparing Moore's example to those contemporary models in the images, his does appear far more "heavy duty" in design, the B version as seen in the images looks like a far more flimsy and lightweight beast.

Best Regards

Neil

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Re: ABC Seeing UFOs

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:31:53 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:50:00 -0400
Subject: Re: ABC Seeing UFOs

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 21:57:20 -0400
>Subject: ABC Seeing UFOs

>The show started nicely with the Stephenville case. Too bad they
>had to spoil it by mixing up the 8:30 triangle/boomerang
>sightings by hundreds of people and the 10 PM lights that were
>videoed.

>They said the 10 PM lights were seen by thousands.

>To the best of my knowledge only a few people have reported the
>10 PM lights, mainly the few who videotaped the lights.

I agree, Dr. Maccabee. They were also very biased against the
Roswell incident. They made it seem that the case was only hype
to sell books.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Has UFO Fame Changed Stephenville?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:52:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:52:00 -0400
Subject: Has UFO Fame Changed Stephenville?

Source: WFAA- TV 8 - Dallas Fort Worth, Texas USA

<http://tinyurl.com/4fp53t>

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

[Video report at site]

Has UFO Fame Changed Stephenville?

Stephenville calls itself the cowboy capital of the world.

But look up the town in Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia, and there is an entire page on UFOs.

Sightings there in January were just highlighted on ABC's primetime but have they really changed the town?

The dairy cow on the Court House Square is again Stephenville's most enduring icon but at Barefoot Sporting Goods, they still sell 25 UFO T-shirts a week.

But that's nothing compared to last January when they were selling 1,000 an hour.

For a brief moment, Erath County replaced Roswell as the center of UFO attention, after 30 regular, trustworthy people, including a county constable, saw the lights zooming by.

The sightings brought international attention.

The town got some UFO tourism.

At the chamber of commerce, they tried to capitalize on the craze and calls from Brazil to Japan.

"We had a lot more request for visitor packets, relocation guides, as well as people calling wanting to know what else is there to do here in Stephenville," said July Danley from the Stephenville Chamber of Commerce.

All the attention didn't change the town.

For most, the UFO craze is distant memory but to those who actually saw it, it's still unsettling.

"It made believer out of me," said Steve Allen.

Allen worked with ABC primetime for its special.

He's not buying the government's claim that all he saw was air force jets, especially after the mutual UFO network got radar readouts that show something else.

"Tell us what is going on, we're not a bunch of idiots. We deserve to know the truth, we can handle it," Allen said.

Stephenville may be back to normal but without better answers,
the mystery remains.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: ufoupdateslist.com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:53:00 -0400
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:53:00 -0400
Subject: Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/3ug73m>

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

Hey, ABC: Reporting Is Believing
By Billy Cox

Not that the Air Force really had anything to fear from the hacks at ABC News. But you do have to wonder if the brass at Carswell Field outside Fort Worth were splitting a gut during its PrimeTime show last night and going, "What a bunch of morons! They're rippin' off Larry King!"

It's a little too easy to get hung up in the fact that Tuesday evening's UFOs: Seeing Is Believing microwaved 90 minutes of leftovers from Peter Jennings' 2005 report by the same name. Because, yeah, after all, they tossed in the whole laundry basket again - alien abductions, Roswell, the Phoenix Lights, radio astronomers vs. flying saucers, even the same old B-52 incident over Minot, S.D., from 1968.

What made this show such an inadvertent glittering jewel was its utter lack of irony. Because David Muir, the standup blow-dry who had to paint the lipstick on this pig, actually said, "Tonight, we'll report what's new."

He said that.

Now, to be fair, we can't blame it all on David. The guy had a team of writers and producers and probably a bunch of marketing suits armed with flash cards and timers warning that devoting more than six minutes would lose the entire audience.

And did you notice how the narrative made such a breezy transition from the Phoenix Lights to NASA's Phoenix Lander, the probe that discovered ice on Mars? Aside from the word "phoenix," neither had a thing to do with the other. So that segue had to be a group effort. No one person dreams up that sort of non sequitur by themselves.

The only "What's New" aspect to Seeing Is Believing was the lead segment - the Stephenville, Tex., incident. But ABC's irresponsible management of it attains tragic proportions only if one assumes investigative journalism, not entertainment, were the imperative.

Let's <sigh> run through it again real quick: A massive UFO passes over a rural region of north Texas. Multiple witnesses also report jet fighters in hot pursuit. Some contend the bogey was heading toward George Bush's ranch in Crawford.

A spokesman for the 301st Fighter Wing at the nearby Joint Reserve Base Naval Air Station (Carswell Field) denies any warplanes were in the sky that night.

Two weeks later, aware that investigators with the Mutual UFO Network are filing radar records requests with various military and civilian agencies, the USAF realizes it's about to be caught in a lie. In a pre-emptive motion, it concedes it had 10 F-16s in the air. Conducting "routine" training missions.

All military agencies in receipt of Freedom of Information Act requests from MUFON - as well as the Department of Homeland Security - stonewall the release of radar data. But it's too late. Federal Aviation Administration and National Weather Service returns tell the story: F-16s were all over the place that night, straying out of their military operating areas and closing to within a mile of the UFO on its southeast trajectory toward Crawford. Nothing routine about this. And when the object bore down on a straight path to the Bush ranch no-fly zone, the military interceptors were nowhere in the vicinity.

ABC compresses this stuff into a four-minute feature dominated by civilian eyewitnesses. There's a sound bite with MUFON report co-author Robert Powell. But no serious examination of the radar data, no airing of the redacted flight logs from Carswell, not even any indication that PrimeTime attempted to resolve the USAF's information embargo.

Perversely, PrimeTime concluded its broadcast with an exhortation from physicist Michio Kaku, who wondered if UFOs embody the technology needed to circumvent the constraints of time and space: "Let this investigation begin!"

Exactly. Because ABC can't handle 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 17](#)

Possible UFO During Mexican Military Parade

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 15:00:48 -0400 (GMT-04:00)
Archived: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:55:00 -0400
Subject: Possible UFO During Mexican Military Parade

INEXPLICATA - The Journal of Hispanic Ufology
September 17, 2008

Source: www.analuisacid.com
Data: 09.17.08

Mexico: Possible UFO During Mexican Military Parade
By Ana Luisa Cid

A video taken by Lic. Daniel Sanchez Rosales over Mexico City on September 16 [2008] during the air show that commemorated the 198th Anniversary of Mexico's independence from Spain.

The equipment used was a Sony DCR-TRV190 camcorder

While we are not altogether dismissing the possibility of a logical explanation, it should be noted that the object descended and then ascended again on its own.

UFOs have been recorded during air shows in past years.

Video at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SWXGr8jV3Gw>

Translation (c) 2008, 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 > 2008 > Sep > Sep 18

Hubble Finds Unidentified Object

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:40:03 -0400
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:40:03 -0400
Subject: Hubble Finds Unidentified Object

Source: Gizmodo.Com - Budapest, Hungary

<http://tinyurl.com/6frata>

Mon Sep 15 2008

[Image & links in article]

Hubble Finds Unidentified Object In Space, Scientists Puzzled

This is exactly why we send astronauts to risk their life to service Hubble: in a paper published last week in the *Astrophysical Journal*, scientists detail the discovery of a new unidentified object in the middle of nowhere. I don't know about you, but when a research paper conclusion says "We suggest that the transient may be one of a new class" I get a chill of oooh-aaahness down my spine. Especially when after a hundred days of observation, it disappeared from the sky with no explanation. Get your tinfoil hats out, because it gets even weirder.

The object also appeared out of nowhere. It just wasn't there before. In fact, they don't even know where it is exactly located because it didn't behave like anything they know. Apparently, it can't be closer than 130 light-years but it can be as far as 11 billion light-years away. It's not in any known galaxy either. And they have ruled out a supernova too. It's something that they have never encountered before. In other words: they don't have a single clue about where or what the heck this thing is.

The shape of the light curve is inconsistent with microlensing. In addition to being inconsistent with all known supernova types, is not matched to any spectrum in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey database.

The only thing the astronomers - working on the Supernova Cosmology Project - can tell is that it appeared all of the sudden in the direction of a cluster with the catchy name of CL 1432.5+3332.8, about 8.2 billion light-years away. Hubble caught a spark that continued to brighten during a 100-day period, peaking at the 21st magnitude, only to fade away in the same period of time.

Apparently, a scientist at the LHC declared that the object is similar to the flash that an Imperial Star Destroyer does when reaching Warp 10. Either that or some dust on the Hubble lenses, so someone tell NASA to get some Windex up there too. [Sky and Telescope]

[Thanks to Joe Merrell 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 18](#)

Re: Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 18:04:23 -0400
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:42:38 -0400
Subject: Re: Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
To: - UFO UpDates Subscribers - <UFO-UpDates.nul>
Date: Wednesday, September 17, 2008 6:53 PM
Subject: UFO UpDate: Hey ABC Reporting Is Believing

>It's a little too easy to get hung up in the fact that Tuesday
>evening's UFOs: Seeing Is Believing microwaved 90 minutes of
>leftovers from Peter Jennings' 2005 report by the same name.
>Because, yeah, after all, they tossed in the whole laundry
>basket again - alien abductions, Roswell, the Phoenix Lights,
>radio astronomers vs. flying saucers, even the same old B-52
>incident over Minot, S.D. [sic], from 1968.

What is it about Minot, North Dakota, that people who don't live
in the Upper Midwest can't get right?

An earlier post today had the city spelled "Minto." At least
that one got the state right.

Minot, North Dakota, is the site of one of the most
spectacularly evidential radar/visual cases in history,
brilliantly investigated by Tom Tulien and Jim Klotz.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 18](#)

Primetime's UFO Special

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 01:28:55 EDT
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:47:19 -0400
Subject: Primetime's UFO Special

I had just posted an essay regarding this latest special by ABC's Primetime and only a few posted it.

I wrote it on my blog and of course I was right.

When I saw the responses to the special here on UFO UpDates List I knew I was finally on to something.

Vince White, Al Lehmborg, Dr. Maccabee all hit the nail on the head although Vince and Al sure added some fire and brimstone to their responses.

The special just didn't do anything special.

It's just another one of those UFO specials that has the obligatory everything one sees in just another UFO special.

With the tons of raw data on both sides of the UFO argument none of it was covered to any depth. UFOs are not a subject you can cover in a mere hour and a half. Had ABC focused on Benwaters alone or Roswell alone or even the Barney and Betty Hill story, it would have been a remarkable feat.

We're doomed to these generic UFO specials from now on because they're ratings boosters. Gotta have that UFO special now because it's big money but don't do anything to solve anything or you ruin the market.

You wonder what other news stories ABC isn't covering properly.

We're in danger. Major financial institutions filing for bankruptcy and storms and disasters imminent. If it's true that we have technology from sources not divulged that could alleviate our problems as many UFOlogists state, then we had better get this field of study moving and fast.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 18](#)

Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:55:04 -0400
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:55:04 -0400
Subject: Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

Source: United Press International - Washington, DC, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/4or4mw>

Sept. 17, 2008

Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

ROSWELL, N.M., Sept. 17 (UPI) -- Several people in Roswell, N.M., have reported spotting an unidentified flying object over the northwest side of the city, a mecca for those interested in UFOs.

Andre Buonaiuto said he and his wife saw a flying saucer Monday night, KOAT-TV in Albuquerque reported Wednesday.

"We walked outside, my wife and I, we noticed a glow in the sky," Buonaiuto said.

He said despite the city's reputation for extraterrestrial activity, it was the first time he had experienced anything resembling a close encounter.

KOAT-TV said the alleged flying disc was reported by multiple viewers.

UFOs and extraterrestrials are a major tourist draw, with the city's annual UFO Festival drawing record numbers of convention-goers in recent years, said UFO novelty store owner Richard Hesse.

City officials are developing plans for a \$25 million UFO museum in Roswell that would open in three years.

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

See:

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

[[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 18](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 10:00:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>Viktor,

>>>This point has been debated during several years. A lot of
>>>confusion was spread by people like Bill Moore, Jaime Shandera
>>>and James Bond Johnson. But it has been settled now, mainly
>>>thanks to Kevin Randle, I think. Major Marcel said clearly that
>>>the debris photographed in General Ramey' office were not the
>>real debris. And so did General DuBose.

>>I have a video interview with DuBose made shortly before his
>>death where DuBose clearly states the "debris" in the JBJ photos
>>_was_ that brought from Roswell, he also colourfully refutes any
>>idea a switch was made involving the debris.

>Neil, and all,

>I have not seen that video but I have, like everyone, the
>affidavit of General DuBose, who said:

>"The material shown in the photographs taken in Gen. Ramey's
>office was a weather balloon. The weather balloon explanation for
>the material was a cover story to divert the attention of the
>press".

>I urge you, and Viktor Golubik, Bruce Hutchinson, and Steven Kaeser
>as well, to buy a balsa wood stick 8 mm thick, add any amount of
>glue that you like to it, and see for yourself how easy it is to
>break it. It is a very cheap and simple experiment.

>A ten-year-old child can do it.

>May I repeat again that Major Marcel had a diploma of radar
>school (reproduced in the book of his son) and that, of course,
>he knew very well that sort of radar equipment. And, again,
>Mogul 4 was never launched, and therefore never landed on the
>Foster ranch.

>I was hoping to have a discussion on the Roswell time line,
>following the important book of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt, but
>all I see, so far, is a repetition of the usual, tired arguments
>against Roswell. This is very disappointing.

>Gildas Bourdais

Thanks to you both. (sorry for the long delay. I've been very busy)

Obviously a transcript of that video is needed and it would be nice if you (Neil) could provide it.

I think I was clear enough on my earlier points Gildas. If you have any questions, please let me know.

If other Roswell researchers could tell us all the negative and positive aspects of their investigation, like I'm willing to do, then we have a place to start.

If you want to talk about the published accounts, that's another affair entirely.

Of Note:

Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special "Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera. Explained then, as remains of a balloon. The case reemerges in 1978, (see below)

You can possibly see a picture of the symbols on the tape in the bottom illustration of symbols on page 158 of Peter Brookesmith's "UFO: The Government Files" 1996 Barnes and Noble. If anyone has a copy, perhaps you can post the photo on "Photobucket.com." I haven't seen this myself yet. I would encourage everyone to get an account there - to facilitate the sharing of photos on this list.

Military Historian Fletcher Pratt in early 1950 alluded to a flying Saucer crash and that bodies of vaguely human appearance and about thirty five inches tall had been found in the wreckage - citing confidential channels. If anyone else knows more about this, that would be interesting...

A Starting Point: Marcel's Account

I think this will elucidate on the matter of Marcel's description and early events for all to evaluate fairly on their own. I will not bias your own opinions by interjecting my own. But, I do have them.

Major Marcel's description (The Roswell Incident):

[Begin Excerpt]

Question: Do you think what you saw was a weather balloon?

It was not. I was pretty well acquainted with most everything that was in the air at the time, both ours and foreign. I was also acquainted with virtually every type of weather-observation or radar tracking device being used by either the civilians or the military.

It was definitely not a weather or tracking device, nor was it any sort of plane or missile. What it was we didn't know. We just picked up the fragments. It was something I had never seen before, or since, for that matter. I didn't know what it was, but it certainly wasn't anything built by us and it most certainly wasn't any weather balloon.

Question: Can you describe the materials that you found on the site?

There was all kinds of stuff - - small beams about three eights or a half inch square with some sort of hieroglyphics on them that nobody could decipher. These looked something like balsa wood, and were of about the same weight, except that they were not wood at all. They were very hard, although flexible, and would not burn.

There was a great deal of an unusual parchment-like substance which was brown in color and extremely strong, and a great number of small pieces of a metal like tinfoil, except that it wasn't tinfoil.

I was interested in electronics and kept looking for something that resembled instruments or electronic equipment, but I didn't

find anything. One of the other fellows, Cavitt, I think, found a black, metallic-looking box several inches square. As there was no apparent way to open this, and since it didn't appear to be an instrument package of any sort (it to was very light weight), we threw it in with the rest of the stuff. I don't know what eventually happened to the box, but it went along with the rest of the material we eventually took to Fort Worth.

Question: What was especially interesting about the material

"One thing that impressed me about the debris was the fact that a lot of it looked like parchment. It had little numbers with symbols that we had to call hieroglyphics because I could not understand them. They could not be read, they were just like symbols, something that meant something, and they were not all the same, but the same general pattern, I would say. They were pink and purple. They looked like they were painted on. These little numbers could not be broken, could not be burned. I even took my cigarette lighter and tried to burn the material we found that resembled parchment and balsa, but it would not burn - wouldn't even smoke.

But something that is even more astounding is that the pieces of metal that we brought back were so thin, just like the tinfoil in a pack of cigarettes. I didn't pay too much attention to that at first, until one of the boys came to me and said: "You know that metal that was there? I tried to bend the stuff and it won't bend. I even tried it with a sledgehammer. You can't make a dent on it."... This particular piece of metal was about two feet long and maybe a foot wide. It was so light it weighed practically nothing, that was true of all the material that was brought up, it weighed practically nothing... it was so thin.

So I tried to bend the stuff. We did all we could to bend it. It would not bend and you could not tear it or cut it either. We even tried making a dent in it with a sixteen-pound sledgehammer, and there was still no dent in it... It's still a mystery to me what the whole thing was. Now by bend, I mean crease. it was possible to flex this stuff back and forth, even to wrinkle it, but you could not put a crease in it that would stay, nor could you dent it at all. I would almost have to describe it as a metal with plastic properties. One of the fellows tried to put some of the pieces together - like a jigsaw puzzle. He managed to get about ten square feet together, but it wasn't enough to get an idea of the general shape of the object itself. Whatever it was, it was big.

Question: What did you do with the material you had picked up?

We collected all the debris we could handle. When we had filled the Carry-all, I began to fill the trunk and back seat of the Buick. That afternoon (July 7) we headed back to Roswell and arrived there in the early evening.

When we arrived there, we discovered that the story that we had found a flying disc had leaked out ahead of us. We had an eager-beaver PIO on the base who had taken it upon himself to call the AP on this thing. We had several calls that night, and one reporter even came to the house, but of course I couldn't confirm anything to them over the phone, and the man who came to the house my wife sent over to see the colonel. The next morning that written press release went out, and after that things really hit the fan. The phone rang right off the hook. I heard that the brass fried him later on for putting out that press release, but then I can't say so for sure...

Anyway, the next afternoon we loaded everything into a B-29 on orders from Colonel Blanchard and flew it all to Fort Worth. I was scheduled to fly it all the way to Wright Field in Ohio, but when we got to Carswell at Fort Worth, the general nixed it. He took control at this point, told the press it was all a weather balloon, and ordered me not to talk to the press under any circumstances. I was pulled off the flight and someone else was assigned to fly the stuff up to Wright {Patterson} Field. everything was sent to Wright-Patterson for analysis.

Just after we got tom Carswell, Fort Worth, we were told to bring some of this stuff up to the general's office - that he wanted to take a look at it. We did this and spread itout on the floor on some brown paper.

What we had was only a very small portion of the debris - there was half a B-29-ful outside. General Ramey allowed some members of the press in to take a picture of this stuff.

They took one picture of me on the floor holding up some of the less interesting metallic debris. The press was allowed to photograph this, but were not allowed far enough into the room to touch it. The stuff in that one photo was pieces of the actual stuff we had found. It was not a staged photo.

Later, they cleared out our wreckage and submitted some of their own. Then they allowed more photos. Those photos were taken while the actual wreckage was already on its way to Wright Field.

I was not in these. I believe these were taken with the general and one of his aides. I've seen a lot of weather balloons, but I've never seen one like this before. And I don't think they ever did either.

Question: Let's go back to how the press and radio people got involved. Can we go over that again?

It was the public Information Officer, Haut I believe his name was, who called the AP and later wrote the press release. I heard he wasn't authorized to do this, and I Believe he was severely reprimanded for it, I think all the way from Washington.

We had calls from everywhere - all over the world. It was General Ramey who put up the cover story about the balloon just to get the press off our back. The press was told it was just a balloon and that flight to wright-Patterson was canceled; but all that really happened was that I was removed from the flight and someone else took it up to W-P. I wasn't even allowed to talk to the press except to say what the general had told me to say. They all wanted to ask me questions, and I couldn't tell them anything.

Question: So what you're saying is that the whole weather-balloon thing was nothing but a cover-up?

Well, one thing that I want to point out is that the newsmen saw very little of the material - and none of the important things that had hieroglyphics, or markings, on them.

They didn't see that because it wasn't there. They wanted me to tell them about it but I couldn't say anything. When the general came in he told me not to say anything, that he would handle it. He told the newsmen: "Yes, that's the weather balloon." So the newsmen had to take his word for it because they had nothing else to go by. They tried to get me to talk about it, but the general had told me not to say anything and I couldn't say anything.

That's when the general told me: "It's best you go back to Roswell. You have duties to perform there. We'll handle it from here..."

Question: Upon being asked whether he knew if the Brazel ranch wreckage was connected with the report that a saucer had crashed near Socorro at about the same, Marcel answered:

I heard about that (perhaps, when Stan first spoke with him - my only comment) but could not verify such an occurrence from my own experience. Of course, if another military group had become involved with a larger piece of wreckage, there would be no reason for me to be informed about it officially. All I can verify is what I saw and, I repeat, the material I saw came from no weather balloon,

Question: would anyone else remember anything about what you found on the Brazel ranch?

My son may remember something. He was twelve then and he saw some of the stuff we took from the site before it was packed off.

[End Excerpt]

Viktor Golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 18](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 07:50:34 +0100
Archived: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 10:01:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 18:31:46 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>The first operation in quantitative science - as established
>>>>by Bacon & Descartes and many since - is to collect _all_
>>>>instances without passing judgement or ruling any out.

>>>>The second step is a quantitative analysis; often called
>>>>applying the 'Laws of Large Numbers'.

<snip>

>I'm not sure what specific claims, and by whom, you are
>referring to here. But scientists are not refusing to look
>through Galileo's telescope; they simply can't get the funding
>to do so. When UFOs were briefly taken seriously worldwide in
>the 1960s, scientists came out of the woodwork ready, willing,
>and able to study UFOs.

>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low,
>but others on the project stood up for scientific principles
>and blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair
>or accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>scientists as a class.

Right Dick, but in any large organized conspiracy most
individuals can say they're innocent and well-meaning, and the
majority will be telling the truth.

The fact is, as you've admitted, there's been no truly
scientific investigation of UFO/ET phenomena, or none that have
seen the light of day. But government, military and media, and
many scientists who should know better, regularly claim that
there's been repeated 'scientific research' with no results.

That's downright lies, but the public accept it as part of the
record.

And we now seem to be doing the establishment's dirty work by
ruling out types of cases in advance - because we know the
establishment won't accept them?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Frank Warren <frank-warren.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 08:24:44 -0700
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 06:57:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>If you want to talk about the published accounts, that's another
>affair entirely.

>Of Note:

>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera. Explained then,
>as remains of a balloon. The case reemerges in 1978, (see below)

<snip>

Good Day Gentlemen,

It's the Newton picture, and the caption incorrectly reads:

"The year 1947 was the beginning of most American UFO sightings. At that time military authorities believed many of the objects seen were actually weather balloons. In 1947 the Navy launched several devices such as this [picture of balloon device shown at left on page] with four balloons and tin-foil covered reflectors to measure wind velocities by radar. When the wreckage of one of these was recovered in Fort Worth, Texas, in 1947, it was first thought to be part of a flying saucer."

Cheers,

Frank

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:28:41 +0100
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 07:02:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 20:16:10 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:46:55 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Kevin,

>Well, that's all well and good, but we still have the problem of
>nearly everyone who interviewed DuBose without the Moore/
>Shandera influence got a different story than the debris was not
>switched. You don't tell us who conducted the interview and
>actually when it was conducted, both important facts.

I will try to find this and post the source.

>>The meat of which is as follows:

>>"Before Brigadier General Rameys broadcast Major Edwin Kirtan,
>>duty officer at Eighth Air Force headquarters at Fort Worth,
>>quoted him as saying 'it looks like a hexagonal object covered
>>with tinfoil or other shining material suspended from a balloon
>>of about twenty feet diameter. It is possibly a weather balloon
>>flown at the highest altitude but none of the army men at this
>>base recognize it as an army type balloon.'"

>Well, your paraphrase isn't exactly accurate because this
>doesn't say "our guys here at FWAAF don't know what it is". It
>says that no one at the base recognized it as an army type
>balloon, which, if it was Mogul would have been the truth.

I don't think so, the equipment flown on MOGUL that summer was
Army issue. The trains used by NYU in the 1947 season used std
meteo "pilot" balloon together with one or more larger meteo
"lifter" balloons, if I recall these deflated automatically when
they went above ?10,000ft? and the flight continued on the
"pilots". These were std "off the shelf" neoprene meteo
balloons, I don't think NYU started using the more "exotic"
plastic envelopes until the 1948 season's flights and both the
47 neoprene balloon flights and the 48 season's plastic flights
both used your good old ML307's that had been in use from 1944.
Plus the trains also had the "return to sender" labels on the
equipment and ballast tanks to aid identification. Even the NM
sheep farmers were returning MOGUL balloons when they came
across them presumably with the help of the labels.

>It
>really doesn't say that they didn't know what it was either. It
>actually gives us a good description of weather balloon and
>radar reflector, tells us that it could be a balloon flown at
>the highest altitude and that no one recognized it as being Army
>equipment. But they did know that it was a balloon and radar
>reflector.

So in the light of what the 1947 MOGUL train's consisted of mentioned above,

"none of the army men at this base recognize it as an army type balloon"

doesn't mean "we don't know what it is"?.

I agree they take a stab at guessing it's the nearest thing they can resolve it to ie, a balloon and radar reflector, but they had the very things on the base to check against and yet they still could not positively identify the debris as such.

>>The article continues with the Newton identification of the >>debris as a weather balloon.

>And now, later, you tell us that it was identified by someone at >the FWAAF in the same article which again argues against your >interpretation of that one line because one of the guys there >did, in fact recognize it.

>I might remind you that Newton told me that he got a call and >was to drive to Ramey's office and he was briefed before he >walked in that Ramey thought it was a weather balloon but that >Newton was to identify it... which suggests that they were >preparing the cover story then. Ramey knew exactly what it was >but wanted the opinion of someone else to confirm it.

Are you saying Newton was the only person at FWAAF who was qualified or had the knowledge to identify the debris?. What about the guy's down on the field shown launching and tracking one the following day?.

Or was he just handy at the time the story was getting out of hand to help push the balloon cover story to the press?.

>>But as I pointed out in my previous post FWAAF had on base both >>"weather balloons" and ML307 targets and used them daily. Ramey >>above states they could not identify the debris as such. Also >>why could they not identify simple "tinfoil"?, and describe the >>material as "other shining material"?. The ML307 used very >>ordinary aluminium foil all be it paper backed.

>Actually, Newton told me they didn't use them daily... he had >launched dozens of the balloons and radar reflectors during the >invasion of Okinawa but hadn't launched any at Fort Worth... >Although winds aloft data was collected in the Dallas/Fort Worth >area but that doesn't mean they were launched at the FWAAF but >could have been launched at the civilian airport or the weather >service office there.

The photos from the 9th July launch at FWAAF only show the ML307 and the tracking radar station, so I take back the "on a daily basis", but it's obvious FWAAF had a team of people who not only knew about ML307's but handled and used them .

>>>The pictures have the look of those taken by Johnson... and, >>>more importantly, one of them was in the Star-Telegram archives >>>suggesting it came from the newspaper and Johnson was the only >>>reporter from that newspaper to go out there.

>>They indeed look like "press" photographs AND were in the Star >>Telegram archives but they were taken with different lens >>(Bond only had the 1 and changing a lens on a SpeedGraphic was >>not a minor task like todays cameras) and were taken on a >>different batch of Ansco film from the Ramey-DuBose images and >>in at least one of the Marcel images a totally different style >>of filmholder was used (possibly a military type with ID code). >>The Marcel negatives were also processed seperately (different >>handwriting on the negs) in the Star Telegram archives which >>indicates they were not submitted together with Bonds 4 images >>You need to examine the whole negatives not just prints, to see >>these later points.

>If we return to the very first interview with Johnson, he said >that he only took two photographs because he had but a single >film holder with him. Then he decided that he had taken four, >based on the composition of the photographs and finally he said >that he had taken six which includes the Marcel photographs.

>And, if you examine the pictures, you see Ramey's overseas cap

>and tie on the radiator in the pictures of Ramey, of Ramey and
>DuBose, and of Marcel. In the picture of Newton, the cap and tie
>are gone (not to mention the fact that this picture was clearly
>taken with a different camera), which argues that the first six
>pictures were taken at about the same time... which also seems
>to indicate that Johnson took them.

Bond's _hat_ can be seen in at least one of the 4 RameyDuBose
set of pictures, this has gone in both the Marcel and Newton
images. You also can't get away from the physical fact that the
Marcel photos were taken with a different lens. Bond only ever
had the one lens for his SpeedGraphic(a distinctive wide angle
type pitched for press use). Bond only had the one camera and
the one lens, someone else took the Marcel pair and the Newton.

We've timed Bond's set of pictures as being taken at aprox
3.15pm. Newton didn't even come on duty that day until 6pm if
his single person shift working in the Weather Office is
correct, which says his picture must have been taken _after_
6pm.

Even if you do not accept our sun angle timing on the shadow
seen of the car fender through Ramey's window you have to admit
that the apparent shadow angle is resonably high, for interested
parties please see:

<http://130.88.20.235/images/fig-3a-ann.jpg>

I've marked on here in yellow the angle in question, this markup
is rough and ready but I think you have to agree the angle(in
yellow) is fairly large and probably over 45 degrees.

We maintain the photo was taken along with the other 3
RameyDubose image at aprox 3.30pm at that time the angle of the
sun above the horizon in Fort Worth is listed as being 53.2
degrees.

Irving Newton didn't arrive in the FWAAF weather office until
6pm he then had to travel over to Gen Ramey's office and pose
for the camera. The sun angle for 6.30pm is listed as being 12.8
degrees above the horizon.

Looking at the image at the link above, which angle is a better
fit 12.8 or 53.2 degrees?.

I've marked in blue the rough angle you would expect to see for
a 12 degree sun angle.

>>Bond himself mentioned that on many occasions with a big story
>>the papers in the FW Dallas area ran an informal system where
>>photos were transferred from one paper to another when needed. A
>>bit like the newsfeed "pooling" that goes on today with TV news
>>footage, you don't imagine each station has it's own crew at
>>each of those news stories, nope they "pool" the footage, if a
>>station covers a major story they make it available for other
>>stations to use and in return they can use footage provided by
>>other stations in the "pool" in their own reports.

>Yes, they would send pictures but not negatives. What purpose
>would be served by giving someone else the negatives?. All they
>needed was a print from the negative... if you surrender the
>negative, then you have lost the ability to use it yourself and
>you don't know what the future might bring. You retain the
>negative and give a print to the other newspapers. That they
>retained the negatives is proved by the fact that the negatives
>were in the envelop at the Archives. (And yes, I know there were
>only four negatives in that envelop, but that was after they
>were sent to the Archives.)

>>Bond himself had transported pictures from the ST to other
>>newspapers by taxi and even by bus. These were usually "spare"
>>shots and not those that were eventually used and published in
>>the home paper. Remember Bonds story where he said he had
>>people calling him asking for pictures?, this informal system I
>>think explains why Bond got those calls asking for spare
>>pictures, he did say he wished he'd taken more.

>Yes, they wanted additional shots... not copies of those that he
>had already transmitted... exclusive shots and not those available
>to everyone else, but he had only taken six... I mean four.

>>So does it take a leap of imagination to think that this process
>>would also work in reverse and the ST puts out a call for a
>>photo of this Marcel guy long after Bond, their only photog on
>>duty that night, had left for home?.

>Again, you don't give up the negatives... do the markings on the
>negatives suggest where they might have come from if they were
>not taken by Johnson... and remember, he insisted, despite the
>evidence that only he had taken pictures in Ramey's office, and
>that only he had interviewed Ramey.

He distributed negs as well, I'm still not sure what the
mechanism or method was at work regarding the disposal of
"spare" photos. Think about the "Bettmann" shot, the neg of this
is not in the ST Archive, it appears to have been disposed of to
a wire photo office of INP possibly in Dallas from the marking
on the copy, but it's credited to James Bond Johnson not The
FW Star Telegram his employer?. As long and the home paper got
the best shots were the photogs allowed to "dispose" of any
other "spare" images as they wished?. I don't know, but it seems
this was likely. Why else were other papers calling Bond
directly for pictures rather than his editor?.

>>I do believe a press conference of sorts did take place and
>>Marcel and Newton had their pictures taken there and the cover
>>story pushed and confirmed by Newton, but this was long after
>>Bond had taken his pictures of Ramey and DuBose earlier that
>>afternoon.

>Johnson said, "No..." but then, he couldn't explain the other
>picture but did say that no one else was there when he was and
>there were no press conferences... I think these facts speak for
>themselves.

If Newton was involved in any press conference called at FWAAF
it would have taken place long after Bond had left the ST and
therefore he wouldn't have known about it. His next
involvement was reading the paper the following morning and by
then the story was dead.

Even setting aside the circumstances we have been told about as
to why Bond was allowed early access to photograph the debris, I
believe the image showing the sun angle above, clearly
demonstrates Bond took his photographs sometime durring the
afternoon of July 8th, we believe between 3pm-3.30pm, not at the
much later press conference. The shadow cast by the car fender
in the photograph acts like a sundial and if you know where your
location is and the date, by calculating sun angles for that
location on that date, it's as good as having a clock in the
photo.

Best Regards

Neil

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

From: **Kentaro Mori** <kentaro.mori.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 11:57:09 -0300
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 07:08:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

>Source: United Press International - Washington, DC, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/4or4mw>

>Sept. 17, 2008

>Roswell Residents Report UFO Sightings

>ROSWELL, N.M., Sept. 17 (UPI) -- Several people in Roswell,
>N.M., have reported spotting an unidentified flying object over
>the northwest side of the city, a mecca for those interested in
>UFOs.

Luis Eduardo Pacheco clarifies that this was a stratospheric
balloon launched the day before from Fort Sumner. More details
in his Stratocat website:

<http://stratocat.com.ar/indexe.html>

Mori

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 10:59:31 -0400
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 07:10:42 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>A Starting Point: Marcel's Account

>I think this will elucidate on the matter of Marcel's
>description and early events for all to evaluate fairly on their
>own. I will not bias your own opinions by interjecting my own.
>But, I do have them.

>Major Marcel's description (The Roswell Incident):

>[Begin Excerpt]

>Question: Do you think what you saw was a weather balloon?

>It was not. I was pretty well acquainted with most everything
>that was in the air at the time, both ours and foreign. I was
>also acquainted with virtually every type of weather-observation
>or radar tracking device being used by either the civilians or
>the military.

<snip>

Victor,

I assume this interview was the video interview that is included
in Roswell Recollections. I would have to go back and watch it
again, but at least some of his responses are identical to my
memory of it.

While this would seem to show that there was indeed a cover up,
the statement is made decades after he left the military and has
only served to re-ignite interest in the Roswell event after he
confirmed what had been essentially published in the Haut's
press release and was later covered up. But, again, we are faced
with a statement from someone in the twilight of their life
making paradigm shifting statements.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Canadian UFO Survey

From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 11:00:34 -0500 (CDT)
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 08:10:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Canadian UFO Survey

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 05:47:42 EDT
>Subject: Canadian UFO Survey [was: Colorado Project Had More]

>>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:12:36 -0500 (CDT)
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>What percentage of all high quality cases are Unknowns? You
>>>don't tell us. Your UFO Survey doesn't tell us.

>>Sure it does. The data is right there. That's why we provide it;
>>to allow anyone to do more analysis.

>No you don't. You provide some of the data (not for 1989 to
>1993) but you don't tally up the High Quality case statistics

You're right. Geoff didn't do all possible tallies and
combinations. Tsk.

>data. The statistics data (the word "data" is plural by the way)

Please. Random House Dictionary says that data is a singular noun
meaning "body of information." You've just gone beyond
objective criticism into personal attack. Great.

>are not there. You don't provide it, as apparently you expect
>people to plow through 7,600 cases to find the High Quality
>cases, and tabulate statistics on them because you are not that
>interested in High Quality cases.

Yes, well, we do expect serious researchers to do some work for
themselves, too. But we can work on this in future studies. As a
matter of fact, we'll be looking at this in the 20-year study
which we will publish next year.

>You only mention one single year with a figure for high-
>quality Unknowns (2007), which I had already mentioned in my
>posting. What did you think I was talking about that was
>different from that ?? Never mind, that will obviously get
>nowhere.

True.

>What percentage of all High Quality cases in the Canadian UFO
>survey from 1989 to date are Unknowns? You can't provide that
>figure because your Survey does not tabulate the data on case
>quality online, whereas you insinuate that "anyone" can just go
>and look it up. There is no table with the 1989 to 2007 data
>quality stats.

The entire 1989 to present database is not available online at

this time. I've noted elsewhere that I had to actually go back and enter cases from the 1980s and and early 1990s again manually because the earlier databases are not compatible. Silly dBase and Quattro Pro.

As for anyone using the data online, as a test a few minutes ago, I just imported an earlier year's data in HTML into Excel with a click of the mouse, then ran a sort on it. It works, and found about a third of the higher-quality cases for that year were unknowns too.

Geoff is working on getting the 7000+ cases into a single file. Apparently, he is having trouble finding time to do this because he has a life.

>As far as I can tell 2005 was the first Survey to give the >High-Quality Unknowns percentage, so we only have that figure >for 2005 (7%), 2006 (less than 1%) and (2007 (less than 1%). You >give no explanation for these figures further on in your >posting, where you come up with 30% to 31.6%.

I just checked the 2003 data to see if this is true. It's not. From the 2003 Survey:

"There were 111 Unknowns out of 673 total cases in 2003. If we look only at the Unknowns with a Reliability rating of 7 or greater, we are left with 28 high-quality Unknowns in 2003 (about four per cent of the total)."

>Why didn't you explain this huge discrepancy? As I had said in >my posting, your survey was claiming less than 1% High-Quality >Unknowns. Now you say 30%. It's your Survey, please explain it!

There is no discrepancy. The percentage of Unknowns with high Reliability ratings remains only a few percent of the total data. The 30 per cent (or so) comes out when we eliminate all low-reliability cases and only look at higher-quality cases.

Incidentally, I have just got around to reading Ann Druffel's excellent book on James McDonald. In the first few pages, she notes that in his own study of cases over five years in his immediate area, he found that only a few percent of the UFOs reported were Unexplained. Maybe take up your argument with him, too.

>I'm sorry but this just looks like gobbledygook manipulation of >statistics.

I'm sorry you feel that way.

>You still don't explain why your Unknowns percentage is so much >lower than the Condon Report's.

Because they didn't look at raw UFO data?

>Why aren't you doing a better >job than the Colorado Project of the 1960's on IFO's vs. UFO's?

You tell me. Oh wait, you did:

>Well there is a reason, as I have stated here on UFO UpDates any >number of times. You deliberately seek out and inflate your >stats with IFO cases. Here is what you say in the 2007 Survey, >that in the first few years of the Survey you had essentially no >IFO's at all, so then you decided you wanted IFO's for some >strange reason:

>"Contributors were then encouraged to submit data on all UFO >reports they received [meaning IFO's], so that a more uniform >assessment and evaluation process could be realized."

>So you deliberately sought out IFO reports to pad and line and >artificially inflate your statistics.

If that's how you want to interpret that. Our view is that we realized we weren't getting all the data from investigators. Some were not bothering to contribute the IFOs they were dealing with. That meant we would be artificially inflating (your phrase) our percentage of Unknowns in the broader database if we didn't include all cases reported as UFOs (but later explained

as IFOs). The original purpose of the study was to see what was being reported as UFOs, not to just look at Unknowns. (That's a separate research project.)

>This is how you managed to accumulate 7,600 mostly Poor Quality
>cases.

GIGO
Most UFO case reports are not of high-quality, unfortunately.

>You don't do any
>legitimate scientific control studies of the IFO case sample
>with the UFO case sample (I shudder to think how you would
>contaminate each sample with indeterminate, insufficient data
>cases).

I'll leave this for Geoff to answer.

>Judging from your posted comments (below) on 2007, as a
>guess I would say you have less than 1,000 High Quality cases
>out of about 7,600 cases since 1989, so the remaining 6,600+
>would be Poor Quality.

Maybe.

>You should get the Poor Quality cases out of your statistics as
>Hynek urged so many years ago (1976 in The Hynek UFO Report, p.
>259), saying:
>"Insufficient Information cases should [be] excluded from
>statistical computations altogether."

Perhaps. But our Survey was originally designed to find out what was actually being reported in terms of UFO sightings. It does that very well. I have no problem with the fact that the analysis of the data is something that needs debate and discussion. That's why we make the data available for anyone to play with and why I even bother with defending it here.

>That does not mean burn them, destroy them, or shred them. The
>Poor Quality reports remain in the files, just should not be in
>the statistics.

I disagree.

>There are many indicators of the poor quality of the vast
>majority of your 7,600 reports. You have almost 40 reports where
>you don't even know the Province! How are those valid cases and
>not garbage reports with Insufficient Data? You have about 50
>reports without even the Month known! God only knows how many
>cases have the Month but are missing the Date.
>You have over 100 cases where you can't even make a Modified
>Hynek Classification of the events! How is that even possible?

It's possible because many people report their sightings to UFO organizations and don't list or can't recall the date or time. As for no information on the province, I know of several instances where the source was a government or military file that listed date, time and other data, but the actual location was blacked out or unavailable to us. Should those cases not have been included?

My view is that cases with missing data should be included but noted as Insufficient Data in an analysis because not including them would lower the number of reports actually made by witnesses in a tabulation, suggesting that fewer were reported than actually were.

>So for 2007, we find that almost 100 of the 836 cases have no
>times or hours. Almost half these cases have no time Durations
>(about 366 of them)! Your Survey claims that "The duration of a
>sighting is one of the biggest clues to its explanation." Well
>if you don't have a Duration then you have by your own admission
>Insufficient Information for "clues to ... explanation."

Indeed.

>You have 436 single-witness cases out of 836, or over half of
>your 2007 data set, another strong indicator of Poor Quality
>cases. Hynek would eliminate virtually all single-witness cases
>unless there were good scientific reasons for retaining them.

You'd eliminate single witness cases as not being worthy of including in a statistical study on UFOs?

Can others on the list comment on this please?

>Some 382 of the 836 reports are Point Source cases, another
>strong indicator of Poor Quality. Over 100 additional cases do
>not even have a Shape reported! How is it even possible to have
>no Shape?? What on earth could be reported without a Shape??
>What is being reported in those cases?? What kind of "UFO" or
>"IFO" has no Shape?? Why do you have such reports in the first
>place?

e.g. Witness: "I saw a UFO flying along the horizon, about half a mile away. Its light was too bright to see any shape."

>You don't even have an Angular Size category of data. Angular
>Size and Duration are the two primary factors that determine the
>amount of visual data a human witness receives from a sighting
>and you don't even collect the Angular Size data!

Brad, please understand; we don't collect angular size data because we get the data from many different sources, most of which don't gather angular size data themselves. Heck, I can't even recall a recent military report where angular size was included. And angular size isn't something found in most of Peter Davenport's case files, for example.

Would it be nice to have? Absolutely.

>And you also shamelessly inflate your statistics with astronomer
>reports of meteor fireballs, on the flimsy excuse that you need
>them for explaining UFO reports. You never answer why you need
>to contaminate the _statistics_ with meteor reports, when you
>can simply keep the meteor reports on file. Keeping the meteor
>reports on file for investigative purposes does not force you to
>add them to your statistics.

We only did this briefly, after discussing it for awhile. We had found that some "meteor" reports in astronomical databases were not in fact meteors, since some lasted for many minutes or even hours. They may have been rightly called UFOs, but were labelled as IFOs by astronomers because they couldn't possibly have been UFOs. We have not included MIAC reports for some time.

>>When considering only higher-quality Unknowns (using a
>>Reliability level of 7 or more), here's the breakdown for 2007:
>>Reliability Number Unknowns Percent
>> 7 68 21 30
>> 8 24 8 33.3
>> 9 3 1 33.3
>>Total 95 30 31.6
>>So in this analysis, Unknowns comprise about 30% of the high-
>>quality cases. I gather this is more like you're wanting it to be.

>You don't explain why your 2006 and 2007 Surveys claim the High
>Quality Unknowns were less than 1% of High Quality reports.

Oy.

>The Unknowns do not "stand out" if they are less than 1% of them!!

Ok.

So here's the thing:

We spend many, many hours of our spare time mining the net and also poring through UFO case reports to see what is being reported in Canada. We are unfunded and do this when we can and with limited technology. We evaluate the information that is available, enter the information into a database and do some simple statistics on the data. We report on the percentages and numbers of what we found, noting demographics and distributions across time and space. The resulting published report is presented for discussion and for further research, the data being made available in a table each year.

What ufologists do with the information, data and study is up to them.

My vision is to create a kind of "Robertson Panel" (the

"Rutkowski Panel"?) where funds could be made available to fly in about a dozen ufologists, non-ufologists and scientists to spend a few weeks together each looking at all reports of UFOs from a given month or year and assessing their quality, then evaluating them objectively and coming to a consensus. My guess is that they would find the same distribution we get doing the Canadian UFO Survey, but perhaps they wouldn't. It would be an interesting exercise.

I think ufology needs more good case investigation, too. Once an interesting case gets identified as such, it would be nice to pour considerable time and money into in-depth investigation. Even if there are only a few dozen such cases a year, doing exhaustive work on them might yield valuable information. Stephenville and the O'hare cases were a good start.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 11:50:28 -0700
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 08:11:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:25:00 +0100
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 13:19:22 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 15:26:19 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>A number of people involved with the RPIT have gone to extrem
>>>lengths in recreating an ML307 from the original Army Signal
>>>Corp drawings originally published in 1944 and ammended a few
>>>times before the events of 1947. Ed has mentioned his part in
>>>this in a separte posting and one of the 1st things this
>>>highlighted was that if the debris in the FW images was an
>>>ML307 it was incorrectly constructed!. As Ed mentions in an
>>>ML307 the paper backed foil must not be glued foil to foil
>>>but rather paper to paper. The the foil seen in the FW images
>>>if it is assumed to be that from an ML307 could only have been
>>>glued foil to foil to appear as it does in the photographs,
>>>this is totally at odds with the original engineering drawings
>>>and would not be acceptable, the foil to foil joints would just
>>>fall appart in practice.

>>The balsa wood radar target frame was covered with a foil/paper
>>laminate, the same stuff that the food industry (companies like
>>Wrigleys and Hersheys) had used to wrap chewing gum and candy
>>bars for 30 years prior to Roswell. (So much for the "exotic"
>>nature of the radar target material.)

>>All this RPIT nitpicking is over what happened at the edges of
>>the foil/paper when constructing the radar targets, where they
>>folded back the material about an inch to create sheaths for the
>>balsa sticks or reinforced edges.
>>This is far from nit-picking, and you shouldn't have had to
>>patch up a busted foil-to-foil joint because there should not
>>have been one, and that's the whole point.

>>The Army Signal Corp specified in their Engineering Drawings
>>exactly how they required the ML307 built, one of the
>>requirements being no foil-to-foil joints. A manufacturer

No Neil! What the schematic instruction actually says, is
"There shall be no foil-to-foil CEMENTED joints", no doubt for
the exact reason you mentioned, that white glue does not cement
foil-to-foil well.

However, you have twisted this into an instruction forbidding
any foil-to-foil joint, which is totally bogus. The foil-to-foil
joint can be secured in others ways that I mentioned, such as
simply taping the edge with Scotch tape, or double folding the
edge to form a paper-on-foil joint. It could be further secured
by gluing the balsa stick inside the foil-lined inner sheath.

If you look even closer at the schematic in a small table of changes at the top write, it is written that the instruction forbidding CEMENTED foil-to-foil joints wasn't added until 1953, so this doesn't even apply to what was being done in 1947. (Or are we going to invoke another Air Force-type crash-dummy time travel theory?)

For reasons I don't totally understand, some of the foil-paper edges were folded one way to form a foil strip on white paper and others the other way to form a white strip on foil. It may have been to help the assemblers identify various edges as they put the kite together. E.g. two of the edge sheaths lined with foil on the inside (made of those "forbidden" foil-to-foil edge contacts) had removable edge sticks. They had to be removable so the target could fold down flat.

If you further examine the schematic, four of the white strips (with foil-to-foil edges) are clearly shown, one along the left side of the target (housing the balsa stick labeled 13), another along the right side (housing stick labeled 11), and two reinforcement edges along the bottom left of the target (one visible through cutaway). In contrast, one of the foil strips on white paper is visible on the bottom right of the target.

More damning are the photos from that period clearly showing your supposedly forbidden ML307 white edge strips. One set I already linked to in my previous post. Here's another one I just threw up on my website to illustrate the point:

http://www.roswellproof.com/Mogul_1948.html

My caption reads:

"Photo shows a Project Mogul balloon being prepared for launch in 1948, with three radar targets attached. Note white edge strip on foil surface (arrow) clearly visible on one of the targets. Several of these white strips are also seen in 1947 photos of torn up radar target in Gen. Ramey's office. They are formed by the white paper foil backing being folded over at the edge forming balsa wood frame stick sheaths and reinforcement along other edges where there are no framework sticks.

"Also note that if you ignore the obvious three-dimensional structure, the target from this angle (directly underneath) has a "hexagonal" cross-sectional profile. Gen. Ramey also was describing the radar target in his office as "hexagonal" before he brought in his weather officer (who instead described the targets as resembling a "six-pointed star"), but this unusual "hexagonal" description would be impossible to determine unless the target was assembled, as these targets are, and also viewed from very restricted angles. Ramey had to have been given the description ahead of time, probably by Army intelligence. This virtually proves that the radar target 'explanation' was predetermined and prescribed., i.e. it was part of a coverup operation."

Angle of viewing and lighting matters. One sees no foil strips in this particular photo, though I think even Neil would concede they are there somewhere. Similarly, if one sees no white strips in other photos, it doesn't mean they don't exist, just that the angle and/or lighting is wrong.

>producing these for the military who did not conform to the
>original design specification would not have their work
>accepted. Foil-to-foil joints were unacceptable because the foil
>was impervious to the liquid glue specified and so a joint made
>in that fashion would be physically very very weak.

Yes, but nothing forbade them from using other means to secure the edges and sheaths, like tape. As usual, you are making a mountain of nothing by misinterpreting minutia.

What exactly is your point here anyway--that this wasn't a ML307 radar target, therefore the debris really is from a flying saucer? Really, this argument is just so crazy it makes the debunkers look rational, and that takes some doing.

>If you follow the engineering drawings and build a sample ML307
>with them, you do not get any foil-to-foil joints, it has been
>done with a scale model.

Whoever did this is not interpreting the engineering drawing correctly. The photos of other ML307 targets with white strips, hence foil-to-foil edges 100% proves the point.

>I've mentioned the balloon launch that took place on July 9th at >FWAAF, if you check the ML307 seen in these photo's it conforms >exactly as it should do to the Signal Corp Engineering drawings, >ie there are no foil-to-foil joints to be seen.

Whether one sees the edge bright white paper strips on bright reflective foil or foil strips on white paper depends very much on the photo lighting and angles. E.g., often the the strips are on the backside of the foil/paper panels and hidden from the camera and often the lighting reduces the contrast between the strips and panels to a point where it is hard to tell.

In the case of the FWAAF photos of July 10th (not 9th):

<http://www.roswellproof.com/FWSTJuly11.html>

I've created yet another Web page showing the blown up and marked up RAWIN target from that demonstration:

http://www.roswellproof.com/Rawin_edge_strips.html

I created these illustrations several years ago to demonstrate to the RPIT people that, yes, there were white strips on the targets, but they have AGAIN obviously been ignored.

One can easily see the foil strips on two edges (marked D & E) when the radar target is blown up. But even here, lighting makes the foil strips disappear along portions of the edges because of lighting/contrast effects. The white strips are there too, along the edges marked B & C, but the angle of the photo makes them hard to see.

However, there is no such difficulty seeing the white strips in the next photo:

http://www.roswellproof.com/Rawin_edge_strips.html#anchor_4

This is a screen capture from a movie of a RAWIN target launch. There is no problem whatsoever in seeing four of the white paper strips. One foil strip is also partially visible from this angle. (The full movie is also included, illustrating how the visibility of the strips changes when the target is rotated through various angles.)

Face it Neil--they live! They are not impossible, nor are they forbidden by assembly instructions.

I have mentioned these "impossible" white strips, along with the white strips clearly shown in the engineering schematic, when I was debating the point with RPIT's Andrew LeVoie 2 or 3 years back, and his response was that the Air Force had altered the photos and schematic to make it only seem that these strips existed. That's an example how totally insane this debate with RPIT has been.

And now you are repeating the argument yet again that the strips and foil-to-foil joints were impossible, despite the point being thoroughly and objectively disproven. Like the Roswell debunkers, you RPIT guys never seem to learn a thing and keep recycling the same old garbage.

>Can I also
>mention that the ML307 used back in 1947 is not the version of >the ML307 that many people think about, ie the one Charles Moore >has. That I believe is an ML307C, the version in use in 1947 was >the earlier version B. The ML307 had a complete redesign in 1951 >with the C version, one of the comments made regarding the C >version in "Origins of the ML-307B/AP Pilot Balloon Targets" was >that the C version was far more "ruggedized". Comparing Moore's >example to those contemporary models in the images, his does >appear far more "heavy duty" in design, the B version as seen in >the images looks like a far more flimsy and lightweight beast.

I fail to see the point you are making here. Moore's model is irrelevant. Looking at various ML307 rawin photos circa 1947 tell all. See, white strips, just like the torn up target on

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Gen. Ramey's rug. Ramey's photo-op debris also was a ML307,
"impossible" white strips and all.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Maryland UFO Conference

From: Peter Resta <SPR100.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 15:42:17 EDT
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 08:12:00 -0400
Subject: Maryland UFO Conference

Announcing:

Mysteries Of Space & Sky V, November 1, 2008, Near Annapolis,
Maryland, USA

All-day UFO conference beginning at 9:30 am.
Cost is \$30 or higher (depending on residence)

Speakers include: Dr. David Jacobs, Don Berliner,
Rob/Sue Swiatek, Anna Jamerson, Keith Chester, and
Dr. Peter Resta. For details or to request a flier,
contact Dr. Resta (spr100.nul) or call:

410-544-4927 X 8

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 08:14:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 10:24:07 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2008 20:56:06 +0100
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2008 11:29:52 +0200
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera.

Here is the photo of Newton in the LOOK Magazine special on UFOs
here at my website:

http://roswellproof.com/LOOK_1967.html

The caption read (complete with historical factual mistakes,
such as the wreckage being recovered in Fort Worth instead of
Roswell):

"The year 1947 was the beginning of most American UFO sightings.
At that time military authorities believed that many of the
objects seen actually were weather balloons. In 1947, the Navy
launched several objects such as this with four balloons and
tin-foil covered reflectors to measure wind velocities by radar.
When the wreckage of one of these was recovered in Fort Worth,
Texas, in 1947, it was at first thought to be part of a flying
saucer."

The mainstream media wasn't any better with its UFO "facts" 40
years ago than they are today (such as the just-shown, half-
horrible ABC special, "Seeing is Believing").

Frank Edwards also briefly mentioned the Roswell case in 1959 in
an article titled "Keep your eyes on Venus" (again replete with
mistakes). He brought it up again in 1966 in "Flying Saucers--
Serious Business" in Chapter 4, "Pick up the pieces", devoted to
crash cases.

The first issue of "Flying Saucer Review" in 1955 also carried a
story about Roswell:

http://uk.geocities.com/jinghiz53/Hughie_Green_and_Roswell.htm

So Roswell obviously wasn't totally forgotten.

>Explained then,
>as remains of a balloon. The case reemerges in 1978, (see below)

>You can possibly see a picture of the symbols on the tape in the
>bottom illustration of symbols on page 158 of Peter
>Brookesmith's "UFO: The Government Files" 1996 Barnes and Noble.
>If anyone has a copy, perhaps you can post the photo on
>"Photobucket.com." I haven't seen this myself yet. I would
>encourage everyone to get an account there - to facilitate the
>sharing of photos on this list.

I am unaware of any photos of the mythical "flower tape".
Charles Moore made a drawing of what he said was there:

http://www.roswellproof.com/beams_symbols_compare.html

Compare with Marcel Sr.'s and Marcel Jr.'s drawings.

>Military Historian Fletcher Pratt in early 1950 alluded to a
>flying Saucer crash and that bodies of vaguely human appearance
>and about thirty five inches tall had been found in the wreckage
>- citing confidential channels. If anyone else knows more about
>this, that would be interesting...

Never heard of him until now. Here's a Mechanix Illustrated
article from 1951 mentioning Pratt and having various experts
speculate on what aliens might look like:

<http://tinyurl.com/58vx6e>

Of course, Frank Scully's "Behind the Flying Saucers" mentioning
New Mexico flying saucer crashes and little aliens came out in
October 1950. Scully had already been writing about this in his
Variety Magazine column in 1949. Generally one of the crashes is
associated with Aztec in 1948, not Roswell.

British spook Bernard Newman published a book in 1948 titled
"The Flying Saucer". Interestingly, it was submitted to the
publisher in late 1947. It was a novel ridiculing the reality of
the 1947 flying saucers as mass hysteria and hallucinations.
However, the plot has top scientists staging faked Martian
flying saucer crashes, including in New Mexico, in order to
panic the world into uniting behind a common threat.

We can speculate all we want as to whether Newman had actually
heard something through the spook grapevine about Roswell, or
was just going by what he read in the newspapers (Roswell had
international coverage.)

>A Starting Point: Marcel's Account

>I think this will elucidate on the matter of Marcel's
>description and early events for all to evaluate fairly on their
>own. I will not bias your own opinions by interjecting my own.
>But, I do have them.

>Major Marcel's description (The Roswell Incident):
>Question: Do you think what you saw was a weather balloon?

>It was not. I was pretty well acquainted with most everything
>that was in the air at the time, both ours and foreign. I was
>also acquainted with virtually every type of weather-observation
>or radar tracking device being used by either the civilians or
>the military.

>It was definitely not a weather or tracking device, nor was it
>any sort of plane or missile. What it was we didn't know. We
>just picked up the fragments. It was something I had never seen
>before, or since, for that matter. I didn't know what it was,
>but it certainly wasn't anything built by us and it most
>certainly wasn't any weather balloon.

>Question: Can you describe the materials that you found on the
>site?

>There was all kinds of stuff - - small beams about three eights
>or a half inch square with some sort of hieroglyphics on them
>that nobody could decipher. These looked something like balsa
>wood, and were of about the same weight, except that they were
>not wood at all. They were very hard, although flexible, and
>would not burn.

>There was a great deal of an unusual parchment-like substance
>which was brown in color and extremely strong, and a great
>number of small pieces of a metal like tinfoil, except that it
>wasn't tinfoil.

<snip>

>But something that is even more astounding is that the pieces of
>metal that we brought back were so thin, just like the tinfoil
>in a pack of cigarettes. I didn't pay too much attention to that
>at first, until one of the boys came to me and said: "You know
>that metal that was there? I tried to bend the stuff and it
>won't bend. I even tried it with a sledgehammer. You can't make
>a dent on it."... This particular piece of metal was about two
>feet long and maybe a foot wide. It was so light it weighed
>practically nothing, that was true of all the material that was
>brought up, it weighed practically nothing... it was so thin.

<snip>

Many, many other witnesses besides Marcel saw and handled the material and described similar anomalous properties:

http://roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

Just one example was Bill Brazel Jr., who gave virtually identical descriptions about the "memory" foil and wood-like beams. Neighbor Loretta Proctor similarly saw a piece of the wood-like beam which Brazel and her husband Floyd tried to mark or cut with a knife and which would not burn.

(Seriously, Viktor, try coating a piece of balsa wood with as many layers of glue as you like, and it will still easily break, burn, or cut. Engineer Bob Galganski demonstrated this a decade ago:

including using an even stronger glue of the time that wasn't even used in making the radar target kites. Not that it matters, but the balsa sticks were not coated with glue in any case. The radar targets were nothing but balsa wood kites and glue was only applied in beads along their length to attach the foil/paper covering.)

(Directed to general audience, not Viktor) A common debunking tactic (such as in the ABC special, Seeing Is Believing special) is to try to make the entire Roswell case about Marcel alone, as if he was the only witness and the whole Roswell case was due to him. There are dozens of other important military and civilian witnesses who corroborate Marcel. Not the same can be said for the witnesses the debunkers like to cite, such as CIC spook Sheridan Cavitt who was with Marcel. Cavitt was obviously lying through his teeth and contradicted by everybody, including his wife.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Guardian Angels Are Here Say Most Americans

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 22:14:51 EDT
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 09:15:00 -0400
Subject: Guardian Angels Are Here Say Most Americans

<http://tinyurl.com/4hnu6y>

Well here's some breaking news that you won't find the government trying to cover up or blame on bad memories and crash test dummies, time compression, nor weather balloons.

According to a study done by the Baylor University Institute for Studies of Religion, the majority of persons polled believed in the interaction of angels. That's a 55% in favor of those halo sporting do gooders.

The belief in angels and demons is still healthy and alive in the 21st Century and that's something to take note of.

If you'll notice, no ridicule accompanied the story on the tv news nor print. It's just a sweet look at the beliefs we hold dear.

No scientific proof, no talking head experts, no FOIA researches through dusty old archive shelves.

Just good ol' faith and declaration thereof.

So we have here a majority of the population believeing in something that they can't prove in court nor a lab.

Why no ridicule nor debunkers and skeptics?

Because it would cause a tsunami of anger and a loss of viewship and sponsorship.

We who believe in angels and demons don't need a scientist to tell us what's real. It's something we know regardless of science's inability to validate.

Sort of like what happens when we try to investigate UFOs. Difference is UFOs show up on radar, leave traces, photo, video, film remnants and better and our military can put their hands on.

Those facts don't mean a hill of beans to the media and the authorities though. Methinks more Americans believe we're being visited by ETs than angels and demons but I'm sure some smart person out there will let me know the real figures.

Bottom line here are the standards of belief, science, sociological issues that shine through in this study that suprised many.

It's okay to believe in what society says it's okay to believe in especially if the media and the government say it's okay.

We don't care though and it's good to see a study in the media that shows that the people decide what's real not some government nor secret body, the media, and that's fine with me. Says there's hope for us yet.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 20:08:16 -0700
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 09:16:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 18:31:46 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 10:44:25 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
>others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
>blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair or
>accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>scientists as a class.

<snip>

Speaking of science and scientists, how is that the National Academy of Sciences endorsed the conclusions/findings of the Condon report? Considering the controversy that Saunders, et al, brought up about the Low "trick" memo, Condon's public dismissive statements before the report was even written, and the (new) info that at least 30 (to 50) percent of the cases in the report were considered "unknowns," just how did the NAS review and endorsement of the report's false conclusions ever occur in the first place?

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 19](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:30:24 +0200
Archived: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 09:18:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>I think I was clear enough on my earlier points Gildas. If you
>have any questions, please let me know.

>If other Roswell researchers could tell us all the negative and
>positive aspects of their investigation, like I'm willing to do,
>then we have a place to start.

>If you want to talk about the published accounts, that's another
>affair entirely.

>Of Note:

>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera. Explained then,
>as remains of a balloon. The case reemerges in 1978, (see below)

>You can possibly see a picture of the symbols on the tape in the
>bottom illustration of symbols on page 158 of Peter
>Brookesmith's "UFO: The Government Files" 1996 Barnes and Noble.
>If anyone has a copy, perhaps you can post the photo on
>"Photobucket.com." I haven't seen this myself yet. I would
>encourage everyone to get an account there - to facilitate the
>sharing of photos on this list.

>Military Historian Fletcher Pratt in early 1950 alluded to a
>flying Saucer crash and that bodies of vaguely human appearance
>and about thirty five inches tall had been found in the wreckage
>- citing confidential channels. If anyone else knows more about
>this, that would be interesting...

>A Starting Point: Marcel's Account

>I think this will elucidate on the matter of Marcel's
>description and early events for all to evaluate fairly on their
>own. I will not bias your own opinions by interjecting my own.
>But, I do have them.

Viktor,

Thank you for reminding us of the first, historical interview of
Major Marcel, which I know well.

I suppose we agree now that he could not be fooled by weather
balloons and radar targets with balsa wood sticks.

BTW, it is sad to see that the Mogul tale is still accepted in
the new ABC special, with Karl Pflock having the last word.
Balsa wood sticks, I tell you!

The message of ABC, it seems to me, is that it is possible to
talk more and more openly about UFOs, but that the time has not

come yet for full disclosure.

Perhaps it's the wise policy to follow, for now.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Canadian UFO Survey

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:39:59 EDT
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 09:56:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Canadian UFO Survey

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 11:00:34 -0500 (CDT)
>Subject: Re: Canadian UFO Survey

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 05:47:42 EDT
>>Subject: Canadian UFO Survey [was: Colorado Project Had More]

>>>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2008 11:12:36 -0500 (CDT)
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 13 Sep 2008 04:15:00 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>What percentage of all high quality cases are Unknowns? You
>>>>don't tell us. Your UFO Survey doesn't tell us.

>>>>Sure it does. The data is right there. That's why we provide it;
>>>>to allow anyone to do more analysis.

>>No you don't. You provide some of the data (not for 1989 to
>>1993) but you don't tally up the High Quality case statistics

>You're right. Geoff didn't do all possible tallies and
>combinations. Tsk.

I find this a flippant and disingenuous remark given that your
Survey the last several years makes the High Quality Unknowns one
of the half dozen or so top subjects which you bullet-point for
the media at the start of the Survey essays. Now you pretend
like it is some unimportant trivia that should be "tsk" tsked
for being focused upon out of an entire universe of "all
possible tallies and combinations."

From the 2007 Survey and I will keep coming back to this:

"In 2007, about 16 per cent of all UFO reports were unexplained.
This percentage of unknowns falls to less than one per cent when
only higher-quality cases are considered."

<snip>

>>are not there. You don't provide it, as apparently you expect
>>people to plow through 7,600 cases to find the High Quality
>>cases, and tabulate statistics on them because you are not that
>>interested in High Quality cases.

>Yes, well, we do expect serious researchers to do some work for
>themselves, too. But we can work on this in future studies. As a
>matter of fact, we'll be looking at this in the 20-year study
>which we will publish next year.

You should stop misleading people and the press in particular by

making High Quality Unknowns one of the top subjects of your Survey if you expect others to do the "work" to back up your own statements about High Quality Unknowns.

>>What percentage of all High Quality cases in the Canadian UFO >>survey from 1989 to date are Unknowns? You can't provide that >>figure because your Survey does not tabulate the data on case >>quality online, whereas you insinuate that "anyone" can just go >>and look it up. There is no table with the 1989 to 2007 data >>quality stats.

...
>As for anyone using the data online, as a test a few minutes >ago, I just imported an earlier year's data in HTML into Excel >with a click of the mouse, then ran a sort on it. It works, and >found about a third of the higher-quality cases for that year >were unknowns too.

Wow, if it's so easy then you should have had no problem doing it for the entire collection of 7,600 cases going back to 1989.

>Geoff is working on getting the 7000+ cases into a single file. >Apparently, he is having trouble finding time to do this because >he has a life.

Apparently he only "has a life" in order to disseminate misleading statistics about Unknowns comprising less than 1% of all High Quality cases. But when it comes to finding 30% to 33% figures then he doesn't "have a life" for that, it's a trivial matter which we shouldn't bother you or him with.

>Why didn't you explain this huge discrepancy? As I had said in >>my posting, your survey was claiming less than 1% High-Quality >>Unknowns. Now you say 30%. It's your Survey, please explain it!

>There is no discrepancy. The percentage of Unknowns with high >Reliability ratings remains only a few percent of the total >data. The 30 per cent (or so) comes out when we eliminate all >low-reliability cases and only look at higher-quality cases.

Well this is not what you keep saying in your bullet-point highlighted findings. From the 2007 Survey:

"In 2007, about 16 per cent of all UFO reports were unexplained. This percentage of unknowns falls to less than one per cent when only higher-quality cases are considered."

You don't say "when only higher-quality Unknowns are considered." You say "higher-quality cases" as if all cases in the High Quality category. That is misleading.

>Incidentally, I have just got around to reading Ann Druffel's >excellent book on James McDonald. In the first few pages, she >notes that in his own study of cases over five years in his >immediate area, he found that only a few percent of the UFOs >reported were Unexplained. Maybe take up your argument with him, >too.

I could match your smartaleck remark with suggesting you take up your argument with Hynek on your GIGO statistics. And I could quote Hynek again and refer to your refusal to abide by his admonition (The Hynek UFO Report, p. 259):

"Insufficient Information cases should [be] excluded from statistical computations altogether."

But I don't need to do that because McDonald went to your country of Canada in March 1968 and explained at the CASI symposium that based on his study of Blue Book cases he would estimate about 30% to 40% Unknowns. This was based on his study of a larger and more statistically significant sample of cases than the local cases he sporadically looked into from 1958 to 1965, before his intensive research began in 1966. But I don't want to get into the meaning of the concept of statistical significance since we are having so much trouble with data selection and sample data quality which necessarily precede statistics in scientific studies - except in your GIGO Surveys, of course.

Blue Book cases are of much higher quality than civilian cases because AF Regulations required a standard questionnaire to be

filled out, which ensured a greater level of uniformity in data collection. And the AF collected Angular Size data, and put the question in its report forms and questionnaires.

Moreover, both McDonald and Hynek were quick to point out that the Colorado Project had ended up with more than 30% Unknowns.

>>You still don't explain why your Unknowns percentage is so much >>lower than the Condon Report's.

>Because they didn't look at raw UFO data?

You can't be serious. The CU Project ran an Early Warning Network. Of course it "looked" at "raw data." But unlike you they discarded much of the garbage data first before attempting to do serious studies. Only later, when the project realized how high a percentage of Unknowns was coming out as a result, then the statistics apparently got fudged. Still, that manipulation of data or stats only succeeded in reducing the 50%+ figure to about 30% to 35%.

>>Why aren't you doing a better >>job than the Colorado Project of the 1960's on IFO's vs. UFO's?

>You tell me. Oh wait, you did:

>>Well there is a reason, as I have stated here on UFO UpDates any >>number of times. You deliberately seek out and inflate your >>stats with IFO cases. Here is what you say in the 2007 Survey, >>that in the first few years of the Survey you had essentially no >>IFO's at all, so then you decided you wanted IFO's for some >>strange reason:

>>"Contributors were then encouraged to submit data on all UFO >>reports they received [meaning IFO's], so that a more uniform >>assessment and evaluation process could be realized."

>>So you deliberately sought out IFO reports to pad and line and >>artificially inflate your statistics.

>If that's how you want to interpret that.

It's not my "interpretation," it's your own statement. You said you had no IFO's in your early days of the Survey so you sought them out.

With comments about who "has a life" or not, one would think you would concentrate scarce resources on the UFO's, not the IFO's or the Insufficient Info cases in your statistics. If you actually conducted a legitimate study of IFO cases that were certain, not "possible" or "probable," then that would be useful in UFO studies, in weeding out IFO cases and in arguing the fundamental difference between UFO and IFO that makes the reality of the UFO phenomenon so compelling.

But if you allow your "IFO" and "UFO" sample to be contaminated with indeterminate cases then you run the serious risk of making both "IFO" and "UFO" samples very similar, thus fueling the Menzelian debunker arguments.

>Our view is that we >>realized we weren't getting all the data from investigators. >>Some were not bothering to contribute the IFOs they were dealing >>with. That meant we would be artificially inflating (your >>phrase) our percentage of Unknowns in the broader database if we >>didn't include all cases reported as UFOs (but later explained >>as IFOs).

I have protested this disservice to witnesses again and again. Most witnesses do not report "UFO's," but use neutral terms like "object" or "light." Then you and other UFO researchers come along and slap the "UFO" label on everything that comes in, no matter what care and caution the witnesses took in making their descriptions. You don't care about the witnesses who try to be careful with their terminology.

You don't care that debunkers use the false "UFO" labels that you slap onto reports and then discredit the witnesses and the entire UFO field for promoting such lousy cases, or for being incapable of telling the difference between IFO's and UFO's without launching an immense investigation and huge argument.

If you screened so-called UFO reports for quality and eliminated all the Insufficient Info cases, you would not give debunkers this foothold. Instead, year after year, you prove to skeptics and debunkers that UFO Unknowns are very rare and that no one can really tell the difference between real UFO's and the IFO's, that it's just a random crapshoot. You enable debunkers to say that UFO "believers" determine the UFO's from IFO's by their subjective biases, because they use no objective criteria.

In fact, in previous arguments you took every opportunity to discredit witnesses' care in use of neutral terminology by saying that if they report to a "UFO group" then they must suffer all the consequences of being seen as making a "UFO" report, including attacks by debunkers, and their carefulness of terminology be damned according to you. This is why many witnesses want anonymity, we are supposed to respect that and make every effort to protect witnesses from abuse, not make things worse for honest witnesses.

We should not disrespect witnesses in this way and leave them out to hang when debunkers go after them. We are supposed to be the experts. We should be the ones who understand the correct terminology and not mislabel sightings because we want to impress the public and the media with how many thousands of sightings we have collected.

Witnesses rely on us to understand and explain concepts to them and handle their reports with due care and consideration. If we tell a witness they "saw a UFO" then he or she will think that the UFO experts have endorsed this terminology. That kind of subtle and misleading influence causes them to abandon careful neutral terms like "object" or "light." We should not be leading or misleading the witness in that fashion.

>>This is how you managed to accumulate 7,600 mostly Poor Quality >>cases.

>GIGO
>Most UFO case reports are not of high-quality, unfortunately.

Then why do you spend so much time and effort on Poor Quality data? You're not investigating most of these cases to gather the additional missing data that might turn them into High Quality cases, so why waste your time on the "garbage" in the "GIGO" equation?

>>You should get the Poor Quality cases out of your statistics as >>Hynek urged so many years ago (1976 in The Hynek UFO Report, p. >>259), saying:

>>"Insufficient Information cases should [be] excluded from >>statistical computations altogether."

>Perhaps. But our Survey was originally designed to find out what >was actually being reported in terms of UFO sightings. It does >that very well. I have no problem with the fact that the >analysis of the data is something that needs debate and >discussion. That's why we make the data available for anyone to >play with and why I even bother with defending it here.

>>That does not mean burn them, destroy them, or shred them. The >>Poor Quality reports remain in the files, just should not be in >>the statistics.

>I disagree.

Just before you said this you said "Perhaps" you do agree that Poor Quality cases should be excluded from statistics. Now you "disagree."

Your disagreement is with sound science and sound statistics. Again, I quote Hynek: "Insufficient Information cases should [be] excluded from statistical computations altogether."

I would urge you to reject Poor Quality cases from all further statistics and respect witnesses who do not use the "UFO" or similar biased labels in making their reports.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: **Stanton T Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 11:53:57 -0300
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 09:57:07 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 20:08:16 -0700
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
>>others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
>>blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair or
>>accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>>scientists as a class.

><snip>

>Speaking of science and scientists, how is that the National
>Academy of Sciences endorsed the conclusions/findings of the
>Condon report? Considering the controversy that Saunders, et al,
>brought up about the Low "trick" memo, Condon's public
>dismissive statements before the report was even written, and
>the (new) info that at least 30 (to 50) percent of the cases in
>the report were considered "unknowns," just how did the NAS
>review and endorsement of the report's false conclusions ever
>occur in the first place?

Let us not forget that the NAS is a self selecting body. Condon
was himself a member. Not likely they would do more than rubber
stamp.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 17:31:40 +0100
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 10:01:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 11:50:28 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Neil Morris <neil.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 17 Sep 2008 16:25:00 +0100
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>All this RPIT nitpicking is over what happened at the edges of
>>>the foil/paper when constructing the radar targets, where they
>>>folded back the material about an inch to create sheaths for the
>>>balsa sticks or reinforced edges.

>>This is far from nit-picking, and you shouldn't have had to
>>patch up a busted foil-to-foil joint because there should not
>>have been one, and that's the whole point.

>>The Army Signal Corp specified in their Engineering Drawings
>>exactly how they required the ML307 built, one of the
>>requirements being no foil-to-foil joints. A manufacturer

>No Neil! What the schematic instruction actually says, is
>"There shall be no foil-to-foil CEMENTED joints", no doubt for
>the exact reason you mentioned, that white glue does not cement
>foil-to-foil well.

>However, you have twisted this into an instruction forbidding
>any foil-to-foil joint, which is totally bogus. The foil-to-foil
>joint can be secured in others ways that I mentioned, such as
>simply taping the edge with Scotch tape, or double folding the
>edge to form a paper-on-foil joint. It could be further secured
>by gluing the balsa stick inside the foil-lined inner sheath.

>If you look even closer at the schematic in a small table of
>changes at the top write, it is written that the instruction
>forbidding CEMENTED foil-to-foil joints wasn't added until 1953,
>so this doesn't even apply to what was being done in 1947. (Or
>are we going to invoke another Air Force-type crash-dummy time
>travel theory?)

David,

Can I nitpick?, the drawing is for the redesigned ML307C not the
1947 ML307B <g> (has anyone seen the original 307A or B
drawings?) but even so these drawings specifically indicate
paper-to-paper only joints, the foil sides of the panels are
deliberately identifiide as such in the assembly details so as to
produce paper-paper joints. These instructions were not put
there for the hell of it, the starch based glue would not adhere
to the foil and the whole assembly would come appart when used.

>For reasons I don't totally understand, some of the foil-paper
>edges were folded one way to form a foil strip on white paper
>and others the other way to form a white strip on foil. It may
>have been to help the assemblers identify various edges as they
>put the kite together. E.g. two of the edge sheaths lined with
>foil on the inside (made of those "forbidden" foil-to-foil edge

>contacts) had removable edge sticks. They had to be removable so
>the target could fold down flat.

>If you further examine the schematic, four of the white strips
>(with foil-to-foil edges) are clearly shown, one along the left
>side of the target (housing the balsa stick labeled 13), another
>along the right side (housing stick labeled 11), and two
>reinforcement edges along the bottom left of the target (one
>visible through cutaway). In contrast, one of the foil strips on
>white paper is visible on the bottom right of the target.

>More damning are the photos from that period clearly showing
>your supposedly forbidden ML307 white edge strips. One set I
>already linked to in my previous post. Here's another one I just
>threw up on my website to illustrate the point:

David, rather than cross-post period images of ML307's apparently
with or without foil-foil, foil-paper joints, lets just cut to
the chase.

You claim the foil sheets in the FW images are those of a miss
constructed ML307 with foil-to-foil joints, yes?. This device
(if MOGUL) had been up to a few tens of thousands of feet
dropped back down, been dragged across the NM desert and was
finally found in the sorry state we see it in in the images.
Those weak foil-to-foil joints have been put to great stress but
with the help of addition scotch tape they have held together
even when the sticks that were supporting them are long gone,
ok.

A simple question.

Show me the scotch tape thats holding these super joints
together in the FW images?.

I've looked at those pictures closer than most people on this
planet over the last 8 years, and personally I have yet to see
anything resembling scotch tape strengthening on those foil
panels. I can point you to lots of things that shouldn't be
there like a nice tape buckle attachment on that white foil
edge, that's not on the ML307 spec sheet either, there were
attachment loops for strings on an ML307 but not flat tapes. For
the curious:

<http://130.88.20.235/images/MR8-clp.jpg>

It's the bottom corner of the foil sheet Marcel is holding in
the MarcelRight shot.

So.. Where's all the tape?.

Best Regards

Neil

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 12:07:04 EDT
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 10:07:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 10:59:31 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>A Starting Point: Marcel's Account

>>I think this will elucidate on the matter of Marcel's
>>description and early events for all to evaluate fairly on their
>>own. I will not bias your own opinions by interjecting my own.
>>But, I do have them.

>>Major Marcel's description (The Roswell Incident):

>>[Begin Excerpt]

>>Question: Do you think what you saw was a weather balloon?

>>It was not. I was pretty well acquainted with most everything
>>that was in the air at the time, both ours and foreign. I was
>>also acquainted with virtually every type of weather-observation
>>or radar tracking device being used by either the civilians or
>>the military.

><snip>

>Victor,

>I assume this interview was the video interview that is included
>in Roswell Recollections. I would have to go back and watch it
>again, but at least some of his responses are identical to my
>memory of it.

>While this would seem to show that there was indeed a cover up,
>the statement is made decades after he left the military and has
>only served to re-ignite interest in the Roswell event after he
>confirmed what had been essentially published in the Haut's
>press release and was later covered up. But, again, we are faced
>with a statement from someone in the twilight of their life
>making paradigm shifting statements.

Hi Steve,

This was straight from the Roswell Incident as I stated. He was quite lucid in his description.

I don't want to put words in your mouth, but which statements (words) of his describe the remains of the Balloon train and which do not?

I didn't list this early account just so we can generalize about

it...

Thanks

Victor

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Joachim Koch** <lists.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 18:55:12 +0200
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 11:10:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

Dear Friends, List,

Is it appropriate to ask someone to summarise the current state of this really important thread? Where do we stand after the many contributions of recent days?

I would like to translate much of what is written here into German - the German Branch of the International Roswell Initiative is not dead - and publish it on my website. But every day new information flows and its hard to collect the bottom line of what has been posted.

Best,

Joachim

Project Wandsdyke Path July 25, 2009
Avebury/Alton Barnes, Wiltshire, UK
In Contact With The Cosmic Matrix

<http://www.kochkyborg.de>

For those in U.S.A. who want to join
and come over to the UK please contact Ron Russell:
<http://www.cropcircles.org/TourSite/Welcome.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 13:36:49 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 11:11:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:30:24 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>Viktor,

>Thank you for reminding us of the first, historical interview of

><snip>

>The message of ABC, it seems to me, is that it is possible to
>talk more and more openly about UFOs, but that the time has not
>come yet for full disclosure.

>Perhaps it's the wise policy to follow, for now.

Gildas,

This post leads me to conclude that you believe there is a UFO conspiracy occurring. Mr. Freidman would call it a "Cosmic Watergate". It appears you may believe those in control are sitting on the information and might be releasing it slowly to prevent alarm? Is that what you mean by "Perhaps it's the wise policy"? Have you considered the possibility that a slow release could be for control and profit?

ET technology could be worth trillions. People may have made billions from the Roswell ship, if you believe even some of what Corso said in his book "The Day After Roswell". From your posts, I know you believe the Roswell ET crash occurred. What has happened with the information obtained from studying the advanced technology? Is it conceivable that someone is profiting from the technology and its slow release?

This concept of slow disclosure "for our own good" could be down right misleading. Humans have corrupted just about everything else why not this? The reason for a delay could be to continue to strengthen special interest control over global populations and maximize riches. Money, power, and wealth drive most everything else.

If the ETs are real and actually pose a grave risk to the human race, then I would say that secrecy is not appropriate. That would be like keeping WWII secret. Our government needs our help. The correct response would be to mobilize all our efforts, not just a few in the secret military. It is not logical and not legal to keep something like that secret.

The information may be alarming for some even if the secrets are benign. It will most likely be traumatic for the religious fundamentalists. The negatives are important but we must not

forget the possible benefits of disclosure, like new technology, understanding, human growth, medical, and most importantly the rule of law. Delaying disclosure will not be any easier for fundamentalist; the shock may as well come now so they can begin their healing process.

What is important is that we learn from history, secrecy has been abused by almost every government known to man. We must be very suspicious of this secrecy because the reasons for it are not fully known. We may think we have the answer but maybe it is wrong. With this type of issue, it is safest to assume the worst (as to the ETs and the secrecy).

Slow disclosure because it might be problematic reminds me of the arguments against the abolitionists. Many did not want to upset the system and allowed slavery to continue, even the ones that thought slavery was wrong. It was reasoned our society would crumble because slaves were needed to do the work. Sometimes it is okay to upset the cart, especially if those pushing it are flat out wrong.

I also argue that some information is so fundamental that others do not have the right to withhold it, even if it is for "our own good". Leaders once rationalized it was too traumatic for the population to know that our earth was round. They worried the population would lose their religious faith. They were wrong then and "they" are wrong now.

Obviously, we don't know the whole story but I do think the evidence is conclusive; there is a cover-up and a conspiracy. The questions are how big is it and what are the reasons behind the secrecy. Since we do not definitively know the answers it is logical to assume the worst.

Yours,

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:44:19 -0700
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 11:13:15 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:30:24 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>Thank you for reminding us of the first, historical interview of
>Major Marcel, which I know well.

>I suppose we agree now that he could not be fooled by weather
>balloons and radar targets with balsa wood sticks.

>BTW, it is sad to see that the Mogul tale is still accepted in
>the new ABC special, with Karl Pflock having the last word.
>Balsa wood sticks, I tell you!

>The message of ABC, it seems to me, is that it is possible to
>talk more and more openly about UFOs, but that the time has not
>come yet for full disclosure.

>Perhaps it's the wise policy to follow, for now.

I think the message was that it was OK to discuss UFOs or aliens
as long as they didn't get too close for comfort. Hence
sightings at a distance were OK (or SETI), but alien abductions
and a Roswell craft/body retrieval were to be ridiculed and
debunked.

Don't want to frighten the kiddies, I guess.

The only exception to this was Rendlesham, where they allowed
Sgt. Jim Penniston to talk about how he walked up to the craft
and actually touched it. At least they didn't bring out some
debunker saying he had been drinking and had actually seen a
meteor fireball or lighthouse. However, with Rendlesham, the
craft quickly departed leaving minimal trace evidence. Nobody
was abducted and no material crash retrieval occurred.

It really isn't too different from the general attitude of
civilian UFO groups from the 1950s to 1970s. Close contact
stories and crash retrievals tended to be taboo and were
generally discounted.

SETI scientists have a similar attitude. Yep, there are probably
lots of aliens out there, I just don't want them moving into my
neighborhood.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 20:04:57 +0200
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 11:13:00 -0400
Subject: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

Dear Friends, List,

Since 1997 I feel really unhappy because of what happened to the more than 20,000 signed Roswell Declarations.

As you might remember, we started a grassroots campaign to collect signed declarations about the UFO coverup regarding Roswell and the UFO issue in general. We were: Kent Jeffrey, Hans-Juergen Kyborg and me.

We named it "The International Roswell Initiative (IRI)" and by the time it became a really big and successful grassroots effort.

People from all over the world signed the declaration, hoping that their signature would bring about some change.

We collected signatures from individuals of all social levels, from workers, scientists and even two Apollo Astronauts. For the first time the three leading UFO research organisations together signed this Roswell Declaration. We all were enthusiastic that we would raise enough pressure to bring about some change, that with the help of even Sen. Steven Shiff we could break up the shells of lies and cover up.

Remember what happened then: after 30 years of silence the U.S. Air force issued two statements and then the Santilli scam followed to ridicule us again.

And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and met him during that campaign.

Remember that he planned, at the end of the collecting phase, to place the declaration combined with a challenging text in major national and international newspapers and then deliver the declarations publicly to the White House. My late Hans and I really planned to travel to Washington to accompany Kent for the delivering of the many boxes containing the declarations.

But instead, after having raised together with us a global campaign so successfully he suddenly changed his mind so completely that it took away our breath when we heard of it. Additionally, our contact broke off from his side immediately and it was hard to get in contact to him again.

So we later heard that he had sent all the declarations via normal mail (!) to the White House accompanied with a letter where he explains his current point of view that he believes that what crashed near Roswell was a MOGUL ballon!

More than 20,000 signed Roswell Declarations delivered to the White House by mail from a man who states that he doesn't stand behind the text of the Declaration anymore.

Wasn't that grotesque?

Though I really appreciated my time with Kent, regarding the Roswell Initiative and the Declaration his behaviour is a

classic betrayal, not only to me and my late Hans but to all those who signed the Declaration.

Shortly after that, Kent, who once was a pilot flying with Delta on transatlantic routes, was reduced to domestical flights only and then he became retired. It still is hard to get in contact with him - maybe some of you have better possibilities. About what happened in his personal life I will not discuss this here, but as I have learned from a contact two years ago he deals with injured and homeless cats.

So - after all that time I still cannot understand what happened to him. It was absolutely not consistent with all the time we spent with him prior to his turnaround.

I really have no facts to verify my thought that he maybe was used to undermine all the Roswell activities regarding the 50th anniversary of the event. Was he brainwashed? Was he threatened with severe consequences if he would continue his path? I really have no clue.

To come back to the point: the more than 20,000 Declarations must be somewhere and still today I have heartache when I think of them.

They are a precious, they are the expressed will of many many individuals to bring the truth up to the surface. The text of the Declaration deals not only with the Roswell Incident but with the cover up on UFOs in general.

So is there someone among you who thinks it would be worthwhile to get them back from the White House to use them again for a better purpose?

I cannot travel to Washington D.C. as easy as you can over there in Turtle Island. So I would ask you again: is there someone among you who would recover the Declarations, the materialized and signed hope of many thousands of people, to save them for further purpose?

Remember that there was a school in one of the northeast states which once dedicated a whole schoolday to the Roswell issue. The girls and boys trusted us that we would bring about change to the governmental debunking.

Yesterday, I found the letter from the government agency who once answered my letter requesting information about what happened to the Roswell Declarations. So I can provide a starting point for the search for the Declarations, at least.

Is there someone who is interested?

Joachim

Project Wandsdyke Path July 25, 2009
Avebury/Alton Barnes, Wiltshire, UK
In Contact With The Cosmic Matrix

<http://www.kochkyborg.de>

For those in U.S.A. who want to join
and come over to the UK please contact Ron Russell:
<http://www.cropcircles.org/TourSite/Welcome.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Canadian Farmer Remembers His Close Encounter

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:16:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:16:00 -0400
Subject: Canadian Farmer Remembers His Close Encounter

Source: The Saskatoon Star Phoenix - Saskatchewan, Canada

<http://tinyurl.com/4zo79j>

Saturday, September 20, 2008

'They're Out There': Farmer Remembers His Close Encounter

Darren Bernhardt
The StarPhoenix
dbernhardt.nul

It was 34 years ago this month when Edwin Fuhr encountered five dome-shaped objects hovering about a half-metre above his canola field.

The passage of time has done nothing to quell the 70-year-old Langenburg man's conviction that we are not alone in the universe. In fact, Fuhr believes his visitors are still keeping watch -- from a distance.

"They're out there, there's no question," he said in an interview.

About five or six years ago, in the northeast part of the sky, four or five lights did something strange.

"They followed you," Fuhr said, saying they looked like stars but "a star doesn't move or change colours."

In 1988, he moved from the farm, about 10 kilometres north of Langenburg, into town. The urban lights tend to wash out the night sky, but every so often in the northeast, the lights show up and follow along, Fuhr said.

"I'm pretty sure they're the same ones (that were in the field in 1974). That's the direction they took off in '74," he said.

Many UFO sightings on the Prairies occur in fall, when farmers are harvesting before the frost hits. That's when reports of crop circles tend to . . . er, crop up.

Going to inspect the landing area the day following his encounter, Fuhr found five rings of depressed canola swirled in a clockwise direction. More circles were found in the area later that month, according to media and police reports from the time.

Over the next while, the site was visited by the RCMP, scientists, UFO researchers from across North America and even the FBI. Sniffer dogs used by the police refused to enter the circles, according to Fuhr.

"Something was there and I doubt it was a hoax. There's no indication anything had been wheeled in or out and Mr. Fuhr seemed genuinely scared," RCMP Const. Ron Morier was quoted in a StarPhoenix story of Sept. 19, 1974.

On Sept. 27, 1974, another newspaper article referred to a Martensville police constable and his wife witnessing a UFO over Saskatoon. It hung above the Nutana neighbourhood briefly before taking off. The officer, Albert Goddue, described it as being dome-shaped.

"No one will ever convince me it was any type of conventional aircraft. It was like nothing I have ever seen in the sky before," Goddue was quoted as saying.

Not everyone remains a believer after a close encounter. On Sept. 19, 1963, an 11-year-old boy and three friends were playing in a Saskatoon schoolyard when they saw a bright oval object hover and drop something. They claim a figure stood up three metres tall, made a moaning sound, held out his hands, and floated towards them.

The 11-year-old told investigators the figure was a man dressed in clothes "like a monk's" which were "white like a crayon."

The accounts are recorded in two books, *Passport to Magonia: on UFOs, folklore, and parallel worlds*, by Jacques Vallee, and *The Complete Guide to Mysterious Beings*, by John Keel.

The children ran off and one girl became so hysterical that she had to be hospitalized.

"Sometimes I could see right through him," the 11-year-old said.

Now 56, he refuses to believe it ever happened.

"It was just overzealous kids with good imaginations," he said in an interview Friday, the 45th anniversary of the event. "I don't want to discuss it."

The man said he went through a "tough time" in school after the supposed sighting was made public. Since then, he has moved from Saskatoon and no longer associates with the other three children who were with him that day. He has been married 35 years and neither his wife nor any of his immediate family members know anything of the incident, he said, asking his name be kept out of the newspaper.

"It's in the past and that's where it should stay," he said. "I don't need the headache."

Fuhr was 36 when he saw the saucers around 10 a.m. Initially, he noticed one metallic object in a depression on the land. He walked to within 15 feet of the object.

"I saw the grass was moving and I looked up and saw this thing spinning at one hell of a speed," he said on Thursday.

There was no sound, no smell, no windows to peer into, said Fuhr, whose joints ached as he walked backwards to the swather, keeping his eye on the saucer.

Then he noticed four more off to the side, arranged in a "half-moon" formation. He estimates the two largest ones were 30 feet in diameter with the rest slightly smaller. They hovered about 15 minutes before taking off, one-by-one, with a gust of vapour.

A few weeks after the incident, a scientist from the National Research Council (NRC) in Ottawa suggested the rings were caused by mushrooms. Allen McNamara, head of the NRC's upper atmosphere research section, also theorized the glow from the saucers may have been caused by the fungi.

The crop circles were exactly the same as "fairy rings" produced by underground mushroom filaments, he was quoted as saying. When asked by reporters about the canola pressed in a circular motion, McNamara guessed it was caused by wind.

Fuhr has never been provided an explanation that would convince him he was imagining things.

"Imagination doesn't leave marks in the ground, does it?" he said, noting the landing site was tested as recently as four years ago and is still emitting radioactive waves.

For the first year, nothing would grow where the circles were and "the ground was hard, like cement."

Though he no longer works the land, it remains in the family, farmed by a nephew. Fuhr has never asked him whether he's encountered anything strange.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell 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) > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

They Don't Teach This In J-School

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:15:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:15:00 -0400
Subject: They Don't Teach This In J-School

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

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

Friday, September 19, 2008

They Don't Teach This In J-School

By Billy Cox

Still agog over ABC's emasculating refusal Tuesday night to get the Air Force on record about the UFO incident Stephenville, De Void nearly wept with nostalgia this week when alerted to the existence of a 41-year-old book.

It's called Problems of Journalism: Proceedings Of The Society Of Newspaper Editors, 1967. Veteran UFO watcher Robert Barrow,

robert-barrow.blogspot.com

picked it up for \$3.50 in 1968, and the chapter he blogged about involves a round table discussion between UFO researchers and newspaper editors.

Gasp - it's true. There was a time when the USAF gave the MSM permission to ask questions about UFOs because its own official study (which turned out to be crap, but that's another story) was underway.

What's great about Barrow's post is how, way back then, one of the few real heroes in any government-authorized assessment of UFOs doubted the media had the stones for the job. Physicist Dr. James McDonald, a member of the University of Colorado panel contracted by the USAF to analyze its data, told journalists they were blowing the story.

"Something is going on here of the greatest scientific interest that has been shoved under a rug, ridiculed and laughed out of court", the former Navy cryptographer told them.

"You and your feature writers have helped ridicule it. It's easier to write a funny story. And once the Air Force tells you there's nothing to it, what is more logical than to say 'People see things; there are a lot of nuts around the country'? And that has led to the net effect that very few of these are reported."

McDonald would go on to be the leading critic of the Colorado report, a whitewash that allowed the USAF to rinse its hands of UFO transparency once and for all. But what's also interesting are remarks made by Harvard astronomer and UFO debunker Donald Menzel, who never read a report he couldn't explain or deride:

"The Air Force has made its mistakes. They never have had enough scientists in the project. They have failed to follow up certain sightings of special importance. To me their questionnaire is amateurish, almost cleverly designed to get the wrong answer and

lose track of the facts."

Four decades later, of course, McDonald's pessimism has been borne out. And really, as ABC PrimeTime proved, you don't even have to ridicule UFOs anymore. Just pile a lot of colorful garbage in the picture window, keep away from the Air Force, and call this exercise in paternalism whatever you want - like journalism.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:06:58 EDT
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:17:13 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 20:04:57 +0200
>Subject: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>Since 1997 I feel really unhappy because of what happened to the
>more than 20,000 signed Roswell Declarations.

>As you might remember, we started a grassroots campaign to
>collect signed declarations about the UFO coverup regarding
>Roswell and the UFO issue in general. We were: Kent Jeffrey,
>Hans-Juergen Kyborg and me.

<snip>
>Remember what happened then: after 30 years of silence the U.S.
>Air force issued two statements and then the Santilli scam
>followed to ridicule us again.

>And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is
>still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and
>met him during that campaign.

>Remember that he planned, at the end of the collecting phase, to
>place the declaration combined with a challenging text in major
>national and international newspapers and then deliver the
>declarations publicly to the White House. My late Hans and I
>really planned to travel to Washington to accompany Kent for the
>delivering of the many boxes containing the declarations.

>But instead, after having raised together with us a global
>campaign so successfully he suddenly changed his mind so
>completely that it took away our breath when we heard of it.
>Additionally, our contact broke off from his side immediately
>and it was hard to get in contact to him again.

<snip>
>Yesterday, I found the letter from the government agency who
>once answered my letter requesting information about what
>happened to the Roswell Declarations. So I can provide a
>starting point for the search for the Declarations, at least.

>Is there someone who is interested?

>Joachim

Wow Joachim, sounds like somebody got to Kent. Maybe it was Kent himself. Some people cave in when they see some of the explanations behind some UFO incidents.

Some people have to have that ETH explanation for all UFO incidents. They find out otherwise and cave in. Others have to have that prosaic explanation and when that doesn't pan out they cave in.

With today's technology and expansion of the internet if you started your initiative again you might well get 1,000 times the yield of your first attempt. That would be results that no one

would sneeze at!

I doubt you'd get any positive response from the White House because they're not going to address the Roswell issue, period. However, they will take note that so many people aren't going to give up and that holds much sway.

I'll ask around to see if anyone will go for it but those letters are probably in an archive somewhere or perhaps have met the fate of the original Roswell documents that Steve Schiff found out about after egging the GAO on to get the info from the Pentagon.

There are lots of enthusiastic young news people and UFO research wannabes and I'm sure they'll see your message and pitch in. It would be a neat news item for sure!

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 13:20:42 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:06:58 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 20:04:57 +0200
>Subject: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

<snip>

>And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is
>still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and
>met him during that campaign.

<snip>

Greg, Joachim, List, All -

>Wow Joachim, sounds like somebody got to Kent. Maybe it was Kent
>himself. Some people cave in when they see some of the
>explanations behind some UFO incidents.

Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the 509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for the military that got to him.

He couldn't and didn't understand that sometimes secrets were so important that not everyone would be privy to them so that when pilots from the 509th told him that nothing happened, it made an impression on him. Never mind that all members of Blanchard's staff who commented said it was alien, the lone exception was the one man Kent was able to talk to.

Kaufmann, talking about his general friend named Thomas was also a problem because Kent's father retired as a high-ranking officer of the Air Force and they could find no trace of this general named Thomas.

Finally, he talked with a man who had been in charge at ATIC who told him that there was nothing to it. Never mind that the guy didn't get there until ten years after Roswell, this made an impression on him.

So, no one got to Kent, his investigation took him in one direction and once he got onto that path, there was no taking him off it. He couldn't talk to Edwin Easley, because he was dead. He couldn't talk to Jesse Marcel, Sr. because he was dead.

Instead he had Frank Kaufmann and all those pilots who wouldn't have known anything because they had no need to know... and he had Lorenzo Kimball who said that he worked in the hospital and who said nothing happened. (I deal Kimball's testimony on my blog in December 2006:

www.KEVINRANDLE.BLOGSPOT.COM

I also wrote a longer piece about Kent called I Understand Kent Jeffrey that appeared in November 2007. It takes these arguments a little farther.

But, my point here is that nobody got to Kent... you can see his evolution if you examine the past record and understand who his father is and his respect for the military.

KRandle
www.KEVINRandle.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Disclosure Abduction & History [was: Blanchard,

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 14:09:21 -0300
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 13:52:59 -0400
Subject: Disclosure Abduction & History [was: Blanchard,

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:44:19 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 10:30:24 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>BTW, it is sad to see that the Mogul tale is still accepted in
>>the new ABC special, with Karl Pflock having the last word.
>>Balsa wood sticks, I tell you!

>>The message of ABC, it seems to me, is that it is possible to
>>talk more and more openly about UFOs, but that the time has not
>>come yet for full disclosure.

>>Perhaps it's the wise policy to follow, for now.

>I think the message was that it was OK to discuss UFOs or aliens
>as long as they didn't get too close for comfort. Hence
>sightings at a distance were OK (or SETI), but alien abductions
>and a Roswell craft/body retrieval were to be ridiculed and
>debunked.

>Don't want to frighten the kiddies, I guess.

>The only exception to this was Rendlesham, where they allowed
>Sgt. Jim Penniston to talk about how he walked up to the craft
>and actually touched it. At least they didn't bring out some
>debunker saying he had been drinking and had actually seen a
>meteor fireball or lighthouse. However, with Rendlesham, the
>craft quickly departed leaving minimal trace evidence. Nobody
>was abducted and no material crash retrieval occurred.

>It really isn't too different from the general attitude of
>civilian UFO groups from the 1950s to 1970s. Close contact
>stories and crash retrievals tended to be taboo and were
>generally discounted.

>SETI scientists have a similar attitude. Yep, there are probably
>lots of aliens out there, I just don't want them moving into my
>neighborhood.

Hi David, Gildas, Viktor;

From my limited personal forays into the abduction phenomenon I
have learned one thing. This isn't an 'us and them' situation.
In other words the media, government, military, SETI or the
Royal Astronomical society are no more immune to the abduction
scenario than Joe Blow down the road. For all we know the CEO at
ABC has been abducted since he was a kid; if you go by the
history of this thing.

Again those who have contacted me over the years with their

abduction story fell into no specific social structure or occupation.

I think we all know this. But not everyone comes forward; it is well hidden on any number of levels if for no other reason than avoiding losing one's job or social status or security clearance. And of course there is the ridicule. It's a no brainer really. What else should we expect?

Prime Ministers, Presidents and Kings, Dictators and religious zelots should not be immune. We often hear arguments as to why some 'foreign' country's government would keep its mouth shut for the sake of protecting the United States Government's position, for example, on the phenomenon. My guess is, there is your connectivity.

Who among the leaders would want to be the first one to come out of the closet? And I'm not saying this is some carefully hammered out agreement formulated amongst the factions I have mentioned. It's tacit [i.e. it's happening to me, my guess it's happening to them too] and filled with suspicion of other's motives. There might be some lower level agreement among historical allies, but who the heck knows.

Perhaps recent disclosure by some countries such as France and Chile is a way of testing the waters of disclosure, to see what the response might be from others.

Paul Hellyer's disclosure might have been driven by this and he hung it on Corsoe's book as a convenient explanation for his sudden embracement of the reality of the UFO Phenomenon.

I've long since given up believing that the phenomenon is localized and new. It is ancient and all pervasive and accounts for a great deal of what's driven mankind for thousands of years though not because of any direct knowledge of who or what but via other socially acceptable mores such as religion and folklore. Same thing, different time. Even now there are those who try to force the phenomenon into a mythology or folklore pigeon-holes and the new pigeon-hole, psychology.

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 > 2008 > Sep > Sep 20

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 14:34:07 -0400
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 15:33:12 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:06:58 EDT
>>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>>From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 20:04:57 +0200
>>>Subject: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>>And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is
>>>still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and
>>>met him during that campaign.

>>Wow Joachim, sounds like somebody got to Kent. Maybe it was Kent
>>himself. Some people cave in when they see some of the
>>explanations behind some UFO incidents.

>Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of
>Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the
>509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for
>the military that got to him.

Kevin,

Thanks for laying this silliness to rest. The reflexive paranoia
of so many of our colleagues is exhausting and destructive.
There appears to be - even in the absence of any evidence
supporting the proposition - a desire to take the most sinister
possible interpretation of the motives of those who hold
opinions we don't like or who change their minds in ways we find
uncongenial.

Inside and outside ufology, people change their minds about all
kinds of things all of the time. And a good thing, too;
otherwise, it would be a world even more infested with rigid
thinking and stubborn adherence than it already is, and all
intellectual progress would cease.

Like you, I disagree with the sweeping conclusions Kent came to,
but I know that he came to them out of honest conviction. It's
just nuts to intimate that somebody could become a Roswell
skeptic only because "somebody got to" him or her.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 20](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 14:40:42 EDT
Archived: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 15:38:13 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

<snip>

>>And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is
>>still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and
>>met him during that campaign.

>Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of
>Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the
>509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for
>the military that got to him.

>He couldn't and didn't understand that sometimes secrets were so
>important that not everyone would be privy to them so that when
>pilots from the 509th told him that nothing happened, it made an
>impression on him. Never mind that all members of Blanchard's
>staff who commented said it was alien, the lone exception was
>the one man Kent was able to talk to.

>So, no one got to Kent, his investigation took him in one
>direction and once he got onto that path, there was no taking
>him off it. He couldn't talk to Edwin Easley, because he was
>dead. He couldn't talk to Jesse Marcel, Sr. because he was dead.

>Instead he had Frank Kaufmann and all those pilots who wouldn't
>have known anything because they had no need to know... and he
>had Lorenzo Kimball who said that he worked in the hospital and
>who said nothing happened. (I deal Kimball's testimony on my
>blog in December 2006:

<snip>

What Kevin is saying here is essentially correct. I had located Lorenzo Kimball and was in contact with Kent too. I believe Kimball was already in contact with the AF at that time or soon after. But, I just played dumb to this suspicion because it was simply more revealing to do so rather than confront him about it at that critical time period.

I will only add that Kent changed his mind after honestly re-evaluating all the testimony and facts, having gone in too boldly on one side of the facts as presented. Later, swinging the other way like a pendulum based upon his own investigative strengths and not that of others. Yes, his military background played a role in his behavior. But, he began making many contacts with a wider distribution of opinions as well.

He told me he was getting away from Ufology for good as a result of all this. He also told me that he would have liked to have punched Kevin in the nose :) He said, because of Stan's age, he would have restrained himself accordingly. But, I personally think Stan quite capable of taking care of himself :)

Kent was obviously upset when he said these things to me. But I thought it quite colorful too and illustrative of the

'behind-the-scenes crunch of activities'... literally :)

Golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 17:57:39 EDT
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 09:56:55 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:06:58 EDT
>>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>>From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 20:04:57 +0200
>>>Subject: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

><snip>

>>>And then this enigmatic turnaround of Kent happened which is
>>>still inexplicably for me as I have seen him, talked to him and
>>>met him during that campaign.

><snip>

>Greg, Joachim, List, All -

>>Wow Joachim, sounds like somebody got to Kent. Maybe it was Kent
>>himself. Some people cave in when they see some of the
>>explanations behind some UFO incidents.

>Kent got himself.

<snip>

Thanks for the clarification Kevin. I figured Kent got himself
which is why I put it in my post as a possibility.

I think you've quoted Joachim as me in your original post so I
added the greater than symbols appropriately.

We can always depend on you for the courteous and pro level
response and clarification of issues you're knowledgeable of.

Thanks for taking the time to do so again here.

Best,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: **Stanton T Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 19:02:15 -0300
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:00:09 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of
>Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the
>509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for
>the military that got to him.

<snip>

Kevin and I are certainly on the same page here. I have written about Kent's total lack of knowledge about how security and the need to know concept operate. He considered UFOs a scientific problem and not a security problem. There was a long and very naive article by him in the MUFON Journal. I wrote a detailed response which wasn't published in MJ, but is on my website at:

<http://www.stantonfriedman.com>

Perhaps I should add that I hadn't signed the petition, primarily because, unlike Kent, I do not want everything about UFOs to be out in the open. Technical info which could be of help to an enemy should not be out there where Osama can get at it. One cannot tell one's friends without telling one's enemies.

Kent's ignorance was his worst enemy.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff

From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 23:47:57 +0100
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:04:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff

I've just updated the web page with the latest developments.
South Wales Police seem to be determinedly obstructive.

See:

<http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/swphelo.html>

for details.

I note that at Greg Boone's website:

<http://ufomafia.com/blog/update-on-uk-ufo-incident-in-cardiff>

Greg quotes Nick Pope as saying "This is one of the most interesting UFO sightings in recent years and I'll be investigating this incident."

Is anyone aware of what enquiries Nick has made, and what the outcome was?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 19:02:24 EDT
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:04:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 11:53:57 -0300
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 20:08:16 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

<snip>

>>>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>>>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
>>>others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
>>>blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair ir
>>>accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>>>scientists as a class.

<snip>

>>Speaking of science and scientists, how is that the National
>>Academy of Sciences endorsed the conclusions/findings of the
>>Condon report? Considering the controversy that Saunders, et al,
>>brought up about the Low "trick" memo, Condon's public
>>dismissive statements before the report was even written, and
>>the (new) info that at least 30 (to 50) percent of the cases in
>>the report were considered "unknowns," just how did the NAS
>>review and endorsement of the report's false conclusions ever
>>occur in the first place?

>Let us not forget that the NAS is a self selecting body. Condon
>was himself a member. Not likely they would do more than rubber
>stamp.

But McDonald was also a member of the National Academy of
Sciences and had many influential contacts everywhere.

When McDonald first saw the spectacular UFO cases in the BB
files on June 6-7, 1966, and went ballistic at Hynek on June 8
for sitting on these cases for so many years (in fact the AF
concealed these disturbing cases from Hynek and Hynek never knew
what exactly was being kept from him or not), the first thing
McDonald did was go to the FTD Commanding General and then to
various agencies including all the way up to the White House on
June 27 (Presidential Science Advisor's Office) to blow the
whistle and demand a full-scale scientific investigation of the
AF UFO cases.

As NAS member, McDonald was very influential and had many
powerful friends throughout the science establishment and in
government. He nearly succeeded in getting the NAS to set up a
special scientific UFO study under his direction, on April 7,
1966, but the AF succeeded in quashing it through the political

stragem of announcing at the Congressional hearing that they would convene a multi-university investigation of UFO's (it is unclear whether the AF knew what McDonald was trying to do with the NAS and deliberately tried to undercut him or whether it was a happenstance that had the same effect and was intended to enable the AF to dominate the field against any such initiatives from scientists such as McDonald, both known and unknown to the AF).

Either way, the AF in effect pulled the rug out from under McDonald and NAS told him they were tabling his UFO study because of the AF's announced high-level UFO study. Hynek reflected the thinking of the AF when he wrote the Secretary of the AF on May 25, 1966, suggesting that if the AF conducted special scientific studies of UFO's it would "quickly pull the carpet out from under Air Force detractors."

Then when the Condon Report was finished the AF flexed its muscles to put the political fix in at the NAS to get a rapid rubber-stamp endorsement without any thorough review. McDonald was influential but no match for a billion-dollar behemoth like the AF with its enormous political clout. According to a reliable source, NAS President Frederick Seitz was responsible for finding Condon for the AF and getting him to agree to take on the UFO project. So it was a conflict of interest for Seitz to then head the review panel on Condon's report. He helped the AF recruit Condon so he was hardly going to be very critical of his own choice. But this is how things happen in Wash DC.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: **Stanton T Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 20:36:31 -0300
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 14:21:59 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 14:40:42 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

<snip>

>>Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of
>>Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the
>>509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for
>>the military that got to him.

>>He couldn't and didn't understand that sometimes secrets were so
>>important that not everyone would be privy to them so that when
>>pilots from the 509th told him that nothing happened, it made an
>>impression on him. Never mind that all members of Blanchard's
>>staff who commented said it was alien, the lone exception was
>>the one man Kent was able to talk to.

>>So, no one got to Kent, his investigation took him in one
>>direction and once he got onto that path, there was no taking
>>him off it. He couldn't talk to Edwin Easley, because he was
>>dead. He couldn't talk to Jesse Marcel, Sr. because he was dead.

>>Instead he had Frank Kaufmann and all those pilots who wouldn't
>>have known anything because they had no need to know... and he
>>had Lorenzo Kimball who said that he worked in the hospital and
>>who said nothing happened. (I deal Kimball's testimony on my
>>blog in December 2006:

<snip>

>What Kevin is saying here is essentially correct. I had located
>Lorenzo Kimball and was in contact with Kent too. I believe
>Kimball was already in contact with the AF at that time or soon
>after. But, I just played dumb to this suspicion because it was
>simply more revealing to do so rather than confront him about it
>at that critical time period.

>I will only add that Kent changed his mind after honestly re-
>evaluating all the testimony and facts, having gone in too
>boldly on one side of the facts as presented. Later, swinging
>the other way like a pendulum based upon his own investigative
>strengths and not that of others. Yes, his military background
>played a role in his behavior. But, he began making many
>contacts with a wider distribution of opinions as well.

>He told me he was getting away from Ufology for good as a result
>of all this. He also told me that he would have liked to have
>punched Kevin in the nose :) He said, because of Stan's age, he
>would have restrained himself accordingly. But, I personally
>think Stan quite capable of taking care of himself :)

>Kent was obviously upset when he said these things to me. But I

>thought it quite colorful too and illustrative of the 'behind-
>the-scenes crunch of activities'... literally :)

I asked Kent on a radio show (Hieronymous) if he ever had a security clearance. He said no. It was obvious he was totally ignorant of security.

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 > 2008 > Sep > Sep 21

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 14:21:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera.

<snip>

>I am unaware of any photos of the mythical "flower tape".
>Charles Moore made a drawing of what he said was there:

>http://www.roswellproof.com/beams_symbols_compare.html

>Compare with Marcel Sr.'s and Marcel Jr.'s drawings.

I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports himself, should at least be trusted on this. You have to "vector-in" the data in order to have a balanced view - taking the good with the bad. Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better solution.

>>Military Historian Fletcher Pratt in early 1950 alluded to a
>>flying Saucer crash and that bodies of vaguely human appearance
>>and about thirty five inches tall had been found in the wreckage
>>- citing confidential channels. If anyone else knows more about
>>this, that would be interesting...
>snip.

>British spook Bernard Newman published a book in 1948 titled
>"The Flying Saucer". Interestingly, it was submitted to the
>publisher in late 1947. It was a novel ridiculing the reality of
>the 1947 flying saucers as mass hysteria and hallucinations.
>However, the plot has top scientists staging faked Martian
>flying saucer crashes, including in New Mexico, in order to
>panic the world into uniting behind a common threat.

Things haven't changed all that much :)

>We can speculate all we want as to whether Newman had actually
>heard something through the spook grapevine about Roswell, or
>was just going by what he read in the newspapers (Roswell had
>international coverage.)

I think it fueled the imagination, certainly.

<snip>

>Many, many other witnesses besides Marcel saw and handled the

>material and described similar anomalous properties:

There comes a point when the realistic material descriptions (as described) can't be so easily exchanged for the claims of the extraordinary. This is especially true of this case.

I think we have to be fair to the facts and not be so easily swayed one way or another. Having investigated Roswell, I feel anyone not taking a balanced view faces the awkward position of having to ignore this piece of evidence in favor of another - at the cost of sounding insincere to the investigative underpinning/findings of the case. I can pick and choose too and what majority or listeners would be the wiser. For that reason, I think it extremely fair to point out the flaws on both sides in fair competition for the truth.

The point of my posts has been to balance the evidence - this being more important than the hyped up opinions about it, one way or another. It is reasonably clear than Marcel said he was photographed with the actual debris - which is very inconvenient to brush aside. But, that he also describes the material in both mundane and extraordinary terms. But, we do find the use of extraordinary materials too (polyethylene fabric/balloon material... see below)

>http://roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

>Just one example was Bill Brazel Jr., who gave virtually
>identical descriptions about the "memory" foil and wood-like
>beams. Neighbor Loretta Proctor similarly saw a piece of the
>wood-like beam which Brazel and her husband Floyd tried to mark
>or cut with a knife and which would not burn.

I spoke with them both and Bill told me it was a bunch of aluminum foil, sticks, and thread-like material (synthetic). He also describes metallic "silver colored" polyethylene quite well (see below on my balloon find). I also asked him and his son to record the location of the debris field onto a topographic map. Loretta Proctor describes a pencil-sized tan stick... fragment. It was hard for her to elaborate beyond that and I found her quite honest as I did Bill.

>(Seriously, Viktor, try coating a piece of balsa wood with as
>many layers of glue as you like, and it will still easily break,
>burn, or cut. Engineer Bob Galganski demonstrated this a decade
>ago:

This is not so neat as you would like to believe it to be...

A considerable number of witnesses used the word Balsa in describing this material, including Marcel. The dimensions of the pieces were also of the correct proportions. He also said it was flexible. If I use the word Balsa, it includes many of it's attributes just as I assume the witnesses intended: The margin of error is within that of any other statement made.

In addition, the flexure strength of Balsa is already quite remarkable. Add sealer, some dried wood glue, and the surface becomes both translucent and hard, decoupling it from the ordinary. It also explains why the color would have been retained. Add in an ad hoc combination of Aluminum foil, tape, and paper and this will only increase the likelihood of its flexure strength. After all, Marcel's son did indirectly indicate that if this was tape, it was certainly still in contact with the wood. And, Marcel himself said it looked painted on. The hard surface-coating would certainly impact it's typical combustibility profile since it is not the wood surface the flames are first in contact with... resulting in an atypical reaction.

The beams were broken, after all, and not originally described as I-beams. As a result, this is not so clear cut as Galganski would have us believe. His first obligation should have been in providing ALL the relevant testimony of witness descriptions. This goes again to my original point of balancing the evidence correctly by inclusion not exclusion.

More tests are certainly needed.

>including using an even stronger glue of the time that wasn't
>even used in making the radar target kites. Not that it

> matters, but the balsa sticks were not coated with glue in any
> case. The radar targets were nothing but balsa wood kites and
> glue was only applied in beads along their length to attach the
> foil/paper covering.)

> (Directed to general audience, not Viktor) A common debunking
> tactic (such as in the ABC special, Seeing Is Believing special)
> is to try to make the entire Roswell case about Marcel alone, as
> if he was the only witness and the whole Roswell case was due
> to him. There are dozens of other important military and civilian
> witnesses who corroborate Marcel. Not the same can be said for
> the witnesses the debunkers like to cite, such as CIC spook
> Sheridan Cavitt who was with Marcel. Cavitt was obviously lying
> through his teeth and contradicted by everybody, including his
> wife.

<snip>

I interviewed Cavitt twice... not sure what his wife eventually
said? I know it was everyone's goal to get her to talk without
her husband around. Once, I had pointed out to him that the Air
Force had not included all his testimony and was curious whether
that aspect became a concern for him... apparently, they were
not being able to verify a plane crash recovery operation he was
involved with during that time period.

It may be apparent that Cavitt knew about the Top Secret nature
of this project and was reasonably more concerned about what he
said. In Marcel's case, they simply ordered him not to speak.
I'm sure Marcel was overwhelmed with the sheer volume of the
material which was unlike any common assemblage - including
polyethylene, aluminum foil (tin foil was much more common), and
funny looking tape. Only in 1947, did the Reynolds company come
up with its most famous creation, Reynolds Wrap Aluminum Foil:
Accordingly, familiarity with large sheets was simply not that
common but rare.

The whole point of posting Marcel's account was to characterize
his descriptions fairly... his words not anyone else's. If he
says he was photographed with the actual debris in his hand,
then I believe him too. So, problems obviously exist in having a
clean separation from these materials.

Curiously, no one asked him if he found actual Balloon material
Or, maybe he did describe it but couldn't connect with it
directly: saying instead: "Now by bend, I mean crease. It was
possible to flex this stuff back and forth, even to wrinkle it,
but you could not put a crease in it that would stay, nor could
you dent it at all. I would have to describe it as metal with
plastic properties,"

This is almost exactly how the material I have behaves without
the melodramatics and historically gained perspective I have/
(you all have) with such fabrics.

He obviously wasn't familiar with it nor for that mater
chemically altered rubber (perhaps) - as far as I can tell, both
of these would not be included in his training nor would he be
familiar with polyethylene (tan/brown/silver?). He did not
describe neoprene rubber at all but perhaps his son may have? He
mentions his father bringing home with him some debris that
included some burned melted organic material - perhaps
describing one of his fathers flame test attempts on some of
this collected debris...

If we look at the Brazel testimony, it isn't "cut and dry" that
he found this on June 14th either since the previous night's
storm activity doesn't fit well with this. I'm just pointing out
that we could have a range of dates and a range of possible
balloon trains regardless of what both opposing sides may have
agreed to out of necessity. The use of polyethylene balloons
came later in June according to the information; But, the
material described by Bill Brazel/Marcel fits well with this
material's properties.

I actually have one of Charlie Moore's late 1940's "Darker
Silver Metallic" Polyethylene Balloon fabrics. A rancher had
found the Large balloon (still somewhat inflated) in a ravine
and kept it all these years. Very extraordinary material for the
1940's too - very tough, plastic by touch and behavior
(warm/pliant) but metallic by appearance and some of it's

mechanical-like properties: Folds (crinkles up) in your hand but bounces right back with no prominent creases in the ordinary sense. This would have been unusual upon first discovery scenarios.

The Balloon Train shown in the "Roswell Incident" (a Large Polyethylene Balloon shown on top along with smaller ones attached below) seems more consistent with this material's descriptions as well. This invites some speculation on the exact finding date, if we do have polyethylene fabrics.

There, it is described as being flight 11A 7/7/1947 (no color description and I'm not saying this was the flight). This type of material could have easily been found/handled by others at a later time too. This rancher handed it out, piece by piece, to his family members. He'd used it as camping cover.

I believe he only gave me the remaining 1/4 of it and it is quite large. This landed west of Alamogordo as far as I can tell - with a date from 1947-1949 according to Charles Moore (and the witness) but he never inspected it directly either. Is he still alive?

I don't want to get caught up in re-describing the debris too much which has already been described by the witnesses. But, we can place it within a different context without veering too far from the descriptive terminology. The further we get from this, the dimmer the prospects of a solution. However, I will make reasonable connections using a combination of those materials (as described) in relation to how they might function together or become altered. Also, add in some historical perspective and some grounded speculation.

There are plenty of witnesses that describe material reasonably similar and consistent with the Mogul/New York University Balloon train and is quite mundane/ordinary, including Marcel and his son. One can't escape the group parallelism. If the AF removed material, they merely swapped out the more unusual stuff to avoid having to explain/describe it: polyethylene, quite possibly, being among one of them that was unique to this program's development. A darker black (aged) neoprene rubber is seen in the photos but Marcel never described it at the debris scene. This invited his later comments related to the swap (apparently) along with the unusual (tape) "painted on" hieroglyphic material surfaces he described along the beams.

It is also clear Marcel was not challenged with many difficult questions that I'm aware of. Perhaps, Bill Moore had invited such checks and balances? But, good luck getting a hold of him, his notes, or his tapes. In as much as he has removed himself, the case has stagnated in bringing clarity to these earliest of descriptions. I'm certain there is new descriptive information there - from the witness accounts.

If Marcel is respectably removed from the equation, do we still have Roswell?

Viktor Golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Joachim Koch <lists.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 11:08:25 +0200
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 14:24:47 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

<snip>

>But, my point here is that nobody got to Kent... you can see his
>evolution if you examine the past record and understand who his
>father is and his respect for the military.

Kevin, List,

I agree with what you wrote completely.

For those who would like help to surface the Declarations, I
have two addresses where Kent wrote letters to in July 1997.
These are:

Janet Murguia
Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs
Office of Legislative Affairs,
East Wing, Room 112
Washington, DC, 20500

This is where he sent at least 7 boxes with approx. 13,000
signed declarations. The remaining 7,000 should have been
sent from locations in Texas and Illinois.

Six month later he received a letter (reponse?) from:

Patricia M. Fornes, Lt.Col, USAF
Congressional Inquiry Division
Office of Legislative Liaison
SAF/LLI
1160 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1160

So here might be the starting points to find the Roswell
Declarations.

I wrote a letter to the latter address a bit later but never
received an answer.

Here in Germany, I still have about 2,000 signed Declarations
which reached me from Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Poland.

The reason why I wrote my plea for support to UFO UpDate is not
to complain about Kent or starting a discussion about his
motives. It is the still prevailing feeling that our Initiative
was and is not complete, we were at the summit in 1997 and have
been dropped deeply by a lone decision without being contacted
beforehand.

So the whole thing fell flat like a landing weather balloon.

Thank you,

Joachim

www.kochkyborg.de/Roswell/rosind.htm

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 21](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:30:47 -0400
Archived: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 14:26:57 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 19:02:24 EDT
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 11:53:57 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 20:08:16 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>>>>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
>>>>others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
>>>>blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair or
>>>>accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>>>>scientists as a class.

>>>>Speaking of science and scientists, how is that the National
>>>>Academy of Sciences endorsed the conclusions/findings of the
>>>>Condon report? Considering the controversy that Saunders, et al,
>>>>brought up about the Low "trick" memo, Condon's public
>>>>dismissive statements before the report was even written, and
>>>>the (new) info that at least 30 (to 50) percent of the cases in
>>>>the report were considered "unknowns," just how did the NAS
>>>>review and endorsement of the report's false conclusions ever
>>>>occur in the first place?

>>Let us not forget that the NAS is a self selecting body. Condon
>>was himself a member. Not likely they would do more than rubber
>>stamp.

>But McDonald was also a member of the National Academy of
>Sciences and had many influential contacts everywhere.

<snip>

Brad,

Your portrayal of Jim McDonald's role (most of which I have
snipped here) is quite accurate, except for one point.

To the best of my knowledge (I am about 95% certain of this) he
was not a "member" of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). He
served on numerous scientific panels assembled by NAS and,
indeed, had many important high-level connections.

As an aside, the governing body of NAS ("members") were
notorious for being the most hidebound, ultra-conservative, Old
Boy network among scientists.

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 > 2008 > Sep > Sep 22

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 12:19:47 EDT
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 06:38:14 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 19:02:15 -0300
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 12:48:05 EDT
>>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>>Kent got himself. It was his disappointment in the tales of
>>Frank Kaufmann, his meetings with pilots and crewmen from the
>>509th who told him that nothing happened, and his respect for
>>the military that got to him.

><snip>

>Kevin and I are certainly on the same page here. I have written
>about Kent's total lack of knowledge about how security and the
>need to know concept operate. He considered UFOs a scientific
>problem and not a security problem. There was a long and very
>na=EFve article by him in the MUFON Journal. I wrote a detailed
>response which wasn't published in MJ, but is on my website at:

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

>Perhaps I should add that I hadn't signed the petition,
>primarily because, unlike Kent, I do not want everything about
>UFOs to be out in the open. Technical info which could be of
>help to an enemy should not be out there where Osama can get at
>it. One cannot tell one's friends without telling one's enemies.

>Kent's ignorance was his worst enemy.

>Stan Friedman

What was once ignorance blossomed as to what he truly felt was more compelling as a combination of events and facts. A balanced view of the evidence brought him back to the middle and then quickly to an opposing viewpoint, hastened by those he felt were bending the truth to suit their own purposes. The more sensible facts or ideas that laid dormant in his mind resurfaced to overwhelm him.

In stark contrast to the opposing views, he was true to the sum total of the evidence that dictated common sense rather than exaggeration. He had moved in a bubble that eventually expanded with his own investigation and which then popped with a vengeance.

He also placed respect in what he perceived to be the integrity of others and found that in the end with other more balanced views. He simply felt betrayed with no one having lent him the opposing tidbits of evidence - having instead to learn their subtle nature on his own. Eventually, showing him a place devoid of what he had thought was a scientific processes rather than a media driven one.

Theses subtle but more meaningful facts that laid in the shadows

eventually reverberated more with the truth, having fit the pattern and solution space more completely.

I think he exemplified the spirit of truthfulness which had always been his intended goal from the beginning. We simply shared an open-sided journey with him.

Viktor Golubik

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 14:04:23 -0300
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 06:39:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff

>From: Joe McGonagle <joe.mcgonagle.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 23:47:57 +0100
>Subject: Re: Police Chase UFO Over Cardiff

>I've just updated the web page with the latest developments.
>South Wales Police seem to be determinedly obstructive.

>See:

><http://www.uk-ufo.org/condign/swphelo.html>

>for details.

>I note that at Greg Boone's website:

><http://ufomafia.com/blog/update-on-uk-ufo-incident-in-cardiff>

>Greg quotes Nick Pope as saying "This is one of the most
>interesting UFO sightings in recent years and I'll be
>investigating this incident."

>Is anyone aware of what enquiries Nick has made, and what the
>outcome was?

Hi Joe,

I am surprised that National Air Traffic Services (NATS) is not subject to FOIA. Is it not accountable to the public? How in the heck did they get away with that? Their counterparts in the United States and Canada don't enjoy this protection, nor should NATS. One might now think in these terms re this protection; rug, broom...NATS. Scary and not from the UFO viewpoint but an aviation viewpoint.

You have your work cut out for you. Thanks for the heads-up.

Good luck,

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 15:10:39 -0400
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 06:45:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>>>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>>>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera.

><snip>

>>I am unaware of any photos of the mythical "flower tape".
>>Charles Moore made a drawing of what he said was there:

>>http://www.roswellproof.com/beams_symbols_compare.html

>>Compare with Marcel Sr.'s and Marcel Jr.'s drawings.

>I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports himself,
>should at least be trusted on this. You have to "vector-in" the data
>in order to have a balanced view - taking the good with the bad.
>Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both
>accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better
>solution.

Victor,

I'm of the opinion that Charles Moore's opinion can be dismissed
out of hand due to his fluctuating testimony, depending on his
payback. Sorry, but I have a very low opinion of the gentleman.

If I recall correctly, Moore had been interviewed many years ago
regarding the Roswell incident and he categorically stated that
his work had nothing whatsoever to do with anything that came
down near Corona. But, after a visit by McAndrews, who
reportedly was carrying the Jesse Marcel Sr's military records
in hand, he suddenly recalls Flight 4, which he now believes was
the object that had been recovered. How convenient.

You are correct in that Moore is no stranger to UFO researchers
and he now has a book on the Roswell crash that he is selling to
promote his concept of how this story goes.

The Mogul explanation has so many problems with it that I'm
shocked that so many still seem to cling to it. Next I guess
we'll be trying to track the test flight dummy schedules against
actual sightings to... oh, wait a minute... that's already been

tried without a match. Hmmmmmmmm.

But I guess my point is that Moore changed his tune regarding Roswell after a visit from McAndrews, which leads me to question his veracity. His immediately joining the book writing set and putting out his "explanation" of the Roswell event in time for the 50th Anniversary seems just a bit much to me.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 16:23:07 EDT
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 06:54:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera.

<snip>

>I am unaware of any photos of the mythical "flower tape".
>Charles Moore made a drawing of what he said was there:

>http://www.roswellproof.com/beams_symbols_compare.html

>Compare with Marcel Sr.'s and Marcel Jr.'s drawings.

I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports himself, should at least be trusted on this. You have to "vector-in" the data in order to have a balanced view - taking the good with the bad. Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better solution. I spoke with one of the Mogul team members that may have had the records on this tape but he was requesting \$ 8,000 for the trouble. I believe he was already in contact with the AF. I came into the situation by chance.

>>Military Historian Fletcher Pratt in early 1950 alluded to a
>>flying Saucer crash and that bodies of vaguely human appearance
>>and about thirty five inches tall had been found in the wreckage
>>- citing confidential channels. If anyone else knows more about
>>this, that would be interesting...

<snip>

>British spook Bernard Newman published a book in 1948 titled
>"The Flying Saucer". Interestingly, it was submitted to the
>publisher in late 1947. It was a novel ridiculing the reality of
>the 1947 flying saucers as mass hysteria and hallucinations.
>However, the plot has top scientists staging faked Martian
>flying saucer crashes, including in New Mexico, in order to
>panic the world into uniting behind a common threat.

Things haven't changed all that much :)

>We can speculate all we want as to whether Newman had actually
>heard something through the spook grapevine about Roswell, or
>was just going by what he read in the newspapers (Roswell had
>international coverage.)

I think it fueled the imagination, certainly.

<snip>

>Many, many other witnesses besides Marcel saw and handled the
>material and described similar anomalous properties:

There comes a point when the realistic material descriptions (as mentioned) can't be so easily exchanged for the claims of the extraordinary. This is especially true of this case.

I think we have to be fair to the facts and not be so easily swayed one way or another. Having investigated Roswell, I feel anyone not taking a balanced view faces the awkward position of having to ignore this piece of evidence in favor of another - at the cost of sounding insincere to the investigative underpinnings/findings of the case. I can pick and choose too and what majority of listeners would be the wiser. For that reason, I think it extremely fair to point out the conflicting flaws on both sides in fair competition for the truth.

The point of my posts has been to balance the evidence - this being more important than the hyped-up opinions about it - one way or another. It is reasonably clear that Marcel said he was photographed with the actual debris - which is very inconvenient to brush aside. But, that he also describes the material in both mundane and extraordinary terms. But, we do find the use of extraordinary (mission defining) materials too: polyethylene fabric/balloon materials that seemed to be described rather than their neoprene counter parts... perhaps swapped out later... in agreement with Marcel's statements (see below).

>http://roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

>Just one example was Bill Brazel Jr., who gave virtually
>identical descriptions about the "memory" foil and wood-like
>beams. Neighbor Loretta Proctor similarly saw a piece of the
>wood-like beam which Brazel and her husband Floyd tried to mark
>or cut with a knife and which would not burn.

I spoke with them both and Bill told me it was a bunch of aluminum foil, sticks, and thread-like material (synthetic). He also describes the behavior of polyethylene quite well (see below on my balloon find). I also asked him and his son to record the location of the debris field onto a topographic map. Loretta Proctor describes a pencil-sized tan stick ... fragment. It was hard for her to elaborate beyond that and I found her quite honest as I did Bill.

Some of Moore's/Others interviewed transcripts were not completely included in the Roswell Incident - where other parts of the Balloon train are described. This invites reasonable speculation about the complete transcripts of the other witnesses. Luckily, the book was published at an early enough date that more testimony was not excluded to bend facts in a certain (possibly self-deluding) direction.

>(Seriously, Viktor, try coating a piece of balsa wood with as
>many layers of glue as you like, and it will still easily break,
>burn, or cut. Engineer Bob Galganski demonstrated this a decade
>ago:

This is not so neat as you would like to believe it to be...

A considerable number of witnesses used the word Balsa in describing this material, including Marcel. The dimensions of the pieces were also of the correct proportions. He also said it was flexible. If I use the word Balsa, it includes many of it's attributes just as I assume the witnesses intended: The margin of error is within that of any other statement made.

In addition, the flexural strength of Balsa is already quite remarkable. Add sealer, some dried wood glue, and the surface becomes both translucent and hard, decoupling it from the ordinary. It also explains why the color would have been retained. Add in an ad hoc combination of Aluminum foil, tape, and paper and this will only increase the likelihood of its flexure strength. After all, Marcel's son did indirectly indicate that if this was tape, it was certainly still in contact with the wood. And, Marcel himself said it looked painted on. The hard surface-coating would certainly impact it's typical combustibility profile since it is not the wood surface

the flames are first in contact with... resulting in an atypical reaction.

The beams were broken, after all, and not originally described as I-beams. As a result, this is not so clear cut as Galganski would have us believe. His first obligation should have been in providing ALL the relevant testimony of witness descriptions. This goes again to my original point of balancing the evidence correctly by inclusion not exclusion.

It is also quite apparent that witnesses did describe this material - possibly from other flights too, so excluding it in absolute sounding terms is a huge mistake from a logic stand point. In this investigation, nothing is that clear cut ...

More tests are certainly needed.

>including using an even stronger glue of the time that wasn't
>even used in making the radar target kites. Not that it
>matters, but the balsa sticks were not coated with glue in any
>case. The radar targets were nothing but balsa wood kites and
>glue was only applied in beads along their length to attach the
>foil/paper covering.)

>(Directed to general audience, not Viktor) A common debunking
>tactic (such as in the ABC special, Seeing Is Believing special)
>is to try to make the entire Roswell case about Marcel alone, as
>if he was the only witness and the whole Roswell case was due
>to him. There are dozens of other important military and civilian
>witnesses who corroborate Marcel. Not the same can be said for
>the witnesses the debunkers like to cite, such as CIC spook
>Sheridan Cavitt who was with Marcel. Cavitt was obviously lying
>through his teeth and contradicted by everybody, including his
>wife.

>snip

I interviewed Cavitt twice... not sure what his wife eventually said? I know it was everyone's goal to get her to talk without her husband around. Once, I had pointed out to him that the Air Force had not included all his testimony and was curious whether that aspect became a concern for him... apparently, they were not able to verify a plane crash recovery operation he was involved with during that time period.

It may be apparent that Cavitt later became aware the Top Secret nature of this project and was reasonably more concerned about what he said. In Marcel's case, they simply ordered him not to speak. Or, more likely, Cavitt simply kept his orders with no axes to grind. He wasn't involved in the way Marcel was and basically wasn't as, apparently, humiliated by the experience. And, if Marcel did find polyethylene, he truly did find something extraordinary and his testimony becomes even more convincing. He may have later excluded the description of the rubber too based upon this bad experience, further justifying his own accounts instead (but not in an intentional nor malicious manner).

I'm sure Marcel was overwhelmed with the sheer volume of the material which was unlike any common assemblage - including polyethylene (?), aluminum foil (heavier tinfoil was much more common), and funny looking tape. Only in 1947, did the Reynolds company come up with its most famous creation, Reynolds Wrap Aluminum Foil: Accordingly, familiarity with large sheets was simply not that common but rare.

The whole point of posting Marcel's account was to characterize his descriptions fairly ... his words not anyone else's. If he says he was photographed with the actual debris in his hand, then I believe him too. So, problems obviously exist in having a clean separation.

Curiously, no one asked him if he found actual Balloon material Or, maybe he did describe it but couldn't connect with it directly: saying instead: "Now by bend, I mean crease. It was possible to flex this stuff back and forth, even to wrinkle it, but you could not put a crease in it that would stay, nor could you dent it at all. I would have to describe it as metal with plastic properties,"

This is almost exactly how the material I have behaves without

the post melodramatic hoopla and with an adequate proportion of historically gained perspective (see description below). I'm not sure all the polyethylene balloons were of the same color since there are small and large ones depicted. It is also unclear whether the drawing of these balloon trains was done before or after the flights, inviting reasonable speculation as to their true flight configuration. Since Flight 7's Radiosonde failed, perhaps backup corner reflectors had been placed on later flights, as a precaution - Flight 9 being one possible alternative since nothing is mentioned about it in any detail.

Other possibilities are that balloon trains, once on the ground, can be dragged by the wind to new locations. This is especially true of the polyethylene balloons which stay inflated and resist puncture.

Marcel obviously wasn't familiar with some of the material, nor for that matter chemically altered rubber (perhaps) - as far as I can tell, both of these would not be included in his training nor would he be familiar with polyethylene (tan/brown/silver?). He did not describe neoprene rubber at all but perhaps his son may have? He mentions his father bringing home with him some debris that included some burned melted organic material - perhaps describing one of his fathers flame test attempts on some of this collected debris ... maybe neoprene baked in the sun too long? Marcel also did not perform the sledge hammer test on these materials directly but said others reported it to him (polyethylene?). He also describe polyethylene's behavior fairly well too. And, he also uses the word parchment at one point.

I actually have one of Charlie Moore's (Group) late 1940's "Darker Silver Metallic" Polyethylene Balloon fabrics. A rancher had found the Large balloon (still somewhat inflated) in a ravine and kept it all these years. Very extraordinary material for the 1940's too - very tough, plastic by touch and behavior (warm/pliant) but metallic by appearance and some of it's mechanical-like properties: Folds (crinkles up) in your hand but bounces right back with no prominent creases in the ordinary sense. This would have been unusual upon first discovery scenarios. Bill Brazel describes it quite accurately too ... in both color and behavior. I may simply be that more than one Balloon train was involved - just as we have accounts of different crash sites.

I believe the rancher only gave me the remaining 1/4 of it and it is quite large. This landed west of Alamogordo as far as I can tell - with a date from 1948 -1949 according to Charles Moore but he never inspected it directly either due to time constraints on my part. I will send him some this week. The rancher did say it looked like a UFO had crashed. He ended up using it as camping cover.

Surprisingly...

It is a tough cross-linked polymer fiber. Thin multiple layers of it are currently in use as Bullet proof vests. You can also pound on it with large surface area hammer (sledge), which might actually reduce the per unit force of impact compared with that of a hammer, and it won't tear or dent in a normal sense - providing adequate recovery properties.

The Balloon Train shown in the "Roswell Incident" (a Large Polyethylene Balloon shown on top along with smaller ones attached below) seems more consistent with this material's descriptions as well (size?). This invites some speculation on the exact finding date - if we do have polyethylene fabrics. Or, if more than one flight had eventually been recovered explaining the other sited debris/landing areas - with wide open spaces, seeing over vast areas is not that difficult. The operation may have uncovered other lost Mogul flights during the search. A partially inflated polyethylene balloon does look unusual on the ground too and will stay inflated much longer and does not shrink (stretch). (Think of tough tarp material and that is fairly close to how it behaves and looks but thinner).

Charles Moore changed his mind later based upon a photo of the debris (he possibly removed polyethylene from the equation, and the later Mogul flights, not knowing the full scope of the events and the likely material swap). After all, Marcel does not describe Neoprene convincingly. The swap may have taken place as Marcel described. Also, Flight 7, having failed may have been

sent aloft (researching that) or having failed, flight 9 (other) may have been equipped with a back up system of corner reflectors. They did, after all, bring them along or have them made in advance. Why, if they didn't need them - having their Radiosondes instead ...

Unfortunately, Charlie Moore is very sick right now (I had a series of questions for him). One being whether he had actually read Marcel's earliest testimony. Reasonable, since he finally saw photos that changed his mind too (at a much later date). So, what influences might the power of words have on him ... Marcel's words ... and that of others. I can't assume he's read all of it?

Currently, Flight 4 seems the obvious choice by a reasonable default process but that might exclude both the purple flowers and the polyethylene materials which are well described by many of the witnesses on both sides of the argument - too hard of a swallow that they are all wrong if we just apply some reason. I will include additional witness descriptions in a later post.

I don't want to get caught up in re-describing the debris too much which has already been described by the witnesses. But, we can place it within a different context without veering too far from the descriptive terminology. The further we get from this, the dimmer the prospects of a solution. However, I will make reasonable connections using a combination of those materials (as described) in relation to how they might function together or become altered. Also, add in some historical perspective and some grounded speculation and we can reason our way through this.

There are plenty of witnesses that describe material reasonably similar and consistent with the Mogul/New York University Balloon train and is quite mundane/ordinary, including Marcel and his son. Throw in reinforcing (removed) testimony and one can't escape the group parallelism. If the AF removed material, they merely swapped out the more unusual stuff to avoid having to explain/describe it: polyethylene, quite possibly, being among one of them that was unique to this program's development. A darker black (aged) neoprene rubber is seen in the photos but Marcel never described it at the debris scene (possible reasons see above). This invited his later comments related to the swap (apparently) along with the unusual "painted on" purple hieroglyphic material (tape?) surfaces he described along the beams and foil.

It is also clear Marcel was not challenged with many difficult questions that I'm aware of. Perhaps, Bill Moore had invited such checks and balances? But, good luck getting a hold of him, his notes, or his tapes. In as much as he has removed himself, the case has stagnated in bringing clarity to these earliest of descriptions. I'm certain there is new descriptive information there - from the witness accounts.

My main point again is that all Roswell researchers should be pointing out the pro and con testimony. If you discover/know of conflicting facts then tell others. Each researcher should be able to contain both sides of this without the drama ...

I do find that Kevin is quite capable if this in conversation.

golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

From: John Rimmer <j.rimmer.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 22:08:21 +0100
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 07:55:00 -0400
Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures

>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 20:36:31 -0300
>Subject: Re: The Roswell Declaration Signatures>

>I asked Kent on a radio show (Hieronymous) if he ever had a
>security clearance. He said no. It was obvious he was totally
>ignorant of security.

If he had a very high security clearance he may not have been at
liberty to tell you.

--
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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:30:07 +0200
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 07:56:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>I spoke with them both and Bill told me it was a bunch of
>aluminum foil, sticks, and thread-like material (synthetic). He
>also describes metallic "silver colored" polyethylene quite well
>(see below on my balloon find). I also asked him and his son to
>record the location of the debris field onto a topographic map.
>Loretta Proctor describes a pencil-sized tan stick... fragment.
>It was hard for her to elaborate beyond that and I found her
>quite honest as I did Bill.

>>(Seriously, Viktor, try coating a piece of balsa wood with as
>>many layers of glue as you like, and it will still easily break,
>>burn, or cut. Engineer Bob Galganski demonstrated this a decade
>>ago:

>This is not so neat as you would like to believe it to be...

>A considerable number of witnesses used the word Balsa in
>describing this material, including Marcel. The dimensions of
>the pieces were also of the correct proportions. He also said it
>was flexible. If I use the word Balsa, it includes many of it's
>attributes just as I assume the witnesses intended: The margin
>of error is within that of any other statement made.

>In addition, the flexure strength of Balsa is already quite
>remarkable. Add sealer, some dried wood glue, and the surface
>becomes both translucent and hard, decoupling it from the
>ordinary. It also explains why the color would have been
>retained. Add in an ad hoc combination of Aluminum foil, tape,
>and paper and this will only increase the likelihood of its
>flexure strength. After all, Marcel's son did indirectly
>indicate that if this was tape, it was certainly still in
>contact with the wood. And, Marcel himself said it looked
>painted on. The hard surface-coating would certainly impact it's
>typical combustibility profile since it is not the wood surface
>the flames are first in contact with... resulting in an atypical
>reaction.

Viktor,

Again, anyone, even ten years's old, who does the test of
breaking a balsa wood stick, 8 mm thick, with any amount of glue
coating, will understand at once that your confusing story does
not hold water.

BTW, Dr Marcel, who is a very professional and scrupulous
person, visited Prof. Charles Moore at Socorro. Moore showed him
a radar target and told him: "this is what you saw". "No, this
is not at all what I saw!" he replied. The discussion was brief,
and Marcel departed. We are talking here about a direct witness

of the debris. Charles Moore was not.

About polyethylene balloons, please see the USAF Roswell Report. The first Mogul balloon train using them was the flight number 8, of July 3. Too late for the Roswell crash. The Air Force, Prof Charles Moore and all the skeptical authors, beginning with Karl Pflock, have never tried to use that confusing argument of yours. Anyway, as everyone knows, polyethylene is fragile, can be cut and burned easily, and does not compare at all with with the strange debris described by so many witnesses.

><snip>

>The whole point of posting Marcel's account was to characterize
>his descriptions fairly... his words not anyone else's. If he
>says he was photographed with the actual debris in his hand,
>then I believe him too. So, problems obviously exist in having a
>clean separation from these materials.

This point has been clarified long ago, especially by by Stan Friedman and Kevin Randle. Let them confirm that here. Kevin Randle and Donald Schmitt did that in their first book, of 1991. Walter Haut told them, in 1989, that he had asked his colleague Marcel who confirmed to him that the press never saw the real debris. Marcel said to journalist Johnny Mann that his picture before debris did not show the real debris. The initial book, of Bill Moore, was not a very good one. It contained a lot of mistakes.

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Two Blackvault Websites

From: John Greenewald, Jr. <john.nul>
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 15:33:42 -0700
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 07:57:00 -0400
Subject: Two Blackvault Websites

I wanted to write to you about two websites I recently launched which might be of value to readers.

First off, I recently expanded The Black Vault Radio Network (BVRN) which has now become the largest Paranormal radio network in the world & Syndicating 22 shows, and nearly 500 hours of content, the resource is invaluable. To top it off, it is only a month or so old and new shows and archives are appearing daily! (It is 100% free)

<http://www.blackvaultradio.com>

The second is The Black Vault TV. This is a free resource for users around the globe to watch online videos, upload their own, make friends worldwide, and of course, learn from the valuable resource. Only about a week old& this resource is aimed at allowing UFO investigators and even witnesses a resource to put their videos online, for free, to share with the world. With a massive site like YouTube& videos are often lost or never seen due to the overwhelming amount available. But with this, visitors know it is a site dedicated to that community, along with related topics of interest.

<http://www.theblackvault.tv>

Sincerely,

John Greenewald, Jr.
The Black Vault

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

Jesse Marcel Jr. On Black Vault Radio

From: **John Greenewald Jnr.** <john.nul>
Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 15:08:19 -0500
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 07:58:00 -0400
Subject: Jesse Marcel Jr. On Black Vault Radio

The Black Vault Radio Network (BVRN)

<http://www.blackvaultradio.com>

September 21, 2008

In this episode of The Black Vault Radio, Jesse Marcel, Jr., son of Jesse Marcel who was the first on the scene during the Roswell incident, joins me to talk about his new book.

Entitled The Roswell Legacy, Marcel and I talk about why he wrote the book, and even get into some war stories from his time in the gulf. A Great Show!

Click:

<http://tinyurl.com/3m3kt4>

to listen to the new episode

NEW - THE "BVRN FAN RANTS"

Get your comments heard on BVRN. Upload your audio or video response now to BVRN:

<http://tinyurl.com/4xsk5o>

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 22](#)

UFO Photos Examined With New Process

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 09:00:00 -0400
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 09:00:00 -0400
Subject: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

Source: American Chronicle - Beverly Hills, California, USA

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/74925>

September 20, 2008

UFO Photos Examined With New Process =96 MUFON Investigates

For more than a month now, MUFON have been investigating photos displayed on Profindsearch.com of the STS-75 tether incident. The images have been enlarged using a special process and reveal detail never before seen.

MUFON is the world's largest UFO investigative group and have recently completed an investigation into the Texas Stephenville Sightings. In January of this year a number of UFO sightings were made in Stephenville and following some very thorough research into this incident, MUFON released their findings in May. Although they were unable to obtain sufficient evidence to confirm an ET invasion, there was also no evidence to suggest this was a hoax or the result of more conventional (earthly) objects. Sadly, for the moment, this will remain a mystery.

An even more spectacular event occurred in 1997 called the "Phoenix Lights", witnessed by hundreds of people. A number of lights appeared in the sky which seemed to be attached to a huge V-shaped craft. Using this new process, one of the "lights" has been enlarged revealing what could be "portholes" on the "craft" and maybe even an "alien" at one of these windows. Please visit our special page:

http://www.profindsearch.com/proof_that_aliens_exist.htm

to view these images for yourself.

With the help of MUFON and their Optical Scientist, we hope to discover much more about the STS-75 'UFO' incident and maybe this is one mystery that will be solved once and for all.

Since publishing these reports we have received many requests for older UFO photos to be re-examined using this new process (including photos connected to the Roswell incident). Sadly, this process is quite time consuming and it may take awhile to examine all the photos that have been suggested.

However, there is no doubt that the new photo process will provide the answer to many unsolved mysteries in the near future, we just have to be patient for a little longer.

The special page will be updated as often as possible with new images and information, so please be sure to visit on a regular basis.

Ian Brockwell is the creator of Profindsearch.com and interests

include writing, teaching, politics, climate change, UFO reports, businesses of all descriptions, medicine and generally trying to enjoy life.

Profindsearch is a very small search engine, which hopes to be a Google one day! (We can all dream)

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > 2008 > Sep > Sep 22

Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 16:04:06 +0100
Archived: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:07:37 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

>Source: American Chronicle - Beverly Hills, California, USA

><http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/74925>

>September 20, 2008

>UFO Photos Examined With New Process - MUFON Investigates

>For more than a month now, MUFON have been investigating photos
>displayed on Profindsearch.com of the STS-75 tether incident.
>The images have been enlarged using a special process and
>reveal detail never before seen.

The claim of "alien faces" and "numbers and letters" discovered by "ernhancement" is risible. The "UFOs" have every appearance of small debris particles inside the near focal distance of the camera lens, and are so described by the Shuttle astronaut taking the video at the time, see

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=As-wYmFYb3I&feature=related>

The doughnut shapes are typical video artifacts, and the appearance of passing behind the tether is an illusion. The particles, when in relatively sharp focus are bright points and do not appear to pass behind the tether. Only when drastically defocused does this illusion occur because the sharper, brighter tether is (obviously) visible through the fainter and transparent extended image of the particle.

Kim Efishoff of NARCAP carefully explained this to the author of the American Chronicle "challenge" back in August and suggested that better use of such a remarkable "special process" of enhancement - if it exists - would be to enhance the Bond Johnson photo of the Ramy telex. They expressed an interest in the idea. I'm not aware that anything has been forthcoming, and i don't expect it to be.

>An even more spectacular event occurred in 1997 called the
>"Phoenix Lights", witnessed by hundreds of people. A number of
>lights appeared in the sky which seemed to be attached to a huge
>V-shaped craft. Using this new process, one of the "lights" has
>been enlarged revealing what could be "portholes" on the "craft"
>and maybe even an "alien" at one of these windows. Please visit
>our special page:

http://www.profindsearch.com/proof_that_aliens_exist.htm

>to view these images for yourself.

Unfortunately the anonymous "scientist" who graciously allowed his remarkable enhancements to be used here - showing that the blurry white spots contain squiggles which he thinks show images of two species of aliens and colorful details of "circuitry" - is not only unfamiliar with JPEG compression artefacts, but - stunningly - also fails to realise that the photo is not from the 1997 Phoenix Lights case at all, but is one of Carl Hart's 1951 Lubbock Lights photos!

>With the help of MUFON and their Optical Scientist, we hope to

>discover much more about the STS-75 'UFO' incident and maybe
>this is one mystery that will be solved once and for all.

>Since publishing these reports we have received many requests
>for older UFO photos to be re-examined using this new process
>(including photos connected to the Roswell incident). Sadly,
>this process is quite time consuming and it may take awhile to
>examine all the photos that have been suggested.

I'll bet. Don't hold your breath.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 23](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:46:31 EDT
Archived: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 07:48:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 15:10:39 -0400
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>><snip>

>>>>Other than 1947, The case appears in the 1967 Look special
>>>>"Flying Saucers," I don't have a copy but either Newton and/or
>>>>Marcel is holding up the debris for the camera.

>><snip>

>>>I am unaware of any photos of the mythical "flower tape".
>>>Charles Moore made a drawing of what he said was there:

>>>http://www.roswellproof.com/beams_symbols_compare.html

>>>Compare with Marcel Sr.'s and Marcel Jr.'s drawings.

>>>I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports himself,
>>>should at least be trusted on this. You have to "vector-in" the data
>>>in order to have a balanced view - taking the good with the bad.
>>>Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both
>>>accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better
>>>solution.

>Victor,

>I'm of the opinion that Charles Moore's opinion can be dismissed
>out of hand due to his fluctuating testimony, depending on his
>payback. Sorry, but I have a very low opinion of the gentleman.

>If I recall correctly, Moore had been interviewed many years ago
>regarding the Roswell incident and he categorically stated that
>his work had nothing whatsoever to do with anything that came
>down near Corona. But, after a visit by McAndrews, who
>reportedly was carrying the Jesse Marcel Sr's military records
>in hand, he suddenly recalls Flight 4, which he now believes was
>the object that had been recovered. How convenient.

He was asked whether one of his balloons could have left a long
gouge or scar mark on the ground and he responded accurately,
that it could not have left such a marking. No where in these

earliest of testimonies (see post of Marcel's testimony) do you find any of the pertinent witnesses at the scene describing a gouge mark. This question was merely put to him in order to decouple this obvious connection from the beginning... and, not necessarily intentionally either - since we all may simply "want to believe."

<snip>

>But I guess my point is that Moore changed his tune regarding
>Roswell after a visit from McAndrews, which leads me to question
>his veracity. His immediately joining the book writing set and
>putting out his "explanation" of the Roswell event in time for
>the 50th Anniversary seems just a bit much to me.

<snip>

He never changed his opinion. I talked with him before this episode...

He brought up Moore's interview without even asking and reaffirmed how it was mishandled and not representative of his true opinion. Unfortunately, he was manipulated by the UFO researchers not "McAndrew."

Concerning whether it was an early or later flight of Mogul, he only refined his opinion in as much as he was able to with new information that was put before him in bits and piece by UFO researchers. He just needed to be shown the 'correctly quoted' earliest of testimonies in order to 'put the pieces' together in reflection of the facts. The earlier that could have been done the less adjustments later.

Many UFO researchers have adjusted their opinions when presented with new information... So, why does that exclude C.B. Moore ? Just because its convenient to do so?

Even in the "Roswell Incident" he says that Polyethylene was not used until 1948. But, we all know now that it was used prior to the Roswell episode in New Mexico. His memory was as good as it could get at that time in 1978-79. In as much as project records are accurate, so too can be his recall on other aspects.

Once he was shown documents from the project, he adjusted his recall... just as we should our opinions.

Always go to the earliest or least contaminated sources for "up to the minute" accurate information...

Also note:

Bill Brazel Jr. does mention that someone he met in Alaska told him about Alien bodies associated with a crash in New Mexico... leaving us to wonder which: this one or the one on the Plains of St. Agustin. It may also be the sole source for much of the "body issue" questions rumored through the years. He clearly states that his father did not tell him such a story.

I'm not sure when Bill was told that either, making us also wonder if that person read these early accounts from such sources as Frank Scully, Aztec, etc...

Even then people were trying to put the pieces together and sometimes they fused various sources trying to make sense of their experiences - later passing it along to us... but more importantly, other people living in the area. That's just the reality of it... and if you do ground investigation this becomes readily apparent.

The only credible source for body counts comes from Barnett, who I found to be much more reliable as a source on that issue... Stan should be happy about that too... I'm not trying to erase all of Roswell, either.

Why has Barnett suddenly been forgotten?

golubik

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 23](#)

Commemorative Edition Of Mack's Passport To The

From: Will Bueche <will.bueche.nul>
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:03:20 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 07:57:46 -0400
Subject: Commemorative Edition Of Mack's Passport To The

Hi Everyone,

I just wanted to drop a note saying that a commemorative edition of Dr. John Mack's final book, Passport To The Cosmos: Human Transformation And Alien Encounters (1999), is arriving in stores in a few weeks.

In Passport, Dr. Mack focuses on the human dimension of alien encounters - how they affect people's lives, how they force a re-examination of our sense of reality, and how the aliens' presence may change our relationship to the world.

A lovely introduction by Michael Cohen is presented at the start, and I worked with one of the experiencers in the book to secure some of her artwork, which has been lovingly set into the book by Kunati Press' art department.

I am also grateful to Budd Hopkins for writing a lovely new blurb, which I am 99% sure managed to be reproduced in whole on the back cover. I expected it would be difficult to write an endorsement of a book that has some themes that one disagrees with, but he did a fine job in acknowledging the perspective of his late friend.

Passport to the Cosmos: Commemorative Edition will be available October 2008. It is a trade paperback edition. The cover art is a pastoral scene of a boy standing on a hill with a retro-style flying saucer in the blue sky above him.*

The main text of the book is essentially the same as the original 1999 hardcover, newly typeset. Where some references had previously been from people's unpublished essays and the like, the references have been updated. There is a new quote by Credo Mutwah next to one illustration, which was taken from the transcripts of John's interviews with Credo.

Essentially, we - everyone who worked on this new edition with Kunati Press - is hoping that this book will be discovered anew by people who hadn't seen the original edition, which remains Dr. Mack's definitive contribution to the subject of alien encounters, and is, in his own words "a better book than Abduction".**

We are anticipating some good retailer support this time, so check your local bookseller including Barnes & Noble.

Here is the Amazon link:

<http://tinyurl.com/5xgdc3>

United States distribution is via the Independent Publisher's Group (800-888-4741). Canadian distribution is via Canadian Manda Group (416-516-0911). Kunati Press can be reached at:

www.kunati.com

Thank you.

* yep, that is an Adamski style saucer in the sky on the cover,

but it is just artistic license - it happens to be a nicely iconic type of saucer.

** "It is a better book, at least as a book, than 'Abduction', but aroused less interest. After all, a Harvard professor can only make news making a fool of himself once." (personal correspondence, John Mack to [redacted], 2004-01-26)

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 23](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 09:30:03 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:38:11 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:46:31 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 15:10:39 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>I'm not sure when Bill was told that either, making us also
>wonder if that person read these early accounts from such
>sources as Frank Scully, Aztec, etc...

Pure speculation on your part.

>Even then people were trying to put the pieces together and
>sometimes they fused various sources trying to make sense of
>their experiences - later passing it along to us... but more
>importantly, other people living in the area. That's just the
>reality of it... and if you do ground investigation this becomes
>readily apparent.

Again, speculation and theory.

><snip>

>I'm not trying to erase all of Roswell, either.

><snip>

It sure sounds like you are trying to erase.

I do not purport to be an expert on Roswell. I have read many
books on the topic, but in fact I am not an expert. However, as
an Attorney I do understand testimony and evidence. I do
consider myself an expert in that area.

It is important to point out that most of what you have been
presenting in these many posts to the List is not, as you would
say, examining both sides of the evidence.

I do not agree with your assessment of your own objectivity. It
is obvious you have taken a side. You have been making a case
for one side and that is yours. It appears you have made up your
mind. I recommend letting others do the same.

A good start is to listen to first hand testimony. An excellent
witness to the actual wreckage material is Jessie Marcel, Jr.
He was interviewed by John Greenwald two days ago (09/21/08).
Click on the below link to listen.

<http://tinyurl.com/3m3kt4>

I have personally evaluated 100s of witnesses for veracity and credibly. I must say that Jessie Marcel, Jr. is by far one of the most credible. I had the pleasure of meeting with him in detail last summer. He is a medical doctor, a highly decorated military officer and a flight surgeon. There is no doubt he is telling the truth and relaying the story accurately.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 23](#)

E-Mails To New York Times

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 12:20:03 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:38:43 -0400
Subject: E-Mails To New York Times

From: Franklin D. Fields, Esq. <fields.nul>
To: executive-editor.nul
Cc: nytnews.nul,
metro.nul,
national.nul,
public.nul
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 12:20:03 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Investigative Reporting On Possible National Security
Incident

This correspondence is sent as a follow up to my previous email referenced below. I received an auto reply but I want to insure human attention.

I am a retired decorated U.S. Army Officer, an established Attorney, and by any account a solid American citizen.

I have brought to your attention an issue that might be a very important story. If this object was a ship from another world or a secret aircraft it is possibly one of the biggest news stories in human history.

Please take the lead. National media coverage of unexplained aerial phenomenon has been sporadic and sometimes tongue-in-cheek. Too often, the general public is not presented with the facts in an objective and authoritative way. There is no better organization than yours to take on this important inquiry.

Your assistance with this extremely important matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,

Franklin D. Fields, Jr.
Attorney at Law

----- Original Message -----
Subject: Investigative Reporting on National Security Incident
From: "Franklin D. Fields, Esq." <fields.nul>
Date: Thu, September 18, 2008 10:53 pm
To: executive-editor.nul
Cc: nytnews.nul
metro.nul
national.nul
=

Dear Journalist,

I am asking your news organization to look into the Stephenville, Texas UFO incident. It could have real national security implications and deserves further investigation.

Stephenville, Texas attracted worldwide attention earlier this year when more than 30 residents specifically reported a sighting. Many of the witnesses were interviewed on national

television programs such as CNN=B4s Larry King Live. All of the witnesses were credible and none were shown to be perpetrating a hoax.

There is plenty of evidence available to corroborate their story. An extensive detailed analysis of FAA radar data was conducted and it was shown that a real physical object was witnessed on January 8, 2008. See report:

<http://www.mufon.com/documents/MUFONStephenvilleRadarReport.pdf>

In addition there are police video recordings and a police radar gun was used to track the object. There was obviously something flying over Stephenville that might be a national security threat. Why is our government not looking into it?

This object could hold a stationary position and then accelerate to incredible speeds in the blink of an eye. It was the size of a =93Wal-mart=94 by some accounts. It made no noise and witnesses were adamant that no plane could have caught this object when it shot out of the atmosphere. Even if this was a secret U.S aircraft there is a story to be told. Why would our government have technology that far in advance of what is available commercially?

Our government should show us the civility to at least act like they are interested. After all, whatever this craft was, it could have been and still might be a real threat to our national security.

Although dated, a CNN/Time poll revealed that 80% of Americans believe the government is hiding information on UFOs. It would seem that the UFO subject is news worthy. See poll information:

<http://www.cnn.com/US/9706/15/ufo.poll/>

Please take the lead on this very important issue. The American public has the right to know the whole story.

Truly yours,

Franklin D. Fields, Jr. Esq.
Attorney at Law
311 State Road 26
Melrose, FL 32666
Cell: (352) 478-1176
Email: fields.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

>But I guess my point is that Moore changed his tune regarding
>Roswell after a visit from McAndrews, which leads me to
>question his veracity. His immediately joining the book writing set
>and putting out his "explanation" of the Roswell event in time for
>the 50th Anniversary seems just a bit much to me.

I quite agree with this assessment of Moore. But problems with his credibility go far beyond him conveniently changing his tune. He was been caught too many times in a web of lies.

Initially I was impressed with his approach. He started off seeming to be an objective, curious, scientific type in "The Roswell Incident". He was interested in the case but didn't push any particular point of view. He did say he doubted any of his balloons or any other could explain what happened based on what was described to him (very large area of debris and large gouge in ground).

But then he became convinced one of his Mogul balloons must have caused the Roswell incident. He turned into a full-fledged debunker and started lying and manufacturing material to support the Flight 4 hypothesis. Especially egregious is how he created a hoaxed trajectory calculation for the 50th Anniversary, a chapter in the 1997 Smithsonian Press Roswell debunking book, "UFO Crash at Roswell. The Genesis of a Modern Myth." Moore started engaging in a little myth-making of his own

Kevin Randle provided him with historical wind data. Moore then used falsified math calculations with changed, hidden (and absurd) assumptions to make his supposedly lost Mogul Flight 4 "exactly" land at the Foster Ranch crash site. Debunkers, of course, seized on this to proclaim that Moore had virtually proven "scientifically" the Flight 4 theory.

Except it was all a hoax, using the prestige of the "scientific" Smithsonian Press to lend it additional credibility. When Brad Sparks and I went over Moore's calculation in 2002, we found that he had cheated in numerous ways. My recalculations of his table wind data showed that the hypothetical balloon would have missed by at least 70 miles (using his stated assumptions and correct math), probably more like 100 miles (if you throw out his ridiculous middle-of-the-night launch change-of-story). The whole shabby story of Moore's hoax at:

http://roswellproof.com/Mogul_hoax_FAO.html

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Trajectory.html

Brad also found that Moore had altered a Mogul map (after writing he was reproducing it "without change") to try to bolster his story, then lied about it in an email debate mediated by debunker ("ex"-CIA employee, fellow exposed hoaxer) Karl Pflock.

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Addendums.html

(See "More Moore Mischief")

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4and5_changes.html

Moore also misrepresented (either deliberately, i.e., lying, or through very bad memory) why he supposedly specifically remembered Flight #4 and its trajectory out of many dozens of other Mogul flights. He claimed he had a vivid memory of them visually tracking it near "exotic" New Mexico locations like Capitan Peak, and the little towns of Capitan, Bluewater, and Arabela, locations he said were exclusively associated with "Flight 4" and no other.

But the historical reality is Flight 17, a thoroughly documented flight (unlike "Flight 4", for which there is NO documentation at all), is the one that passed directly over these same "exotic" locations, only 3 months later.

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Addendums.html

(See, "What Does Moore Remember?")

I also found out about another instance of a bogus Moore UFO claim, this time associated with the famous 1948 Thomas Mantell case. Moore was saying he was part of a nearby Skyhook balloon

launch team and their balloon supposedly accounted for Mantell's fatal UFO chase. Furthermore, he claimed he knew the solution all along.

However, McAndrew and the Air Force in 1994 actually disproved this other Moore Zelig-like claim. According to Skyhook records, shown to Moore by McAndrew, Moore was never there, joining the Skyhook launch team 3 weeks later during another Skyhook launch. This was after Moore said he had a "vivid memory" of being part of the earlier launch team that created Mantell's UFO.

Moore tried to shrug it off, instead spinning this as an example of how inaccurate old memories could be. Yet Moore didn't apply this lesson to Flight 4 when he wrote his later debunkery of Roswell. He again claimed he had a "vivid memory" of them tracking the balloon in the early morning over those "exotic" locations, even though this was almost certainly 3 months later with Flight 17. Yet Moore pinned his entire hoax calculation on this phantom Flight 4 "vivid memory."

In reality, the only mention of a possible balloon launch that could possibly be associated with a "Flight 4", states that it was cancelled on account of cloudy weather. The cloudy weather that would have forced cancellation was also supported by weather records Moore gave in his book, but he also misrepresented these to try to support his middle-of-the-night launch. This is again discussed at my website in describing his hoax.

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Trajectory.html

(See "Whether the Weather")

Moore has also claimed that the Project Mogul name was so top-secret, that even he didn't know the name "Mogul" until it was fully declassified in the 1990s. (See, e.g., Pflock's book, p. 145, where Moore tells him in 1993 that he had just found out about the Mogul name a year before, from Robert Todd of all people.) I guess this was to make Mogul sound so mysterious and supersecret that the military had to kick civilian ass, like Mack Brazel's, to keep the whole thing hushed up.

But what is the probable truth of the matter? Brad Sparks also sent me a 1949 unclassified letter from White Sands Naval missile chief Cmdr. Robert McLaughlin to physicist James van Allen (of van Allen radiation belt fame), about UFO sightings in the White Sands area, including his and Moore's. McLaughlin identifies Moore as "head of Project Mogul for the Air Force."

http://roswellproof.com/McLaughlin_Van_Allen_letter.html

So McLaughlin, who isn't part of Project Mogul in any way, knows about the "supersecret" name "Project Mogul", but the man he identifies as heading it, Moore, doesn't know for another 40+ years? How believable is that?

There are other documents of low classification, such as an FBI document from August 1947 concerning a hoax disc case, that mentions "Mogul" by name four times.

http://roswellproof.com/FBI_telegram.html

(see document at bottom)

It seems just about everybody but Moore seemed to know about the name "Mogul."

There are some other things Moore has probably lied about or remembered badly in order to debunk Roswell, again pointed out by Brad Sparks, such as the radar range limitation on White Sands radar. Moore claimed only one type of radar unit was used at White Sands and it was limited to 39.7 miles. He used this alleged limitation to help debunk Frank Kaufmann's story of tracking the UFO at White Sands that blew up over Brazel's place. He has also used it to try to "explain" why they rarely used radar targets after Flight 4. Supposedly the tracking was limited, in part, because of the range limitation.

But the reality is they tracked V-2 rockets with radar at White Sands, starting in 1946, and they went a lot further up and downrange than "39.7 miles". One document Sparks has shows that

a late July 1947 V-2 launch was tracked by four different radar to an altitude of 100 miles (not Moore's one radar to only 40 miles).

Another document Brad sent me, a Mogul team UFO report from August 1947, notes how they had tracked UFOs on radar at an altitude of about 200 miles! (Notice how the report also mentions how the radar had been "modified" for such long-range tracking.)

http://roswellproof.com/Alamogordo_UFO_Aug_1947.html

Probably 90% of the whole Mogul explanation is based on uncritical acceptance of Moore's mere say-so. Another example is Moore claiming that the Fort Worth photos show the remains of more than one radar target and weather balloon. (see Pflock, p. 164) First of all, this is at direct odds with the story being put out by General Ramey in 1947 of a singular balloon and target, and weather officer Newton, who then and now said it was a standard singular target and weather balloon he identified that could have come from anywhere.

I have also done a 3D computer reconstruction of the debris in the photos which again definitely indicates one target, not multiple ones. (There is other very clear evidence in these photos that this was a brand new target taken out of its shipping box and broken up for display, but I can't go into this here.)

But if you read the debunkers like Pflock or Weaver/AF report, Moore's at-best bad eyeball estimate (at worst, deliberate lie) "examination" of photo debris gets spun into Moore "unquestionably" (Plock's word) identifying the multiple targets and balloons that one would expect from a Mogul crash.

Needless to say, I do not find Moore to be a terribly credible witness to anything. Not only is his memory of events highly suspect, he seems to like being the center of attention on UFO historical events like Roswell and the Mantell case. (I call this "last hurrah" syndrome, and seems to have infected a few other Roswell witnesses like J. Bond Johnson and Frank Kaufmann.) On top of that, he has clearly lied and confabulated at times to push his point of view.

Moore never really was much of a Roswell witness, since he wasn't involved in any way. Any involvement comes strictly from the assumption that Mogul explains the Roswell case. So he is really an expert Mogul witness, but not a very reliable or believable one given his checkered history. Everything he says about Mogul and Roswell should be taken with a big grain of salt.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 23](#)

Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 17:30:42 EDT
Archived: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:42:58 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 16:04:06 +0100
>Subject: Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

>>Source: American Chronicle - Beverly Hills, California, USA

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/74925>

>>September 20, 2008

>>UFO Photos Examined With New Process - MUFON Investigates

>>For more than a month now, MUFON have been investigating photos
>>displayed on Profindsearch.com of the STS-75 tether incident.
>>The images have been enlarged using a special process and
>>reveal detail never before seen.

Thanks Martin for exposing this pseudoscientific nonsense. I contacted MUFON and MUFON's Director of Research, Robert Powell, said he never even heard of this alleged "MUFON" photo enhancement process before I contacted him.

<snip>

>Unfortunately the anonymous "scientist" who graciously allowed
>his remarkable enhancements to be used here - showing that the
>blurry white spots contain squiggles which he thinks show images
>of two species of aliens and colorful details of "circuitry" -
>is not only unfamiliar with JPEG compression artefacts, but -
>stunningly - also fails to realise that the photo is not from
>the 1997 Phoenix Lights case at all, but is one of Carl Hart's
>1951 Lubbock Lights photos!

Great catch Martin. This sounds like a deliberate hoax.

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 24](#)

Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 08:09:06 -0700
Archived: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 07:58:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 10:30:47 -0400
>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 19:02:24 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>From: Stanton T Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 11:53:57 -0300
>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 20:08:16 -0700
>>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2008 17:38:46 -0400
>>>>>Subject: Re: Colorado Project Had More Than 50%

>>>>>Unfortunately, the only funding that amounted to anything
>>>>>(Colorado Project) was badly misused by Condon and Low, but
>>>>>others on the project stood up for scientific principles and
>>>>>blew the whistle on them. So I don't think it is either fair ir
>>>>>accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to
>>>>>scientists as a class.

>>>>>Speaking of science and scientists, how is that the National
>>>>>Academy of Sciences endorsed the conclusions/findings of the
>>>>>Condon report? Considering the controversy that Saunders, et al,
>>>>>brought up about the Low "trick" memo, Condon's public
>>>>>dismissive statements before the report was even written, and
>>>>>the (new) info that at least 30 (to 50) percent of the cases in
>>>>>the report were considered "unknowns," just how did the NAS
>>>>>review and endorsement of the report's false conclusions ever
>>>>>occur in the first place?

>>>>Let us not forget that the NAS is a self selecting body. Condon
>>>>was himself a member. Not likely they would do more than rubber
>>>>stamp.

>>But McDonald was also a member of the National Academy of
>>Sciences and had many influential contacts everywhere.

><snip>

>Brad,

>Your portrayal of Jim McDonald's role (most of which I have
>snipped here) is quite accurate, except for one point.

>To the best of my knowledge (I am about 95% certain of this) he
>was not a "member" of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). He
>served on numerous scientific panels assembled by NAS and,

>indeed, had many important high-level connections.

>As an aside, the governing body of NAS ("members") were
>notorious for being the most hidebound, ultra-conservative, Old
>Boy network among scientists.

Thanks for your input, Brad/Dick/Stan---

Out of curiosity, I did a little Googling, and found the following:

Frederick Seitz, who was the President of the National Academy of Sciences at the time, and who was also a personal friend of Dr. Condon, chaired the committee at NAS that was setup to review the Condon report. Dr. Seitz was an associate and former student of Condon's dating to the 1930's, and Condon was an associate and mentor to Seitz from his early graduate student days and beyond.

In a Master of Science degree thesis researched and written by Diana Palmer Hoyt, entitled "UFO Critique / UFOs, Social Intelligence, and the Condon Committee", Hoyt states the following:

"On the surface, it seems unlikely that a committee from the National Academy of Sciences would have certified the conclusions of the Condon Report - purportedly a scientific study - when clearly, the science of the Condon report was conditioned by the biased understanding of UFOs in the 1960s. There are several possible explanations for the committee's conclusions:

- "1. They only met twice and had only seven weeks to study the Report;
2. They were influenced by Seitz, who was a former student of Condon's and who could be expected to support him;
3. They only read the Conclusion written by Condon, and did not compare the body of the Report with its Conclusion.
4. Based on their understanding of science and ufology, they believed that Condon had done the right thing, and agree with the conclusions he drew.

"All four explanations are plausible; Sturrock (1999) suggests that it was more than likely that they did not read the whole report-only Condon's conclusion." See:

<http://tinyurl.com/3gdle6>

for details

In addition, the role of another associate of Condon's, Dr. Hugh Odishaw, who was Condon's long-time confidant and friend, and who served as secretary of the Division of Physical Sciences at NAS during the Colorado Project, was critical. He had previously, in 1951, been Condon's assistant at the National Bureau of Standards. What was significant was how he helped select the members of Seitz' 11-member special review panel. According to a 1987 letter by J.R. Greenwell, "...Odishaw selected individuals who he thought would endorse the report's negative UFO findings. He did not look upon this as any sort of 'conspiracy.' Based on our conversation, I think he honestly viewed it more as his duty to science, as well as his loyalty to an old friend." (See: <http://tinyurl.com/5yc3vl>)

If the NAS committee had only seven weeks between the receipt of the Condon report (and only met twice in that time to discuss the over 1,400 page study), and before they issued the results of their review, where Hoyt says the NAS "...fully endorsed the scope, methodology, and findings of the report," it seems likely that Sturrock's supposition is not only likely correct, but given that the President of NAS, and the head of the review committee, Seitz, was also a former student of Condon's, and a long-time friend, that Seitz was probably influenced by his extremely long-term relationship with Condon.

It would appear that Seitz and his committee did an inadequate, superficial review of the report (and perhaps only Condon's

faulty, biased conclusions), and thus reached what could be termed a disreputable and corrupt conclusion endorsing the Condon report, despite the controversies raised by McDonald, Drake, and others with Seitz personally, by letter, before Seitz' committee even received Condon's draft report, in addition to the objections Saunders, Keyhoe, Hynek, and others much more knowledgeable about the UFO phenomenon raised with Condon, and who refused to consider the evidence due to his inherent bias and inability to overcome the scientific taboo and conventional mainstream thought about the UFO controversy.

Interestingly, Dr. Frederick Seitz would go on later to work for RJ Reynolds Tobacco, Inc., supervising their medical research, which was intended to bolster the tobacco manufacturer's contentions that cigarettes were not harmful to smokers, and also was one of the early, leading scientists who disputed the man-made basis for global warming. For further details on these additional corruptions of scientific principles and ideals, see:

<http://tinyurl.com/496uxo>

[http://www.ecosyn.us/adti/Seitz Tobacco Crimes.html](http://www.ecosyn.us/adti/Seitz_Tobacco_Crimes.html)

<http://www.desmogblog.com/frederick-seitz-dead>

So, I'd have to say, despite Dick Hall's comment that "I don't think it is either fair or accurate to attribute cowardice or unscientific behavior to scientists as a class," it would certainly be fair to apply to both Dr. Condon and Dr. Seitz the terms cowardice, unscientific behavior, and even intentional deceit and corruption in their roles when examining the UFO issue, and in Seitz' case, the same could be said for his later involvement in the tobacco and global warming controversies. It would also seem that the National Academy of Sciences, in regard to the Condon report, and Dr. Hugh Odishaw, also bear some share of blame for this coverup of institutional inadequacy, and, to put it most politely, incompetence and malfeasance, in this case.

The U.S. Air Force "fix" was in from the beginning, and they got exactly what they wanted from the "scientific community," or in this scandal, an apparent "old-boy network" of like-minded friends, associates, students, and others who knew and supported Condon's biased and false conclusions, and despite the strong evidence of the large proportion of true unknowns.

Steve

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 24](#)

'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
Archived: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 07:59:29 -0400
Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

Excluding the stories with fairies and elves, has anyone compiled a series of abduction accounts where something nice has happened?

I'm sure the term abduction defeats the purpose and I'm sure there are many accounts of the Space Brothers bringing peace and joy to the world but for some reason won't appear on national television.

I'm talking nuts and bolts stories where things aren't as frightening as usual.

I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering from it should receive some form of specialized attention by society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and incarceration in institutions.

Best,

Greg

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 24](#)

UFO Sighting Over Australian Ranch

From: **Sheryl Gottschall** <gottscha.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 14:57:03 +1000
Archived: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 08:02:25 -0400
Subject: UFO Sighting Over Australian Ranch

Source: The Daily Telegraph - Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/4w8jvb>

September 24, 2008

UFO Sighting In Australia

Three station workers and three backpackers have been left stunned after witnessing strange lights flying over a remote Australian station.

Ray Aylett, Normie Hooker and Alan "Doc" McIntosh were sitting on their pergola at Muckaty Station with three European backpackers when a bright light appeared.

Mr Aylett, 58, said they were all stunned by the bizarre sighting. "This strange light was coming straight for us, over the house," he said.

"We all walked outside and were watching it come towards us, then it went straight east and faded out."

Mr Aylett, who has lived at the station north of Tennant Creek for eight years, said he couldn't believe his eyes as the bright light approached on a Thursday night two weeks ago.

"This thing was strange," he said. "I have never seen anything like it."

"Normie and Doc had never seen anything like it either, and those backpackers, they were in shock."

"I was sitting there watching for a couple of minutes."

"You could see it coming towards us but it wasn't a plane."

"It made no noise - you couldn't hear anything."

Mr Aylett said there was no way their judgement could have been affected by alcohol.

"Me and Doc had had a couple of beers, but Normie doesn't drink," he said. He said the light returned the next night, this time coming from the other direction.

"One bloke went out with a pair of binoculars and said it just turned and went east," 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 24](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: [Diverge247.nul](#)
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 03:59:12 EDT
Archived: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 08:07:09 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Franklin D. Fields <[fields.nul](#)>
>To: [ufoupdates.nul](#)
>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 09:30:03 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <[Diverge247.nul](#)>
>>To: [ufoupdates.nul](#)
>>Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:46:31 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>I'm not sure when Bill was told that either, making us also
>>wonder if that person read these early accounts from such
>>sources as Frank Scully, Aztec, etc...

>Pure speculation on your part.

>>Even then people were trying to put the pieces together and
>>sometimes they fused various sources trying to make sense of
>>their experiences - later passing it along to us... but more
>>importantly, other people living in the area. That's just the
>>reality of it... and if you do ground investigation this becomes
>>readily apparent.

>Again, speculation and theory.

>><snip>

>>I'm not trying to erase all of Roswell, either.

>><snip>

>It sure sounds like you are trying to erase.

Thanks Franklin...

What is the probability of a crashing flying Saucer and crashing Balloon Trains coming down in the same area and having Many similar characteristics? And then our willingness to insist upon the impossibility of a link connecting the two.

Could you get some jury members onboard this and feel comfortable convicting someone on murder charges based upon that illogical insistence? Looking like a slick lawyer who has the power of persuasion but little else.

Roswell believers hang on to very small details which are then volumized... out of control. And they can hide out easily enough because the flood of details is seemingly complex to get through. But, really, researchers should be able to simplify the case to it's fewest core details... which turn out to be quite trivial indeed.

Irving Newton recalls Marcel dancing around insisting that the Aluminum foil we see in the photos was not a radar target! And Marcel says he was holding up the actual stuff. So we can say there it is... done! So, is Newton lying now? Even though we have the photographs too?

No one comes out a winner unless we just accept the simplest of explanations.

Wouldn't a lawyer die to have the murder photographed! And yet that's not good enough for you either because the volume is too loud... you can't think clearly... the room is as big as the cosmos and you can't have your room turned upside down right now... yet scientist do that regularly and willingly while making discoveries - by simply looking at the evidence, asking good questions, and making great observations.

If Marcel is describing Polyethylene, then he is even more vindicated in his insistence of this being otherworldly along with everybody else. And guess what? Polyethylene was used and did fall on that part of the land at that time... so you can't just throw it out... that testimony.

>I do not purport to be an expert on Roswell. I have read many >books on the topic, but in fact I am not an expert. However, as >an Attorney I do understand testimony and evidence. I do >consider myself and expert in that area.

>It is important to point out that most of what you have been >presenting in these many posts to the List is not, as you would >say, examining both sides of the evidence.

I listed Marcel Jr. father's testimony in full and from it's most early account. Why isn't it quoted accurately and in full elsewhere. You being a lawyer and such might give you a clue.

I'm pointing out what is seldom considered or seen these days and using the first witness testimony to do so. No surprises, really...

>I do not agree with your assessment of your own objectivity. It >is obvious you have taken a side. You have been making a case >for one side and that is yours. It appears you have made up your >mind. I recommend letting others do the same.

My objectivity comes from having been involved with this longer than you. Seeing the other side of the argument is at this juncture objective in consideration of all that has come before it. Food for thought.

I spell out my reasons very clearly. You are welcome to show you counter arguments... you being a lawyer and such. Dig in, you'll be amazed... how simple this is... no need to get in any wrangle with anyone...

>A good start is to listen to first hand testimony. An excellent >witness to the actual wreckage material is Jessie Marcel, Jr. >He was interviewed by John Greenewald two days ago (09/21/08). >Click on the below link to listen.

I did list the earliest first hand Testimony and will list more. So far, I'm the only one to list it completely. Go ahead find it elsewhere in it's entirety at one of the Pro Roswell web sites or researchers sites. If it is so stupendous it should be more visible not less.

Seems Rudiak comes close but he's broken up/segregated the linear testimony and it is not complete nor in context with the period. You being a lawyer and such ought to appreciate a full unbroken deposition placed in the proper historical context, right?

I've talked with Marcel Jr and do not think he's lying. Do you understand psychology and how old memories can reconfigure? You being a lawyer and such understand the vagaries of recall?

Plus, he is telling the truth but it can have another interpretation. I believe him to be very ethical and fair minded.

Remember, Roswell has become BIG but these are actually quite SMALL details on a human life-scale. So, how could anyone put this on anyone's shoulders, really hard! I would never do that and that is also my point... that this is really all very small and trivial stuff... but the emphasis is misplaced onto cosmically significant scales: The output conclusion is

incongruous with the input signal... period! Noise is being over amplified into music...

Just bring it back to reality and let go... suspend preconceived notions and images... focus on rudimentary principles.

Think of the movie Twelve Angry Men and that ought to put this into context for you. Might actually be a good idea for a movie on Roswell too - could be very entertaining and educational :) Can anyone think of a new title?

In his early account (1979) he does not call it I-beams and he also told me in ~1994 he wasn't so sure on things. I believe then he wanted to know first whether or not his father had sufficient training. He was being very fair and honest in his recall. I'm just telling you this without having any motivation from ANY book deal involvements. I helped him get his fathers records. I've turned down money in fact. Book publishers and reporters are nothing more than trained firework experts looking for sparks and bad smelling smoke and nothing in between. The boring truth has no appeal in the market place... .

Marcel Junior's first account (The Roswell Incident):

Dad got a call to go out and investigate a downed aircraft or something like that. He was gone a couple of days and returned with a van and part of a car filled with wreckage and debris.

The material was foil-like stuff, very thin, metallic-like but not metal, and very tough. There was also some structural-like material too -- beams and so on. Also a quantity of black plastic material which looked organic in nature.

Dad returned toward evening. He was gone all one night and most of the next day. He had a 1942 Buick and a Carry-all trailer, and both were loaded with this material which was only a fraction of the total.

(Dr. Marcel recalled that he was about eleven at this time. When asked if he had managed to save a piece of this material, he replied):

You know, I could have kicked myself a thousand times over for not doing so. Dad said it was classified stuff and not to take any, so I didn't. But I sure wish I had.

Question: Did Dr. Marcel (Dr.? probably a typo) recall hearing anything more about the incident after that?

Yes. The story leaked out and we were bombarded with reporters, etc. I wasn't too involved in this. My main impression was that the metal objects and strips were from some kind of machine not a weather balloon. I was told that it was some type of aircraft, but it wasn't any type we were familiar with -- that's for sure. Dad said that the speed of impact was not in keeping with any type of aircraft we had at the time.

(Several weeks later, April 1979, Dr. Marcel remembered something else):

In reference to the UFO incident of 1947 or 1948 I omitted one startling description of the wreckage for fear it might have been the fanciful imagination of a twelve-year-old. Imprinted along the edge of some of the beam remnants there were hieroglyphic characters. I recently questioned my father about this, and he recalled seeing these characters also, and even described them as being a pink or purplish-pink color. Egyptian hieroglyphics would be a close visual description of the characters seen, except I don't think there were any animal figures present as there are in true Egyptian hieroglyphics.

I keep wondering if some remnants of the crash might still be lying on the New Mexico desert floor. According to my father, some of it was left behind when he and his crew investigated the air-crash site. I suspect, however, that after the true nature of the craft became known to the Air Force Intelligence, the whole site was gone over with a vacuum cleaner.

As you know, my dad brought a portion of the wreckage into the house and spread it over the kitchen floor, trying to piece some of the larger fragments together. There were quite literally

piles of metallic scrap along with bits of a black, brittle residue that looked like plastic that had either melted or burned. The task was hopeless because there was far too much debris for one kitchen floor to hold.

I doubt if all the smaller fragments were picked up from the kitchen, and, indeed, my mother remarked that some of it was probably swept out the back door. About that time we poured a concrete slab around the back door for a patio. I don't recall whether this was before or after the incident. but if it was shortly after, what better way to preserve some of these fragments that were swept away? Chances of recovery of anything would be vanishingly small, but not zero.

><http://tinyurl.com/3m3kt4>

>I have personally evaluated 100s of witnesses for veracity and >credibly. I must say that Jessie Marcel, Jr. is by far one of >the most credible. I had the pleasure of meeting with him in >detail last summer. He is a medical doctor, a highly decorated >military officer and a flight surgeon. There is no doubt he is >telling the truth and relaying the story accurately.

>snip

So have I...

How many times has he relayed that story and again I'm not saying he's lying (see above). Does he quote this first account in his book? I have not read it... yet.

I would love to say Roswell was real! I actually heard the story while living there before any Roswell researcher came along... geez... wake up :) I'd have much more to gain by going the other way on this! Don't you think I know how much I have to lose...

I do happen to think Barnett the most credible person claiming to see bodies and a saucer... (so, did he see falling dummies one day and the recovery crew ? But, the time period is all wrong based upon the witness accounts... problem/more research?)

golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 05:32:32 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:24:12 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as
>the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond
>description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at
>the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering
>from it should receive some form of specialized attention by
>society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and
>incarceration in institutions.

Greg/List:

I see as more relevant a study into what could prevent or stop
the abductions. Here's one possible hypothesis:

Since most abduction victims are alone, in dark and secluded or
remote locations, has anyone heard of abductions occurring in a
barracks-type setting with lots of familiar people and lots of
light?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 09:15:12 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:27:21 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Diverge247.nul
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 03:59:12 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 09:30:03 -0400 (EDT)
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>>I'm not sure when Bill was told that either, making us also
>>>wonder if that person read these early accounts from such
>>>sources as Frank Scully, Aztec, etc...

>>Pure speculation on your part.

>>>Even then people were trying to put the pieces together and
>>>sometimes they fused various sources trying to make sense of
>>>their experiences - later passing it along to us... but more
>>>importantly, other people living in the area. That's just the
>>>reality of it... and if you do ground investigation this becomes
>>>readily apparent.

>>Again, speculation and theory.

>>><snip>

>>>I'm not trying to erase all of Roswell, either.

>>It sure sounds like you are trying to erase.

<snip>

>My objectivity comes from having been involved with this longer
>than you. Seeing the other side of the argument is at this
>juncture objective in consideration of all that has come before
>it. Food for thought.

<snip>

Mr. Golubik,

You have put out some interesting theories and arguments. My point is that you are arguing one side and some how believe that you are impartial and seeing things that others can not or will not. I simply do not believe that is the case. You have a point of view and that is your prerogative. Please just don't get on your high horse and assume yourself to be more impartial than others.

I am on the opposite side of the argument and do not intend to argue the merits of the case. Others have done that more effectively than I could. You are doggedly defending what you believe is to be the "real" story. It does not appear that any facts or arguments will change your mind.

It is fascinating that you brought up the movie "Twelve Angry

Men", it was a great movie. Do you image yourself as Henry Fonda's character? Is that why you selected the email name "diverge"? By the way, diverge is defined by dictionary.com to be "to move, lie, or extend in different directions from a common point; branch off." That appears to what you are doing.

I do not want to get personal. You're obviously intelligent and articulate. I just respectfully disagree. As you said, "No one comes out a winner unless we just accept the simplest of explanations."

In my opinion the simplest explanation is exactly what the 1947 headlines stated "RAAF Captures Flying Saucer On Ranch in Roswell". That headline represented the official story as described by the unit that found the object. The rest is cover-up. It is plan foolishness to think that Army officers, of the 509th caliber, would miss identify a balloon and believe it to be a Flying Saucer. Get real.

You can read the original news article at:

<http://www.roswellfiles.com/Articles/RoswellNews.htm>

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 15:25:51 -0400
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:31:48 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as
>the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond
>description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at
>the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering
>from it should receive some form of specialized attention by
>society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and
>incarceration in institutions.

Psychiatry has a legitimate role: If someone's thought processes are messed up to where they can't look after themselves, hold a job, function socially well enough that people don't complain excessively, then such individuals legitimately need help.

Psychiatry has no business whatsoever forcing people who express experiences or ideas the psychiatrist doesn't believe or agree with into 'treatment.' Such forced 'help' is criminal and immoral.

Does anyone know the mental health laws well enough to say whether laws actually allow the forced 'treatment' of anyone based on nothing more than a person reporting experiences or stating ideas the psychiatrist doesn't believe or agree with?

If a UFO abductee can be forced into the mental health system, then some major revision of mental health laws is essential.

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

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:32:01 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 03:59:12 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 09:30:03 -0400 (EDT)
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:46:31 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>
Vic, List, All -

>Irving Newton recalls Marcel dancing around insisting that the
>Aluminum foil we see in the photos was not a radar target! And
>Marcel says he was holding up the actual stuff. So we can say
>there it is... done! So, is Newton lying now? Even though we
>have the photographs too?

If we're going to examine all the facts (or witness testimony)
then let's put it all in the record.

First, Marcel said that he was told by Brigadier General Ramey
not to open his mouth. Just pose there with the debris. If we
accept that, then the major "dancing around insisting that the
Aluminum foil we see..." is not Marcel but some other Major.

Second, I asked Newton if he knew Marcel and he said, "No." If
that is true, then any Major from the base, or from Roswell who
was in the room could have been the man "dancing around..." as
long as Newton didn't know him.

And, for the record, according to the Officer's Roster for the
8th Air Force, there were 41 Majors assigned to the FWAAF in
June 1947.

So, what do we have? Newton's story that we accept as being
accurate, Marcel's orders not to speak, and the fact that Newton
didn't know Marcel.

And in this case, neither man is lying... they are accurately
reporting what they observed from their perspectives which were
not the same.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 17:02:47 -0700
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 11:34:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 14:37:31 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2008 02:57:39 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports
>himself, should at least be trusted on this.

See my other posts about Moore clearly lying through his teeth
to promote the "Charlie Moore's little lost Mogul balloon
explains world's most famous UFO case" hypothesis.

His undeniable hoaxing of a trajectory to "prove" winds took the
Mogul "exactly" to the Foster Ranch is the clearest example of
his deviousness.

>You have to "vector-in" the data
>in order to have a balanced view - taking the good with the bad.
>Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both
>accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better
>solution.

The credible witness testimony probably runs 10 to 1 against
something mundane like a balloon explaining Roswell. I have
compilations of over 20 witnesses, mostly eyewitnesses, to
debris with highly anomalous physical properties, extraordinary
light weight coupled with extraordinary strength and hardness
and resistance to heat. These are not descriptions of extremely
fragile balloon debris.

According to more accounting, the number of witnesses suggesting
body recovery now runs to over 40. Yes, most of these are second
hand, but there are also a few eyewitnesses like Haut, Benthal,
"Benjamin", probably Sain, and maybe a few others.

There are probably half a dozen eyewitnesses to the military
driving a tarped, oval-shaped object on flat-bed truck through
the center of town surrounded by machine-gun toting MPs. Mogul
balloon recovery?

There are witnesses to multiple flights carrying debris and
probably bodies out of Roswell: Henderson friends/family, Smith,
B-29 crew members (Slusher, Thompson, Osepchook), Dubose, of
course Marcel's flight with Porter aboard and witnessed by
Shirkey, and others.

How many flights does one need to fly out the debris from a

crashed Mogul balloon? All you really need is a few grocery bags and a Piper Cub. One bag would have sufficed for what was displayed in Fort Worth.

>>Many, many other witnesses besides Marcel saw and handled the
>>material and described similar anomalous properties:

>There comes a point when the realistic material descriptions (as
>described) can't be so easily exchanged for the claims of the
>extraordinary. This is especially true of this case.

Like I said, the witnesses to the extraordinary outnumber the witnesses to the "realistic" (whatever that means) by 10 to 1.

Regarding your "realistic" debris descriptions, who do you have?

CIC man Cavitt: Obvious liar still covering up. Contradicted by everybody. Testimony actually directly contradicted a Mogul balloon scenario since he was still reciting the old 1947 weather balloon cover story.

Mack Brazel newspaper interview: Obviously coerced and self-contradictory. Many witnesses to Brazel being in military custody and coerced. Even the Roswell provost marshall, Easley, admitted to Kevin Randle they held him at the base for several days under armed guard. For what—a Mogul balloon crash?

Mogul engineer Charles Moore: Not really a Roswell witness, since he witnessed nothing. He wasn't there and has no idea what might have been recovered from the field. Is going strictly by what was reported in Brazel's (coerced) newspaper account. On top of that, the man has clearly lied about many things concerning the Mogul balloons.

Bessy Brazel Schreiber: Can't clearly place her there at the scene. Many contradictory elements to her story (such as being at ranch during military recovery or with her father in Roswell). Debris descriptions poor match to Mogul debris. May have possibly picked up debris descriptions from newspapers at time or her father at a later time. Still, probably the one and only possible "balloon" witness. A cipher.

Sheriff Wilcox newspaper stories: Self contradictory. Contradicted Brazel. Admitted he was working with the military. Family said he was coerced (actual death threats).

AP reporter Jason Kellahin: Said he saw balloon debris at Brazel place when military there, but it was physically impossible for him to get there in time frame and location is all wrong. Was probably somewhere else at another site or remembering badly. A witness to Wilcox working with military and Brazel in military custody. See:

<http://roswellproof.com/Kellahin.html>

Walt Whitmore Jr.: Changed his story. Originally described unusual debris, then it became balloon debris. Said he still had some balloon debris, but could never produce it. Another cipher.

Reporter J. Bond Johnson and his photos: Was simply told by General Ramey this was from Roswell, but Johnson had no idea whether this was true or not. Ramey was saying this was a singular balloon and radar target, not a multiballoon, multi-target photo. Johnson's photos actually prove the point and show a fresh radar target out of a box, not one from the field. Tiny quantity of debris inconsistent with a Mogul and contradicts witnesses to numerous flights of debris and large quantities of debris being recovered.

Weather officer Irving Newton: Same story as Johnson. Was merely told debris was from Roswell but had no direct knowledge this was the case. Stated then and now that it was a singular balloon/radar target. A Roswell skeptic, but still doubts what he saw was from a Mogul. Thinks it could have been a standard weather balloon/target from anywhere. Marcel and Dubose, who were directly involved, said the weather balloon was just the cover story. Balloon was swapped for real debris.

Col. Marcellus Duffy: Supposedly viewed debris flown to Wright Field and ID'ed it as coming from Mogul, of which he was the original project officer. But a document strongly suggests he

was never there, instead being near Mogul headquarters. Further when asked what he had seen by Robert Todd in correspondence, he danced all around the issue in two letters and said it could have been any number of things, NEVER clearly ID'ing it as from Mogul or even a balloon. Probably never saw anything and was part of coverup, unless you believe he could be in two places at once. See:

<http://roswellproof.com/RoswellSummary11.html>

I think that about covers it. These are the witnesses for the prosecution. Moore was never there and witnessed nothing. The testimony of Duffy, Cavitt, Brazel, Wilcox, Johnson, and Newton can all be discounted as resulting directly from a coverup for which there is considerable evidence. Kellahin's account cannot be what was found at the Foster Ranch. He was either elsewhere or never saw anything in the field.

This leaves Schreiber and Whitmore Jr., whose testimony is very shaky at best. Their debris descriptions also contradict each other and the photos. E.g., Whitmore said he found "white linen-like cloth with reflective tinfoil on one side."

In contrast, Schreiber's affidavit reads, "Most of it was a kind of double-sided material, foil-like on one side and rubber-like on the other. Both sides were grayish silver in color, the foil more silvery than the rubber."

Unfortunately a real radar target, and the one shown in the Fort Worth photos, was foil-PAPER, not a linen-like cloth nor rubbery. If you want to know what it is like, get a Hershey's chocolate bar Wrigley's chewing gum, both wrapped in white foil paper-same stuff-which had been used in the food industry for 30 years prior to Roswell.

Whitmore Jr. at least got the color right-white-but how do you square that with the contradictory grayish color of Schreiber?

Both also claimed that only small pieces were left. Whitmore Jr. said the largest piece he found was only about the size of two sheets of paper and Schreiber said no bigger than a basketball. But the Fort Worth photos show much larger sheets of foil-paper, the largest we know from specs being 3 ft x 3 ft. Also remember the Air Force claim is that this was ALL of what was recovered and the stories of subsequent recoveries were all exaggerations of flying saucer writers. You can't have it both ways.

But Mogul advocates ignore all the serious inconsistencies and claim all these people were describing balloon material, specifically from Mogul.

In contrast, there is far more consistency to the witnesses to extraordinary material. How many people could independently come up with a description of the very lightweight memory foil that couldn't be torn or cut? And this goes clear back to the original testimony in "The Roswell Incident". Both Marcel and Brazel Jr. were giving this description even though the two men never met or knew one another. Whitmore Jr. at that time (before changing stories) gave a very similar description to the foil (though not the memory property). Further, Marcel, Brazel Jr., and Whitmore Jr. never described their foil material as double-sided, "white", or shiny, i.e. what you would expect for the foil/paper material of a radar target. Brazel and Whitmore compared it to the appearance of lead foil, i.e., a darker, duller gray.

For witness foil/memory foil descriptions:

http://roswellproof.com/debris2_memory_foil.html

>I think we have to be fair to the facts and not be so easily
>swayed one way or another. Having investigated Roswell, I feel
>anyone not taking a balanced view faces the awkward position of
>having to ignore this piece of evidence in favor of another - at
>the cost of sounding insincere to the investigative
>underpinning/findings of the case. I can pick and choose too and
>what majority or listeners would be the wiser. For that reason,
>I think it extremely fair to point out the flaws on both sides
>in fair competition for the truth.

The point is the witness testimony is overwhelmingly one-sided

to something extraordinary happening. The ordinary testimony is largely from people with no direct connection to what was recovered (like Moore, Johnson, Newton) or from coerced witnesses (Brazel & Wilcox).

>The point of my posts has been to balance the evidence - this
>being more important than the hyped up opinions about it, one
>way or another. It is reasonably clear than Marcel said he was
>photographed with the actual debris - which is very
>inconvenient to brush aside.

And it is possible he was, but these aren't the public photos of the weather balloon we know about. If something truly extraordinary had been recovered, it would be standard military procedure to historically document it. Photos of Marcel and Ramey with "real" Roswell debris would have been taken as a matter of course. Then, as Marcel's story went, Ramey took him to the map room and when he got back the weather balloon debris had been brought in. These produced the balloon photos were all know about.

Marcel after 30 years may simply have gotten the two photo sessions mixed up as one. Note that when Moore interviewed him, Marcel wasn't shown the public balloon photos and may have assumed Moore was referring to another set of photos. Yes, I know this is speculation, but it's a perfectly reasonable scenario.

Another possibility is that William Moore simply misquoted Marcel. There is one clear instance of where Moore misquoted Roswell radio announcer Frank Joyce, whose real story (told many times to various researchers) was that Brazel retracted his original story, then when Joyce asked him about his original story of the "little green men", Brazel retorted that they weren't green and walked out. But Moore attributed this to Walt Whitmore, Joyce's boss, on his deathbed, getting his notes of his interview with Joyce confused. Moore admitted to this and later corrected Joyce's story, but not before the damage was done. Debunkers still use the original erroneous Moore account to attack Joyce as inconsistent and not credible.

Marcel certainly did deny in other interviews that the photos of the balloon were what he brought from Roswell, and had Gen. Dubose to back him up. E.g., in his last interview with Linda Corley when shown the photos, he indicated "real" debris was still in the room, but of course they weren't stupid enough to show that to the reporters, first hiding it from view.

>But, that he also describes the material in both
>mundane and extraordinary terms.

Could you define "mundane" here? Marcel's debris descriptions were clearly not of something "mundane" but of something extraordinary (had had a lot of backup from other witnesses).

The only "mundane" descriptions by Marcel were reported in newspaper stories back in 1947, but of course Marcel was acting under orders then. In the midst of this, Marcel was quoted back then saying the debris was scattered over a "square mile", a description he repeated 30 years later to Leonard Stringfield. I does one reconcile a square mile of debris with the tiny quantity of debris in the photos or even a Mogul crash?

>But, we do find the use of
>extraordinary materials too (polyethylene fabric/balloon
>material... see below)

You mean the same stuff as grocery plastic bags are made of?
This you call "extraordinary material"?

By "extraordinary", the rest of us mean witnesses were describing exceptionally lightweight material that couldn't be torn, cut, burned, broken, bent, marked, scratched, etc. Does this apply to chewing gum wrapper material or plastic grocery bags?

Of course, this is purely academic with polyethylene since nobody described anything like it. Furthermore, the plastic Mogul balloons didn't enter the story until early July and they were all accounted for. Why do you keep bringing up this red herring (as you continue to do several times further below)? Not

even the debunkers argue plastic balloons anymore. It's been thoroughly discredited.

>>http://roswellproof.com/debris_main.html

It would do Viktor good to read through this entire lengthy compendium of witness debris descriptions and stop treating "The Roswell Incident" as the endall of Roswell research.

>>Just one example was Bill Brazel Jr., who gave virtually >>identical descriptions about the "memory" foil and wood-like >>beams. Neighbor Loretta Proctor similarly saw a piece of the >>wood-like beam which Brazel and her husband Floyd tried to mark >>or cut with a knife and which would not burn.

>I spoke with them both and Bill told me it was a bunch of >aluminum foil, sticks, and thread-like material (synthetic).

Odd, in a number of other interviews he clearly said it more resembled lead foil. But more importantly, he attributed unual properties to the foil. E.g.:

"I would fold it or crease it and lay it down and watch it. It was kind of weird. The piece I found was a jagged piece. I couldn't tear it. Hell, tin foil or lead foil is easy but I couldn't tear it. I didn't take pliers or anything. I just used my fingers. I didn't try to cut it with my knife. The color was consistent through the pieces I found. It was a dull color [and the same on both sides]. It was about the gauge of lead foil. Thicker than tin foil. It was pliable. Real pliable. I would bend it over and crease it and if you straighten back up, there would be a crinkle in it. Nothing. It would flatten out and it was just as smooth as ever. Not a crinkle or anything in it. [It didn't make a sound.] ...As best as I can remember, it was smooth. "

"There were several bits of metal-like substance, something on the order of tinfoil, except that this stuff wouldn't tear and was actually a bit darker in color than tinfoil - more like lead foil, except very thin and extremely lightweight. The odd thing about this foil was that you could wrinkle it and lay it back down and it immediately resumed its original shape. It was quite pliable, yet you couldn't crease or bend it like ordinary metal. It was almost more like a plastic of some sort except that it was definitely metallic in nature."

>He also describes metallic "silver colored" polyethylene quite >well (see below on my balloon find).

Well here we go. Your imaginary metallic silver colored polyethylene simply did not exist at the time. So why do you bring it up?

>I also asked him and his son to >record the location of the debris field onto a topographic map. >Loretta Proctor describes a pencil-sized tan stick... fragment. >It was hard for her to elaborate beyond that and I found her >quite honest as I did Bill.

Funny, she had no trouble at all "elaborating" with other researchers. E.g.:

(Friedman and Berliner) "The piece he [Mac Brazel] brought looked like a kind of tan, light brown plastic. It was very lightweight, like balsa wood. It wasn't a large piece, maybe about four inches long, maybe just a little larger than a pencil. We cut on it with a knife and would hold a match on it, and it wouldn't burn. We knew it wasn't wood. It was smooth like plastic, it didn't have a real sharp corners, kind of like a dowel stick. Kind of dark tan. It didn't have any grain, just smooth."

(1991 Video, UFOs: A Need To Know) "In 1947, I think it was the first of July, he came over with something that looked like wood that he had found over on the ranch and wanted us to take a look. ...The piece he brought up was about the size of a lead pencil and about 4 or 5 inches long. It was kind of a tan color, kind of what we would say plastic now, but we didn't have plastic then. You couldn't cut it, or burn it, or whittle it - just very, very hard. It was very light, it seemed to be."

>>(Seriously, Viktor, try coating a piece of balsa wood with as
>>many layers of glue as you like, and it will still easily break,
>>burn, or cut. Engineer Bob Galganski demonstrated this a decade
>>ago:

>This is not so neat as you would like to believe it to be...

>A considerable number of witnesses used the word Balsa in
>describing this material, including Marcel.

They compared it to balsa in lightness and color. But that was
always where the similarity ended, because universally they then
described a material that was very hard touch, couldn't be
marked, whittled, cut, broken, or burned, such as Loretta
Proctor's descriptions above.

>The dimensions of
>the pieces were also of the correct proportions. He also said it
>was flexible. If I use the word Balsa, it includes many of it's
>attributes just as I assume the witnesses intended: The margin
>of error is within that of any other statement made.

Baloney.

>In addition, the flexure strength of Balsa is already quite
>remarkable.

Nonsense. I can break thin balsa kite sticks between two of my
fingers. This is all the radar targets were made of. It wasn't
some supermaterial. Where do you dream up this stuff Viktor?

>Add sealer, some dried wood glue, and the surface
>becomes both translucent and hard, decoupling it from the
>ordinary.

More BS. Easily disproven with simple experiments, as engineer
Bob Galganski did 10 years ago. Further the sticks were never
coated with sealer and wood glue. These were simple balsa kites.
They ran beads of glue along the length to glue the paper side
of the foil paper to the balsa.

Even if they did totally dip the sticks in wood glue (as
Galganski did to test your theory), you have to be totally at
loss with reality to think balsa wood and dried wood glue would
be impervious to knives and flame much less breakage. Galganski
easily disproved it all.

>It also explains why the color would have been
>retained.

Yes, but so what?

>Add in an ad hoc combination of Aluminum foil, tape,
>and paper and this will only increase the likelihood of its
>flexure strength.

>After all, Marcel's son did indirectly indicate that if this
>was tape,

Marcel Jr. never indicated, directly or indirectly any such
thing. Stop putting words in witnesses mouths they didn't say.

>it was certainly still in contact with the wood.

"Certainly"? More baloney. The radar targets used common
household Scotch acetate tape, just about impossible to miss if
they really were still stuck onto the wood. And if I have the
standard Mogul debunking story straight, the radar targets were
out in the hot, dusty desert for a month. Maybe you should try
another experiment Viktor. Put Scotch tape on balsa sticks,
leave them out in the desert during the summertime, let them get
dragged around, and lets see if the tape is still stuck onto the
sticks.

Be sure to first glue paper-foil to one side of the stick, then
use the tape to reinforce the connection, i.e., the tape
overlaps the paper and the balsa and is initially stuck to both.
That was the whole point of using the tape here anyway. The
glued paper-foil tended to tear way from the balsa stick.

The point here, is that the acetate tape had to be much wider than the thin balsa framework stick of the radar target in order to reinforce the connection. So if the tape did manage to remain adhered to the stick after a month, it would also extend well beyond the stick and still be connected to the foil paper. Or, it could have torn away from the foil paper but would doubtlessly still be stuck to the white paper as it delaminated from the foil.

Either way you have plastic tape flapping away well beyond the stick. Does that sound like Dr. Marcel's I-beam description to you? Oh, BTW, his description was of a METALLIC beam, nothing like balsa wood. He's been quite clear about I asked him how he reconciled the difference between his description and his fathers and he answered that maybe they were just recalling different beams and materials. (Robert Shirkey, BTW, also described seeing a very similar "I-beam" with purplish symbols as Marcel Jr. as they were loading Marcel's plane to Fort Worth.)

Oh here's another experiment. Take an ink marker and paint symbols onto the tape and see if they transfer onto the balsa. Let's see, better not draw them on the more-logical, non-sticky side, because it will be rather hard for the ink to diffuse through the plastic to get onto the wood. Be sure to draw them on the sticky side and see how much transfer to the stick and gives it an "embossed" appearance. Good luck Viktor.

>And, Marcel himself said it looked
>painted on.

He said the symbols look "embossed", not "painted on." Please quote accurately. "Embossed" means they had a raised appearance.

>The hard surface-coating would certainly impact it's
>typical combustibility profile since it is not the wood surface
>the flames are first in contact with... resulting in an atypical
>reaction.

The garbage just keeps coming. Again, Bob Galganski tested this nonsensical theory out a long time ago, coating balsa with not one, but multiple layers of glue. I even have a video of him giving a sample to Marcel Jr. and asking him to try burning it. Using a simple cigarette lighter (no doubt also used by his Dad, a heavy smoker), it burst into flames within seconds.

>The beams were broken, after all, and_not Originally described
>as I-beams. As a result, this is not so clear cut as Galganski
>would have us believe. His first obligation should have been in
>providing ALL the relevant testimony of witness descriptions.

Even if you ignore Galganski's simple scientific test and even still assuming the balsa wood was thoroughly coated with glue (it wasn't), if the sticks were broken up, the broken ends would have no coating at all on them, directly revealing the soft, pulpy balsa wood core. Ever think of that? I guess none of the witnesses who extensively handled this material, like Marcel or Brazel Jr., were smart enough to examine the broken end, instead thinking the material was superhard because they couldn't cut or mark it along its hardened Elmer's glue surface. And Marcel indicated he couldn't get it to either smoke or burn, even though the broken end would be the logical place to try to light the material. Loretta Proctor likewise indicated that her husband and Mack Brazel tried to burn a shard, i.e., a broken piece, and couldn't get it to burn, and they couldn't mark it or cut it with a knife.

Elmer's white glue really becomes remarkable tough stuff exposed to desert sun for a month. So does broken balsa wood sticks apparently if you suspend all critical thought processes.

>This goes again to my original point of balancing the evidence
>correctly by inclusion not exclusion.

Does "balancing the evidence" mean believing everything, no matter how nonsensical or easily disproven?

>More tests are needed.

Is anyone stopping you? It doesn't take much of a budget to get some thin balsa sticks from a hobby shop and coat them with Elmer's white glue. Good luck trying to turn them into

supermaterial.

>>including using an even stronger glue of the time that wasn't
>>even used in making the radar target kites. Not that it
>>matters, but the balsa sticks were not coated with glue in any
>>case. The radar targets were nothing but balsa wood kites and
>>glue was only applied in beads along their length to attach
>>the foil/paper covering.)

>>(Directed to general audience, not Viktor) A common debunking
>>tactic (such as in the ABC special, Seeing Is Believing special)
>>is to try to make the entire Roswell case about Marcel alone, as
>>if he was the only witness and the whole Roswell case was due
>>to him. There are dozens of other important military and civilian
>>witnesses who corroborate Marcel. Not the same can be said for
>>the witnesses the debunkers like to cite, such as CIC spook
>>Sheridan Cavitt who was with Marcel. Cavitt was obviously lying
>>through his teeth and contradicted by everybody, including his
>>wife.

><snip>

>I interviewed Cavitt twice... not sure what his wife eventually
>said?

When Cavitt was interviewed by Col. Weaver of the Air Force,
Mary Cavitt kept interjecting and commenting about this or that.
After Cavitt had been telling the story that nothing important
happened, there was no secrecy, etc., Mary Cavitt added that she
tells everybody who calls that her husband was telling the
truth. Weaver then starts discussing how Roswell snowballed
after Marcel started talking to researchers. Mary Cavitt then
interjected:

"Cav never told me anything. He said I'll never tell you
anything then you won't spread anything. We always wondered how
little Jesse knew so much. To us it should have been business."

So Cavitt says it was nothing and there was no secrecy, but he
wouldn't tell his wife anything because he obviously knows she
has trouble keeping a secret and would talk about it, as
evidenced by her constant side comments during his interview.
The Cavitt's knew to keep their mouths shut and Mary Cavitt
can't understand why the Marcel's would talk and why Marcel Jr.
would be told anything.

That's Mary Cavitt totally contradicting her husband in her own
innocent way that nothing happened.

>I know it was everyone's goal to get her to talk without
>her husband around. Once, I had pointed out to him that the
>Air Force had not included all his testimony and was curious
>whether that aspect became a concern for him... apparently,
>they were not being able to verify a plane crash recovery
>operation he was involved with during that time period.

The story of Cavitt being sent out by Marcel and Blanchard to
pick up body parts from a B-29 crash is in Cavitt's transcript.
However, Cavitt also said he was back in Baltimore training and
didn't arrive in Roswell until June or July. Col. Weaver said
his records indicated he arrived in June. The only B-29 plane
crash that fit the time frame was May 20 and Cavitt couldn't
have been in two places at once. Cavitt further associated the
crash with two B-29 engaged in refueling practice, and a review
of the records by the Air Force indicated no such accidents in
1947-1948. There was a B-29 crash at Roswell on takeoff in
August 1947, but didn't involve refueling.

Nonetheless, McAndrew in his interview with Moore was suggesting
that maybe body parts from one of these B-29 crashes accounted
for the reports of bodies. I guess McAndrew decided to drop that
unlikely explanation, and instead later went with the more
plausible crash-dummies from the future.

>It may be apparent that Cavitt knew about the Top Secret nature
>of this project and was reasonably more concerned about what he
>said.

Huh? Project Mogul was fully declassified by the time the Weaver
interviewed Cavitt, he specifically brought up Mogul, even
coaching Cavitt about the flower tape, the large size, the

materials. There was no reason for Cavitt not to talk. But Cavitt stuck to his tiny weather balloon story (debris scattered over an area no bigger than his living room) and insisted he didn't see anything like symbols, those stories being made up by flying saucer authors. So much for Cavitt being a witness for a Mogul balloon crash.

>In Marcel's case, they simply ordered him not to speak.
>I'm sure Marcel was overwhelmed with the sheer volume of the
>material which was unlike any common assemblage

Overwhelmed by the sheer volume? Let's see, but then we to reconcile this statement with Mack Brazel's story in the Daily Record of all the debris amounting to more than two small rolled bundles weighing about 5 pounds. Then we have the tiny amount of debris in the Fort Worth photos and Ramey and Newton saying it was a singular balloon and radar target. Furthermore, the Air Force report insists that was all the debris recovered and the stories of large quantities of debris and large scale debris recoveries were manufactured by flying saucer authors. Then there is Cavitt's story of the debris field being no larger than his living room.

More to the point, Moguls may have been long, but didn't consist of that much debris. E.g., Albert Crary's diary indicates rancher Sid West found the remains of Mogul #6 launched on June 7, 1947. This was only 3 days after the fictional #4 launch. It indicates West contacted Alamogordo directly and they sent out two or three guys in a jeep to pick of the remains. Does that sound like they were overwhelmed by the sheer volume of material?

Even if you add up every conceivable rubber weather balloon and radar target on the mythical Flight #4, it adds up to less than 30 pounds of debris, hardly "overwhelming."

These were balloons Viktor, not B-29's.

>- including polyethylene,

More with your fictional polyethylene. Again (maybe this will eventually sink in), polyethylene balloons were first used by Mogul in July 1947 and all were accounted for. None could account for the debris at Brazel's place. Got that? Even debunkers like Pflock gave up on "polyethylene" Moguls a long time ago.

The balloons in June were all neoprene weather balloons, since the polyethylene balloons weren't ready yet. The two documented ones, #5 and #6, didn't go anywhere near the Brazel place. This left the missing #4, whose configuration is solely the invention of Charles Moore and which Crary's diary indicates was cancelled on account of cloud cover.

>aluminum foil (tin foil was much more common), and
>funny looking tape. Only in 1947, did the Reynolds company come
>up with its most famous creation, Reynolds Wrap Aluminum Foil:
>Accordingly, familiarity with large sheets was simply not that
>common but rare.

When you brought up this Reynolds Wrap argument in email with me some years back, I did a little research and discovered that aluminum foil had been a common consumer good for 3 decades. When companies like Alcoa had a glut of cheap aluminum on their hands, they began looking for new markets around 1910. First they started wrapping cigars in aluminum foil to preserve freshness; soon afterwards cigarettes. Then the food companies like Hershey's and Wrigley's started using foil-paper laminate to wrap their candy products. This was all before 1920. Another example, in 1924 or 1925, they started wrapping It's It ice cream bars in aluminum foil.

By the 1930s, heavier foil paper began to be used as backing on fiberglass insulation. There's your large sheets you claim nobody would be familiar with.

The point is, unless you led a very sheltered life, just about everybody over the age of 3 would have been very familiar with aluminum foil from common consumer products, everybody, it would seem, except the drooling idiots at Roswell.

As for your "size matters" argument, what's the difference between a weather balloon and a child's birthday balloon. It's bigger. What's the difference between the foil-paper cover of a radar target and the foil-paper wrapping a Hershey's chocolate bar? It's bigger. Is anybody going to be confused what they have simply because it's bigger? No of course not. Same material, same properties. It's another of your nonsensical arguments.

>The whole point of posting Marcel's account was to characterize >his descriptions fairly... his words not anyone else's. If he >says he was photographed with the actual debris in his hand, >then I believe him too. So, problems obviously exist in having >a clean separation from these materials.

>Curiously, no one asked him if he found actual Balloon >material

Maybe you need to read beyond The Roswell Incident Viktor. He did indeed specifically deny finding balloon material of some kind and he said it couldn't have been because it was porous. He was able to blow through it. E.g., from his Linda Corley interview.

"...the material was unusual. Of course the Air Force called it a balloon. It couldn't have been. It was porous. It couldn't hold any air. The material was a fabric... I tried to blow through it. It would go right through it. I tried to blow it with my mouth." [Corley asking for clarification: "What piece? That foil looking stuff?"] "No, no. ...what looked like balloon material. A cloth. ...It wouldn't hold any air. ...it's a cloth-like material, but it was also metallic. ...It was a metallic cloth. It [air] would go right through it. I even tried to burn it. It wouldn't burn. ...a balloon has to have ...gas to go up in the air - even hot air. This could not hold anything like that. It was porous."

Does that sound like "polyethylene" or neoprene rubber balloon material to you?

>Or, maybe he did describe it but couldn't connect with it >directly: saying instead: "Now by bend, I mean crease. It was >possible to flex this stuff back and forth, even to wrinkle it, >but you could not put a crease in it that would stay, nor could >you dent it at all. I would have to describe it as metal with >plastic properties,"

Does that sound like "polyethylene" or neoprene rubber balloon material to you?

>This is almost exactly how the material I have behaves without >the melodramatics and historically gained perspective I have/ >(you all have) with such fabrics.

Does that sound like "polyethylene" or neoprene rubber balloon material to you? What other balloon fabric material are you talking about? Later developed materials that you try to introduce below don't count.

>He obviously wasn't familiar with it nor for that mater >chemically altered rubber (perhaps) - as far as I can tell, both >of these would not be included in his training nor would he be >familiar with polyethylene (tan/brown/silver?).

Of course the neoprene rubber turns black and quickly degrades to ash in the hot desert sun. Does that sound like "metallic fabric" to you?

And (sigh) the polyethylene didn't exist, it wouldn't have been metallic appearing even if it did. Both neoprene rubber and polyethylene burn like crazy, which Marcel said his material didn't (couldn't even get it to smoke). Neither neoprene rubber or polyethylene is porous and both are extremely easy to cut.

It seems you do a lot of cherry picking in trying to argue the pro-Mogul case. Sure, throw out every bit of the extraordinary testimony and all you are left with, by definition, is the ordinary. But that is being extremely dishonest with the evidence.

>He did not

>describe neoprene rubber at all but perhaps his son may have?
>He mentions his father bringing home with him some debris that
>included some burned melted organic material - perhaps
>describing one of his fathers flame test attempts on some of
>this collected debris...

Again you aren't giving an accurate overall representation of all of Marcel Jr.'s comments. He compared it to bakelite from electronic circuit boards. Obviously you again relying solely on "The Roswell Incident" in which he is quoted as saying:

"[There was] a quantity of black plastic material which looked organic in nature. ... There were ... bits of black, brittle residue that looked like plastic that had either melted or burned."

...which to my ear doesn't sound much like neoprene rubber balloon material. Here are some other quotes.

"Some of the debris was not metallic but more like pieces of black plastic fragments thicker than the metallic skin."

"[There was] a brittle, brownish-black plastic-like material, like Bakelite." (from Affidavit)

"...There was some black, plastic material that I thought was like Bakelite that was pretty well shattered also."

Old neoprene rubber weather balloon material does not look like plastic. It would not be thicker than the metal material. If you try to burn it, it would burn easily and completely, being reduced to soot. It would not look like melted plastic. Left out in the hot sun, it turns to something resembling black paper ash after 2 or 3 weeks (as Charles Moore has demonstrated).

>If we look at the Brazel testimony, it isn't "cut and dry" that
>he found this on June 14th either since the previous night's
>storm activity doesn't fit well with this. I'm just pointing out
>that we could have a range of dates and a range of possible
>balloon trains regardless of what both opposing sides may have
>agreed to out of necessity. The use of polyethylene balloons
>came later in June according to the information;

No it didn't. Not used until July and all accounted for. You don't seem at all familiar with the historical material.

>But, the
>material described by Bill Brazel/Marcel fits well with this
>material's properties.

No it doesn't.

>I actually have one of Charlie Moore's late 1940's "Darker
>Silver Metallic" Polyethylene Balloon fabrics.

Not used until well after the Roswell events. You're not going to regale us with another time-warp theory like the crash dummies, are you?

>A rancher had
>found the Large balloon (still somewhat inflated) in a ravine
>and kept it all these years. Very extraordinary material for
>the 1940's too - very tough, plastic by touch and behavior
>(warm/pliant) but metallic by appearance and some of it's
>mechanical-like properties: Folds (crinkles up) in your hand but
>bounces right back with no prominent creases in the ordinary
>sense. This would have been unusual upon first discovery
>scenarios.

Totally irrelevant, since it didn't exist at the time.

>The Balloon Train shown in the "Roswell Incident" (a Large
>Polyethylene Balloon shown on top along with smaller ones
>attached below) seems more consistent with this material's
>descriptions as well. This invites some speculation on the
>exact finding date, if we do have polyethylene fabrics.

Except we don't.

>There, it is described as being flight 11A 7/7/1947 (no color
>description and I'm not saying this was the flight). This type

>of material could have easily been found/handled by others at a
>later time too. This rancher handed it out, piece by piece, to
>his family members. He'd used it as camping cover.

>I believe he only gave me the remaining 1/4 of it and it is
>quite large. This landed west of Alamogordo as far as I can tell
>- with a date from 1947-1949 according to Charles Moore (and the
>witness) but he never inspected it directly either. Is he still
>alive?

Again, why are you wasting our time with these red herrings
since there is no evidence this material could possibly have
ended up at Brazel's place in the given time frame? It didn't
exist at the time.

>I don't want to get caught up in re-describing the debris too
>much which has already been described by the witnesses. But, we
>can place it within a different context without veering too far
>from the descriptive terminology. The further we get from this,
>the dimmer the prospects of a solution. However, I will make
>reasonable connections using a combination of those materials
>(as described) in relation to how they might function together
>or become altered. Also, add in some historical perspective and
>some grounded speculation.

It's hardly historical or grounded speculation since it was a
balloon material that didn't exist yet.

>There are plenty of witnesses that describe material reasonably
>similar and consistent with the Mogul/New York University
>Balloon train and is quite mundane/ordinary, including Marcel
>and his son.

>One can't escape the group parallelism. If the AF
>removed material, they merely swapped out the more unusual stuff
>to avoid having to explain/describe it: polyethylene, quite
>possibly, being among one of them that was unique to this
>program's development.

Dream on Viktor. All polyethylene balloons accounted for.
Nothing resembling your balloon material existed yet. Got it?

>A darker black (aged) neoprene rubber is
>seen in the photos but Marcel never described it at the debris
>scene. This invited his later comments related to the swap
>(apparently) along with the unusual (tape) "painted on"
>hieroglyphic material surfaces he described along the beams.

>It is also clear Marcel was not challenged with many difficult
>questions that I'm aware of. Perhaps, Bill Moore had invited
>such checks and balances? But, good luck getting a hold of him,
>his notes, or his tapes. In as much as he has removed himself,
>the case has stagnated in bringing clarity to these earliest of
>descriptions. I'm certain there is new descriptive information
>there - from the witness accounts.

>If Marcel is respectably removed from the equation, do we
>still have Roswell?

Yes, because numerous other witnesses backed up his anomalous
debris descriptions, though apparently you choose to blow these
off or are simply unaware of them. There are also numerous other
witnesses to bodies, coercion and coverup, high security, debris
flights, etc.

Here's just one example.

One of the Roswell ambulance drivers told a researcher that he
drove his ambulance several times with MPs and went to the north
or northwest. He was instructed to not help unload the
ambulance, which was unusual. He remembers the date, because he
was supposed to be married at the base, but the base went into
lockdown for several days and they had to reschedule for July
10.

Wait a second. That researcher was you Viktor, and you described
this witness' testimony to me over the phone. What do you think
the MP's were helping to retrieve in an ambulance-a
polyethylene Mogul balloon?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Brad Sparks <RB47x.nul>
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 09:35:33 EDT
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 11:35:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 13:13:26 -0700
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 21 Sep 2008 15:10:39 -0400
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2008 22:07:36 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>>I think Charlie Moore, having made one or two UFO reports
>>>himself, should at least be trusted on this. You have to
>>>"vector-in" the data in order to have a balanced view - taking
>>>the good with the bad.

>>>Ignoring one credible witness in favor of another demeans both
>>>accounts. But, accounting for both often leads to the better
>>>solution.

I have followed this thread with interest and Vic Golubic's plea for more balanced assessments of Roswell witnesses and evidence. But with ex-AAF officer Charlie Moore a special exception must be made because of his long track record of false assertions going back to the early 1950's. Moore must be put in a special category of highly dubious claimants, for reasons that Steve Kaeser alludes to and David Rudiak gives some details for.

>>I'm of the opinion that Charles Moore's opinion can be dismissed
>>out of hand due to his fluctuating testimony, depending on his
>>payback. Sorry, but I have a very low opinion of the gentleman.

A very good case can be made for dismissing everything Moore says, unless it can be backed up by other, more credible evidence. Dave Rudiak compiles some of the many reasons, which I must snip below, as I only have a few additional comments to make.

>>If I recall correctly, Moore had been interviewed many years
>>ago regarding the Roswell incident and he categorically stated
>>that his work had nothing whatsoever to do with anything that
>>came down near Corona. But, after a visit by McAndrews, who
>>reportedly was carrying the Jesse Marcel Sr's military records
>>in hand, he suddenly recalls Flight 4, which he now believes
>>was the object that had been recovered. How convenient....

>>The Mogul explanation has so many problems with it that I'm
>>shocked that so many still seem to cling to it. Next I guess
>>we'll be trying to track the test flight dummy schedules
>>against actual sightings to... oh, wait a minute... that's already
>>been tried without a match. Hmhmhmhmhm.

I have previously pointed out what must be considered conclusive

proof that 600-foot constant-level Mogul Flight 4 never occurred and never crashed on the Brazel Debris Field. The NYU Final Report states quite clearly that Flight 5 was the "first successful" constant-level balloon flight. If Flight 4 had traveled nearly 100 miles, staying aloft for hours while being chased by the Mogul chase plane according to Moore, then it would have been the "first successful" Mogul balloon flight, not Flight 4. So no such Flight 4 could have occurred as the AF claims. Flight 5 was followed by plane, recovered and accounted for.

Mogul scientist Albert Crary's diary states clearly that Flight 4 had been cancelled due to weather (I notice that both AF Roswell Report authors Col. Richard Weaver and Lt James McAndrew flatout lied about what Crary's diary actually said and have the nerve to state that Crary's diary recorded that Flight 4 had been launched!). The cluster of balloons with sonobuoy launched later that day was not the 600-foot tall Mogul array and it would not have traveled very far from the launch site. The balloon cluster was apparently given the "Flight 4" designation but since it was not a constant-level balloon array it was left off the reporting for the constant-level balloons.

Since the gigantic 600-foot Mogul balloon assemblies required a day or more to build, it is clear that the 600-foot Mogul array launched the next day, June 5, 1947, was in fact the Flight 4 Mogul array recycled and renumbered.

>>But I guess my point is that Moore changed his tune regarding >>Roswell after a visit from McAndrews, which leads me to >>question his veracity. His immediately joining the book writing set >>and putting out his "explanation" of the Roswell event in time for >>the 50th Anniversary seems just a bit much to me.

>I quite agree with this assessment of Moore. But problems with >his credibility go far beyond him conveniently changing his >tune. He has been caught too many times in a web of lies.

<snip>

http://roswellproof.com/Mogul_hoax_FAO.html

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Trajectory.html

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4_Addendums.html

http://roswellproof.com/Flight4and5_changes.html

<snip>

>Moore has also claimed that the Project Mogul name was so top->secret, that even he didn't know the name "Mogul" until it was >fully declassified in the 1990s. (See, e.g., Pflock's book, p. >145, where Moore tells him in 1993 that he had just found out >about the Mogul name a year before, from Robert Todd of all >people.) I guess this was to make Mogul sound so mysterious and >supersecret that the military had to kick civilian ass, like >Mack Brazel's, to keep the whole thing hushed up.

The main reasons for making Mogul mysterious were to explain why no one, in the AF or anyone else, had come up with the explanation sooner, and to explain why Roswell 509th personnel were so surprised by the debris (because they were purportedly out of the security loop on "Top Secret" Mogul).

>But what is the probable truth of the matter? Brad Sparks also >sent me a 1949 _unclassified_ letter from White Sands Naval >missile chief Cmdr. Robert McLaughlin to physicist James van >Allen (of van Allen radiation belt fame), about UFO sightings in >the White Sands area, including his and Moore's. McLaughlin >identifies Moore as "head of Project Mogul for the Air Force."

http://roswellproof.com/McLaughlin_Van_Allen_letter.html

The McLaughlin letter actually comes from Charlie Moore's own files, and he apparently received a courtesy copy at the time, in 1949. Moore gave a copy to Jim McDonald in 1968, and that is how we have a copy. Moore certainly knew he was part of Project Mogul at the time, in the late 1940's, as this 1949 letter in his own files proves. He certainly refreshed his memory over the years when he supplied copies of the unclassified letter to

others.

Moore also read his Mogul colleague Albert Crary's diary when the AF gave him a copy in 1994. Crary names Project Mogul at least twice in the 1946-7 portions that have been released, including a record that a written Mogul Progress Report had been given to AAF Major W. D. Pritchard, whom Moore maintained was merely a radar officer assisting the project. Yet Moore persisted in his claims that he and his colleagues did not know the "Mogul" codename, and he expressed surprise that Pritchard would know enough about Mogul to stage a balloon demonstration launch for the press to debunk Roswell on July 9, 1947.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Google News & UFOs

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 09:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:14:55 -0400
Subject: Google News & UFOs

Is Google News being used to influence public opinion of UFOs?

A Working Hypothesis: by Franklin Fields

According to many researchers, some commenting on this List, elements of the government (or secret government), have used standard methods of censorship, propaganda and even PSY-OPS to affect public opinion on UFOs. Some researchers have even shown evidence or covert ties to well-known news organizations. I am proposing that Google is a possible co-conspirator. I do not have solid proof - yet - your indulgence is appreciated. This post is intended to get feedback on my research efforts.

Regardless of my theory's correctness, a reasonable person must agree that if PSY-OPS were actually occurring Google, Yahoo, and others similar sites would be likely candidates to assist those wanting to control information.

According to the latest figures from the research firm Nielsen Online, Google's audience from June to July was up by about one million visitors to an estimated 129 million, the largest population for a parent company of web sites in the US. Along with Google's powerful search engine there is Google News, the fastest growing Internet news service:

<http://news.google.com/>

In 2006 Google News had an estimated audience was over 38 million and was growing rapidly.

For those that are not familiar with Google News it scans thousands of web news sources worldwide and displays the headlines for users together with a summary and picture. Clicking on the headline takes the user to the original website hosting the news. Google does not advertise on its news service. They are presumably doing it as a marketing tool that will lead more customers to their other services. Most certainly they are able to select which news is available for their users and find out what articles their users are reading. It puts Google into a very powerful position. To fully understand this power one can look to the military and its warfighting doctrine "Information Dominance".

Google News has been heralded as impartial because computers run the process. Humans do not select which news articles are displayed. The computer-generated process that some have called a primitive artificial intelligence (AI) makes all the decisions. It decides news story importance via complex formulas using factors that are kept secret. What is known is that some of the factors include a news story's prominence, frequency and the original source. What is meaningful to understand is that someone must program the computers and monitor their operation. In other words there must be some human contribution, accordingly it can not be impartial.

To quote Google:

"traditionally, news readers first pick a publication and then look for headlines that interest them. We do things a little

differently...

Click on the headline that interests you and you'll go directly to the site which published that story. Our articles are selected and ranked by computers that evaluate, among other things, how often and on what sites a story appears online. As a result, stories are sorted without regard to political viewpoint or ideology and you can choose from a wide variety of perspectives on any given story."

What Google does is select which news articles viewers will be presented and in what order. This is an effective information dominance or propaganda tool. No real news organization must censor. Any story can be published its placement and position will dictate if it has any real news relevance and Google's computers will take care of that little detail.

To show how powerful Google's new service can be one must simply look to last week's news. The US Securities and Exchange Commission opened a "preliminary inquiry" into how Google's incorrect listing of an outdated bankruptcy story sparked a \$1 billion run on United Airlines' stock value. In another case proving they do censor, Google was criticized for not including sources that are censored in China. The Google Team wrote:

"For users inside the People's Republic of China, we have chosen not to include sources that are inaccessible from within that country."

Google now places specific IP addresses from China on a blacklist and prevents them from being indexed. This can be done for any site that Google wishes to blacklist.

You might be asking what does this have to do with UFOs? Well of course many of the implications are obvious but consider a few specific examples. I have had several UFO articles published recently by the American Chronicle. One was titled Was the Stephenville UFO a National Security Threat? See:

<http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/73833>

After the article was published it quickly moved to the top of the Google News list for articles that come up when searching for "UFO".

When Google News ranked my article high it received a large volume of hits/views. Using the American Chronicle author's interface I was able to track the number of hits the article was getting. By 11:00 am it had close to 500 hits. Then suddenly it was gone from the Google News listing. I do not mean it was dropped in ranking, it was gone. It could not even be pulled up by a specific article title search.

When I noticed the article was gone the hit counter slowed way down. I sent Google an email inquiring and also the American Chronicle.

Google replied:

"As you may know, Google News is highly unusual in that it provides a news service compiled solely by computer algorithms without any intervention from human editors. Your feedback will assist us with improving this process."

I had many iterations of email with Google and came to the conclusion that the human help-attendants really had no clue, they are just PR data collectors.

The article re-appeared a few hours later and the hit counters started jumping up again.

I believe I have figured out that the article's placement on the list is determined, in part, by the time and date it was listed as well as the number of hits it gets. That means that my articles lost very important time that would have insured more hits and better placement. The two hours of 'missing time' had a dramatic affect on my article's view count.

American Chronicle's response was more interesting. They stated:

We see that we did everything to have your article crawled by

Google News and see the 500+ views would indicate that this did happen. We do not know why it is no longer listed. We are also perplexed. There are articles on the same page that were crawled by Google News 4 minutes ago as we write this. So this is odd. We will try something else and see what happens."

Very unusual in light of the fact that the American Chronicle and its affiliates have over 3,000 contributors, over 100,000 articles, and over 8 million visitors annually.

Interestingly, two other authors of UFO articles have experienced the same problem and I have had the problem with another UFO article.

I have many more issues with Google but I will cover only one more odd topic that is possibly related to a UFO PSY-OP. I was conducting a test and monitoring Google News using the search terms "UFO" and "Extraterrestrial" on September 22, 2008 and noticed the following headlines:

- UFO reports go up around Party Season.
- UFO INC Sells Flying Saucer Weapons to Our Enemies!
- Stonehenge archaeologists reveal global warming theory behind crashed UFO remains

They were all in the top 10 search results.

One article was ranked number one for several hours and another stayed in the top three most of the day. There are many more similar headlines, all portray UFOs in a negative, frivolous, or inconsequential fashion. All of the headlines were from the web site, The Spoof. See:

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

Google's inclusion of non-news sources such as The Spoof in their 'News' listing seems inappropriate for a web service that prides itself as being a site for important headlines. However, that fact alone is not overly suspicious.

I did email Google and complain about The Spoof's inappropriate inclusion. I was informed that it was labeled as "satire" and that they would continued to allow it with no further discussion.

To focus this point, the headlines, as mentioned, above are mixed in with real news articles and the subtitle "satire" has a smaller font with a light gray color.

To the sophisticated reader the headlines may not have a consequence. However, to those many millions of headline browsers these ominous headlines most assuredly have an influence. I contend they are subliminal messages. Maybe not planned or part of a PSY-OP, but a least something to consider.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:49:13 EDT
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:43 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 15:25:51 -0400
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

><snip>

>>I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as
>>the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond
>>description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at
>>the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering
>>from it should receive some form of specialized attention by
>>society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and
>>incarceration in institutions.

>Psychiatry has a legitimate role: If someone's thought processes
>are messed up to where they can't look after themselves, hold a
>job, function socially well enough that people don't complain
>excessively, then such individuals legitimately need help.

>Psychiatry has no business whatsoever forcing people who express
>experiences or ideas the psychiatrist doesn't believe or agree
>with into 'treatment'. Such forced 'help' is criminal and
>immoral.

>Does anyone know the mental health laws well enough to say
>whether laws actually allow the forced 'treatment' of anyone
>based on nothing more than a person reporting experiences or
>stating ideas the psychiatrist doesn't believe or agree with?

>If a UFO abductee can be forced into the mental health system,
>then some major revision of mental health laws is essential.

Oh hell yeah!

That's what so surprised me almost ten years ago when I was
hosting a live chat on our magazine, Parascopes. I asked the
guests if anyone had an unpleasant experience regarding
psychiatry and their UFO experiences and I got a tidal wave of
99% agreement they all hated psychiatrists and the stories
poured in for days. Some of these stories so terrifying I could
not begin to repeat them here.

There are anti-psychiatric groups all over the world and they've
been throwing psychiatric criminals in jail left and right,
ruining their funding and even Jaime Maussan destroyed billions
of dollars of forced psychiatric drugging in Mexico alone.
Jaime, Jeff Rense, me, and dozens of other ufologists and
reporters have been fighting this stuff for years and I'm the
new guy on the block at it.

Where I grew up in the Hudson Valley, NY, there were massive
psychiatric centers. I mean_huge_! I saw on a daily basis for

over 30 years almost, the ravages of psychiatric treatment on people.

If you even mentioned UFOs in my home area and someone overheard you wrong they'd haul you off. I mention it alot in my new book coming out.

I literally grew up under the terror of being dragged out of my own home had I gone overboard about UFOs and I've got tens of thousands of witnesses to back me up on it.

Bottom line is there are many psychiatric watch dog groups out there and they're easy to find nowadays.

Best,

Greg

www.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 25](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:10 -0500
Archived: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 13:42:23 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 05:32:32 -0700 (PDT)
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>snip>

>>I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as
>>the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond
>>description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at
>>the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering
>>from it should receive some form of specialized attention by
>>society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and
>>incarceration in institutions.

>Greg/List:

>I see as more relevant a study into what could prevent or stop
>the abductions. Here's one possible hypothesis:

>Since most abduction victims are alone, in dark and secluded or
>remote locations, has anyone heard of abductions occurring in a
>barracks-type setting with lots of familiar people and lots of
>light?

You might want to do a little reading, i.e., Hopkins, Mack,
Jacobs, Turner, Dennett, Fowler, etc. There are many abduction
cases that involve abductees and witnesses who were not in
remote or secluded locations when they were abducted.

One example is below.

Eddie Melvin is an African-American business man who has
experienced a lifetime of abduction encounters. This particular
article focuses on an abduction that occurred when he was
serving in the Army in Panama.

HQ Battery 517, Panama: 1965

http://www.alienjigsaw.com/Abductees/HO_Battery_517_Panama.html

As far as 'happy camper abduction stories' are concerned, The
Allagash Four were 'happy campers' until they all got abducted.
I would have to say that I have not heard of any 'happy camper'
abduction stories.

Katharina

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: **Kathy Kasten** <catraja.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 17:46:12 +0000
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 08:07:34 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Franklin D. Fields
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 09:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Google News & UFOs

>Is Google News being used to influence public opinion of UFOs?

>A Working Hypothesis: by Franklin Fields

>According to many researchers, some commenting on this List,
>elements of the government (or secret government), have used
>standard methods of censorship, propaganda and even PSY-OPS to
>affect public opinion on UFOs. Some researchers have even shown
>evidence or covert ties to well-known news organizations. I am
>proposing that Google is a possible co-conspirator. I do not
>have solid proof - yet - your indulgence is appreciated. This
>post is intended to get feedback on my research efforts.

>Regardless of my theory's correctness, a reasonable person must
>agree that if PSY-OPS were actually occurring Google, Yahoo, and
>others similar sites would be likely candidates to assist those
>wanting to control information.

>According to the latest figures from the research firm Nielsen
>Online, Google's audience from June to July was up by about one
>million visitors to an estimated 129 million, the largest
>population for a parent company of web sites in the US. Along
>with Google's powerful search engine there is Google News, the
>fastest growing Internet news service:

<snip>

Frank:

What I understand, on the other side of the equation, is that
Google tracks browser activity by the user.

So, if true, every website I visit is tracked by Google.

KK

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 13:19:20 -0500
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 08:08:18 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:49:13 EDT
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>Where I grew up in the Hudson Valley, NY, there were massive
>psychiatric centers. I mean_huge_! I saw on a daily basis for
>over 30 years almost, the ravages of psychiatric treatment on
>people.

John Ford languishes in one of these charming edifices right
this very moment... largely there, one finds, because he was
adamant about believing in UFOs and that fact was used to
contrive the insanity required to water-board his activity
regarding corrupt Suffolk County Party Boss John Powell.

<http://alienview.net/fordnew.htm>

-

Restore John Ford!

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 14:39:48 EDT
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 08:12:10 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:10 -0500
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>You might want to do a little reading, i.e., Hopkins, Mack,
>Jacobs, Turner, Dennett, Fowler, etc. There are many abduction
>cases that involve abductees and witnesses who were not in
>remote or secluded locations when they were abducted.

>One example is below.

>Eddie Melvin is an African-American business man who has
>experienced a lifetime of abduction encounters. This particular
>article focuses on an abduction that occurred when he was
>serving in the Army in Panama.

>HQ Battery 517, Panama: 1965

>http://www.alienjigsaw.com/Abductees/HQ_Battery_517_Panama.html

>As far as 'happy camper abduction stories' are concerned, The
>Allagash Four were 'happy campers' until they all got abducted.
>I would have to say that I have not heard of any 'happy camper'
>abduction stories.

Now_that's_scary!

Thanks Katharina for setting the record straight here.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 15:42:53 -0400
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 08:12:27 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:49:13 EDT
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>If you even mentioned UFOs in my home area and someone overheard
>you wrong they'd haul you off.

I know what the police-psychiatrist teams actually do.

What I'm asking is, do the laws actually allow for that?

My suspicion is the police-psychiatrist teams are actually
overstepping their legal authority.

Far as I know, the criterion for involuntary confinement is the
patient is a danger to themselves or others. How does reporting
an abduction make them a danger to themselves or others?

In my anti-organized stalking activism, I have discovered that
there are some pretty savvy mental health defence lawyers, and
some of them take legal aid. What I urge my colleagues to do,
among other things, is to use the free 30 minutes offered by
many lawyers to window shop for a lawyer with mental health
defence experience, or at least a lawyer with medical
malpractice experience before talking to anyone, especially
officials. Doctors are also officials.

That procedure might help abductees. I lucked out beyond belief
in that a lawyer I connected with actually had defended one of
the electronic harassers, and was therefore fully aware of the
crime of organized stalking and electronic harassment.

Another thing some of our members have done is to form local
groups, and do any talking to officials with at least one other
witness right there. It's not easy to bring a group all from a
single city together, but it's not hard to gather people within
a two hour trip of a central city.

And I don't know if a parallel to this procedure would help
abductees, but it just might in a few cases: Some of our members
have discovered that by asking the question "Who among your
staff know what organized stalking is?" to crisis support
organizations, there are some staffers who actually do.
Interestingly, the most knowledgeable crisis support staffers in
this regard are those who work for rape crisis centers. They are
well aware of police- psychiatrist abuses too.

A question like "Who among your staff members has ever dealt
with UFO abductees?" might provide an occasional very positive
surprise. Imagine having such a person as your witness dealing
with hostile, corrupt officials.

Eleanor White

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 15:53:49 -0400
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:13:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 09:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Google News & UFOs

<snip>

>Regardless of my theory's correctness, a reasonable person must
>agree that if PSY-OPS were actually occurring Google, Yahoo, and
>others similar sites would be likely candidates to assist those
>wanting to control information.

Some of the articles and videos posted on various sites, Google
included, by the U.S. Patriot Radio broadcasters, have
experienced deletion, and visit counter re-setting to keep the
rank very low. Many many times.

This type of information control is no theory.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 17:04:33 -0400
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:16:00 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:10 -0500
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 05:32:32 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 18:48:41 EDT
>>>Subject: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>>I talk with some abductees and my heart just goes out to them as
>>>the suffering they go through and terror is just beyond
>>>description. I'm really starting to believe there's no light at
>>>the end of the tunnel with this affliction and people suffering

>>>from it should receive some form of specialized attention by

>>>society without the ridicule and horrid chance of medication and
>>>incarceration in institutions.

>>Greg/List:

>>I see as more relevant a study into what could prevent or stop
>>the abductions. Here's one possible hypothesis:

>>Since most abduction victims are alone, in dark and secluded or
>>remote locations, has anyone heard of abductions occurring in a
>>barracks-type setting with lots of familiar people and lots of
>>light?

>You might want to do a little reading, i.e., Hopkins, Mack,
>Jacobs, Turner, Dennett, Fowler, etc. There are many abduction
>cases that involve abductees and witnesses who were not in
>remote or secluded locations when they were abducted.

>One example is below.

>Eddie Melvin is an African-American business man who has
>experienced a lifetime of abduction encounters. This particular
>article focuses on an abduction that occurred when he was
>serving in the Army in Panama.

>HQ Battery 517, Panama: 1965

>http://www.alienjigsaw.com/Abductees/HQ_Battery_517_Panama.html

>As far as 'happy camper abduction stories' are concerned, The
>Allagash Four were 'happy campers' until they all got abducted.
>I would have to say that I have not heard of any 'happy camper'
>abduction stories.

I agree with Katharina. Numerous cases contradict the premise
that all/most abduction reports occur in isolated, remote areas
without other witnesses.

In my personal experience I have worked with abductees ('experiencers') who desperately wanted to believe that something positive was involved, but their own experiences contradicted that wishful thinking.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 16:11:16 -0700 (PDT)
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:17:00 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Katharina Wilson <K_Wilson.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:10 -0500
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 05:32:32 -0700 (PDT)
>>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>>I see as more relevant a study into what could prevent or stop
>>the abductions. Here's one possible hypothesis:

>>Since most abduction victims are alone, in dark and secluded or
>>remote locations, has anyone heard of abductions occurring in a
>>barracks-type setting with lots of familiar people and lots of
>>light?

>You might want to do a little reading, i.e., Hopkins, Mack,
>Jacobs, Turner, Dennett, Fowler, etc. There are many abduction
>cases that involve abductees and witnesses who were not in
>remote or secluded locations when they were abducted.

>One example is below.

>Eddie Melvin is an African-American business man who has
>experienced a lifetime of abduction encounters. This particular
>article focuses on an abduction that occurred when he was
>serving in the Army in Panama.

>HQ Battery 517, Panama: 1965

>http://www.alienjigsaw.com/Abductees/HQ_Battery_517_Panama.html

<snip>

Thanks for your response Katharina! But I'm still looking for
any account of abductions occurring from an open barracks-type
setting with lots of familiar people around and lots of lights.

Unless your reference to Eddie J. Melvin's account has more data
to include that open setting with lots of familiars and lots of
light, I'm sorry but I haven't found anything like that 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 00:25:04 EDT
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:18:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 03:59:12 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2008 09:30:03 -0400 (EDT)
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2008 12:46:31 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>Vic, List, All -

>>Irving Newton recalls Marcel dancing around insisting that the
>>Aluminum foil we see in the photos was not a radar target! And
>>Marcel says he was holding up the actual stuff. So we can say
>>there it is... done! So, is Newton lying now? Even though we
>>have the photographs too?

>If we're going to examine all the facts (or witness testimony)
>then let's put it all in the record.

>First, Marcel said that he was told by Brigadier General Ramey
>not to open his mouth. Just pose there with the debris. If we
>accept that, then the major "dancing around insisting that the
>Aluminum foil we see..." is not Marcel but some other Major.

>Second, I asked Newton if he knew Marcel and he said, "No." If
>that is true, then any Major from the base, or from Roswell who
>was in the room could have been the man "dancing around..." as
>long as Newton didn't know him.

>And, for the record, according to the Officer's Roster for the
>8th Air Force, there were 41 Majors assigned to the FWAAF in
>June 1947.

>So, what do we have? Newton's story that we accept as being
>accurate, Marcel's orders not to speak, and the fact that Newton
>didn't know Marcel.

>And in this case, neither man is lying... they are accurately
>reporting what they observed from their perspectives which were
>not the same.

>KRandle

Kevin, List, All,

As you can see this case is not that strong, always one more stretch of the facts to reach a safety zone - to prove some absolute conclusion that is untenable with a balanced view of the evidence.

This has been my point from the beginning: one more example of a "House of Cards" type support structure needing constant alien-like intervention in what turns out to be a cartoon triage clinic.

The earliest first hand testimony is by far the best, yet it is not routinely scrutinized nor brought up as you can see - in plain comparative fashion..

As a scientific matter this case must be couched in terms of probability, not certainty!

Failure to do so, loses all perspective with the facts. It undermines ANY credible scientific voice not to do so. In fact, it would border on unethical scientific conduct in such circles.

The "Opinionaters" would have no choice but to temper their "opinions" mingling in such company. This is the only place where the rubber meets the road - that can foster the climate of objectivity.

So, just be scientific about it - from the beginning. Geez, is that so difficult? No need to incite some UFO riots based upon this evidence! Just like you can't convince me that a slow/fast moving light at night, that doesn't turn, at all, is an ET space craft . . . could be, but it has no substantial qualities that says it is unconventional.

But, you can still talk about both sides of this event even under that constraint, But, Balloon Trains and UFOs with the same mundane descriptions of Balsa Wood and Foil landing in the same vicinity of Earth turns into government UFO cover-up of epic proportions. Evan Bill Brazel uses the word "Splinters" in his original testimony. So, I can't change that,

Possibly, Marcel didn't keep his orders nor had to worry about such matters when conferring with others under the same command structure - after all, if we know about it and his family knows about it too, etc. So, is he under an even bigger command structure, know as WIFE - as we males often find, is the case :) Please, he's just trying to figure this out by sharing with a similarly trained and trusted individual. So, this doesn't carry any ABSOLUTE "COSMIC" weight, either.

He obviously was intrigued about it. And who said this only had to be in 'only' that one room. Obviously, they talked and shared opinions and still followed orders, Newton actually launched the things routinely rather than, possibly, saw only black and white photo depictions of them in a training manual. Or, worse yet, just black and white drawings.

Geez, maybe Halloween Pumpkins aren't orange? But, I guess it depends on what planet you're from, So, which planet are you from?

I personally would rely on my own eyes on this one, not someone trying to insist that they're blue "all the time", when I know my eyes tell me differently. Creative license has it's place and I'm all for that, but, I give this case a very low probability of UFO reality, nothing more.

Roswell has it's place secured as a launching pad in terms of turning a tide of public opinion - and is being driven so, as sole justification. Perhaps, "OK to do" in tactical military minded circles, accomplishing the justification for war and getting the public behind you, the ends justify the means, etc. So, let's just be practical for a few moments - off the battle field.

Kevin (and Stan), name one fact of information, the smallest that you can think of (least common multiple with the greatest impact) that would convert your "opinion" on Roswell?

Where would it occur (time and/or space) in the branching algorithm of decisions about Roswell (flow chart), that would make your arrow just fall to the other side of the bush -

missing the donkey's ass entirely, clipping his (Or, her) already tattered ear, and hitting a cow pie instead. Sorry, this poor Donkey has been struck a few times :)

Please, read the entire thread (topic) if you happened along a little late.

golubik

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 26](#)

Bo & Peep Again

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 10:20:00 -0400
Archived: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 10:20:00 -0400
Subject: Bo & Peep Again

Source: KMBC-TV 9 - Oklahoma City, USA

<http://www.news9.com/global/story.asp?s=9074337>

Sep 25, 2008

Local Ties To Heaven'S Gate

By Christian Price
News9.com INsite Team

OKLHOMA CITY--In 1973, investigative reporter Hayden Hewes sat down to interview two individuals who would later shock the world with their story and suicide.

Marshall Appelwhite and Bonnie Neddels had heard Hewes's local radio show about UFO's and the paranormal.

"This couple comes to me saying that they wanted me to announce to the world that they were here and that they could show death overcome," Hewes said. "The mysterious two, Bo and Peep, he and she. They wanted no publicity on themselves, just their mission, that death could be overcome. Whether you believed in them or not, it didn't matter. It wasn't the soul that wasn't going; their physical bodies would rise in full view of anyone when the aliens came."

After the interview with the mysterious two, Hewes said that he felt that he had seen the man before, but didn't know from where.

"One day I was working on a story for the New York Times. I happened to have an illustration published in a book years ago called The Aliens as to what an alien looked like reported around UFOs," Hewes said. "I happened to have a picture of these people on my desk at the same time I had a copy of my book. It was an identical overlay in his physical structure, what he was wearing, his hair, his jaw, and his eyes. That was why I felt like I knew him, because it was based on my own research."

Hewes and his co-author Brad Steiger wrote a book based on their interview with the mysterious two. After the notoriety of the book died down, not much else was thought of about Bo and Peep until 1997.

"When they committed suicide in '97, it was big news again," Hewes said. "For five days around the world, everything was about them. Since Brad and I wrote the only book on them, I started to get phone calls the day after they committed suicide. It really opened everybody's interest because here these people had committed suicide for what they believed."

In 1998, the Heaven's Gate story was voted one of the best stories of the decade. Again Hewes was sought out for his input since he knew their story from the beginning.

"I was contacted last year by Tower Productions out of Chicago to come down and film a segment for The Final Report, which was the Heaven's Gate story of '97," Hewes said.

For the always curious Hewes, doing the interview wasn't to see himself on the National Geographic Channel; it was to see other people's conclusions after doing their own research on the subject.

"I'm just anxious to see their slant on it after their investigation into the different personalities, the people, the pros, the cons, to see what their conclusion is," Hewes said. "My part in it, to me, is not the highlight, I know my story. What to me, and what I'm looking forward to seeing, is the conclusion they reached from their perspective on the story. Whether it agrees with me or disagrees, I can always respect a skeptic for their narrow minded opinion."

The Final Report on Heaven's Gate and Hewes interview can be seen on the National Geographic channel September 29 at 9 p.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:10:45 EDT
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:48:43 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <alienview.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 13:19:20 -0500
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 10:49:13 EDT
>>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

><snip>

>>Where I grew up in the Hudson Valley, NY, there were massive
>>psychiatric centers. I mean_huge_! I saw on a daily basis for
>>over 30 years almost, the ravages of psychiatric treatment on
>>people.

>John Ford languishes in one of these charming edifices right
>this very moment... largely there, one finds, because he was
>adamant about believing in UFOs and that fact was used to
>contrive the insanity required to water-board his activity
>regarding corrupt Suffolk County Party Boss John Powell.

><http://alienview.net/fordnew.htm>

I knew there was something chewing at the back of my mind and it
was about Ford. Thanks for reminding us Alfred!

I remember growing up how people would get hauled off if they
talked about UFOs. They would get beat down and never the same.
It was like how people talked about the way the Nazis or the KGB
would act. Just snatch you up without due process or anything.
Just because you went against the grain.

If anyone's ever seen the inside of some of the psychiatric
centers from the old days they would make Dr. Frankenstein's lab
look like a Motel 6.

God help us, the most horrid memories I have are of people after
they emerged from these institutions.

A few years ago Pete Robbins schooled me on Sec. Forrestal who
grew up in my hometown area. That story alone is enough to chill
your bones. The part of our hometown area he grew up in was UFO
central.

I'm sorry, but I can't go along with that benevolent space
brother stuff without more evidence. I wrote an essay about this
several months back. We're to believe aliens are in talks with
our government and foreign governments and my essay dealt with
why would we trust anyone who would only talk to our politicians
when we can't stand them in the first place?

That right there gives us an indicator to their true intentions.

They're either incredibly gullible or freakin' evil.

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

Best ,

Greg
ufomafia.com/blog

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:26:14 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:49:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Kathy Kasten <catraja.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 17:46:12 +0000
>Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 09:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
>>Subject: Google News & UFOs

>>Is Google News being used to influence public opinion of UFOs?

>>A Working Hypothesis: by Franklin Fields

>>According to many researchers, some commenting on this List,
>>elements of the government (or secret government), have used
>>standard methods of censorship, propaganda and even PSY-OPS to
>>affect public opinion on UFOs. Some researchers have even shown
>>evidence or covert ties to well-known news organizations. I am
>>proposing that Google is a possible co-conspirator. I do not
>>have solid proof - yet - your indulgence is appreciated. This
>>post is intended to get feedback on my research efforts.

>>Regardless of my theory's correctness, a reasonable person must
>>agree that if PSY-OPS were actually occurring Google, Yahoo, and
>>others similar sites would be likely candidates to assist those
>>wanting to control information.

>>According to the latest figures from the research firm Nielsen
>>Online, Google's audience from June to July was up by about one
>>million visitors to an estimated 129 million, the largest
>>population for a parent company of web sites in the US. Along
>>with Google's powerful search engine there is Google News, the
>>fastest growing Internet news service:

><snip>

>What I understand, on the other side of the equation, is that
>Google tracks browser activity by the user.

>So, if true, every website I visit is tracked by Google.

KK,

Let me give you an example. I just did a search on Google for
the term "UFO". It came back with a search results page listing
the top 10 "UFO" sites. There is a text line on the top right
hand side of the results page that says "Results 1 - 10 of about
6,280,000 for UFO".

Google collected in its database that I searched for the term
"UFO". So they know what I searched for but also when I select
number 6 from the list they know that as well. Google can also
identify who I am from the IP address of my computer.

Google provides a web browser the list of UFO sites it wants the
browser to see and in what order. If for example they did not
want you to see the link for UFO UpDates they could put it at

6,000,000 on the list 6,280,000 available.

Lastly, they could provide different users different lists. If for example, I searched for "UFO" I could get a different list than you when you searched for "UFO".

If you open your browser and type in a specific web site like

<http://www.virtuallystrange.net>

you will go directly to the site and Google could not track that since you are not using their site. However, NSA or your ISP could.

Google has a great deal of "information" power.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 14:40:10 +0100
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:53:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 15:53:49 -0400
>Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>Some of the articles and videos posted on various sites,
>Google included, by the U.S. Patriot Radio broadcasters,
>have experienced deletion, and visit counter re-setting
>to keep the rank very low. Many many times.

>This type of information control is no theory.

Right Eleanor,

A few years back, when I was passionate about such things, I found Google was 'downgrading' or even deleting certain news-item pages. Once or twice I wrote Google and had pages restored to a 'real' rating.

I still don't know if those were Google decisions or under instruction. That's because Google deletes certain pages if someone pressures them to. But usually you get a notice at bottom of a search page that tells you Google has an issue with a page and that it's been deleted from that search. Often it will only affect one country's searches.

It's all a bit complex and seems based on the fact that 'libel or suppression laws' in most countries are still designed to protect the rich and powerful (and the establishment) from people telling the truth.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 16:29:05 +0200
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:54:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 00:25:04 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>But, you can still talk about both sides of this event even
>under that constraint, But, Balloon Trains and UFOs with the
>same mundane descriptions of Balsa Wood and Foil landing in the
>same vicinity of Earth turns into government UFO cover-up of
>epic proportions. Evan Bill Brazel uses the word "Splinters" in
>his original testimony. So, I can't change that,

Viktor,

Buy a balsa wood stick and break it with two fingers, as David Rudiak said!

Gildas Bourdais

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

From: **Alejandro T. Rojas** <arojas.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:55:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:55:00 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Photos Examined With New Process

><http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/74925>

>>September 20, 2008

>UFO Photos Examined With New Process - MUFON Investigates

>For more than a month now, MUFON have been investigating photos
>displayed on Profindsearch.com of the STS-75 tether incident.

For clarification... this process is not a MUFON photo analysis
process.

Looking into it, apparently there was possibly a MUFON member
involved with the use of this process. However, it is not part
of any official MUFON protocol, nor have we endorsed the
process.

Alejandro Rojas
Mutual UFO Network
Director of Public Education

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

The Economy's Tanking But...

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:56:00 -0400
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:56:00 -0400
Subject: The Economy's Tanking But...

Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

<http://tinyurl.com/4anyw3>

Friday, September 26, 2008

The Economy's Tanking, But...

By Billy Cox

De Void knows what you're thinking:

"My 401(k) is on fire. My house is worth \$45,000 less than what I paid for it. I'm losing \$\$\$ driving to work. If I lose my job, I'll have to eat the cat. I'm tweezering the gruesome splattered chunks of my mutual funds from the fresh splinters in the walls and ceiling. Why won't the U.S. Air Force comment on the Stephenville UFO?"

Well, forget Stephenville. Dr. Michael Swords, retired history professor at Western Michigan University, says you'd need a time machine to understand the USAF's dysfunctional PR relationship with this stuff.

"Alexander The Great once asked Aristotle what it'd take to teach him geometry quickly," Swords says from his home in Kalamazoo. "Aristotle said, 'There is no royal road to geometry. And there isn't a royal road to this, either. This is one of the most complicated fields in world history.'"

You'd have to revisit the late 1960s, when the USAF was looking for a way to wriggle off the UFO accountability hook. Its mechanism was the University of Colorado study of UFOs, whose bogus conclusions that the phenomenon did not and never would produce compelling science stirred a tempest of controversy even before they were published in 1969.

Swords has spent countless hours evaluating that amazing ruse, which was endorsed by the National Academies of Science despite the fact the U of C's dismissive conclusions were at sharp odds with raw data reflecting alarming percentages of unknown explanations for UFOs. He added his dissent to the growing body of skepticism in the Journal of UFO Studies nearly 20 years ago.

In June, Swords and Mutual UFO Network's national research director Robert Powell traveled to Texas A&M University to examine files kept by the one of the Colorado Project's late panelists, physical chemist Roy Craig. After sifting through 1,500 pages, they discovered even more evidence that its late director, Edward Condon, had produced a \$500,000 report (in 1960s dollars, remember) designed to fit pre-assigned conclusions.

Craig stated in 1968 that Condon had drafted his recommendations "without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the report which were by now nearing completion."

The Colorado study's official rendering of UFOs listed over 30 percent as unknowns. But in yet another recently retrieved 1968 memo to Condon, physicist Joseph Rush noted the disparity in the forthcoming official attitude with the facts: "This may seem an anomalous conclusion, since more of the (cases) are unexplained than explained."

Whoa.

"The only way to write a bulletproof history is through official military documents, Freedom of Information Act documents, ironclad stuff," says Swords. "And Air Force policy since the 1950s has been not to make encouraging remarks about this mystery to the public.

"You'll get official statements like, 'This incident is under investigation, we're studying it, and there's no need for false alarm,' or 'This incident has been looked into and we've found an explanation,' whether it's a balloon experiment or a flight of ducks or whatever. It's a mistake to open your mouth up and start talking about things that are actually interesting."

Almost as astonishing to Swords as the USAF's ability to sustain the mindless charade for so long is the apparent behavior of the mystery that enables it.

"This phenomenon is kind of amazing, not only for what it does, but by the way it seems to gauge its impact," Swords says. "It's managed to be covert enough so that it doesn't force you to admit its reality on an official, organizational structural level. It's like this thing understands what we're like well enough to know how far it can push without going over the top."

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

PRG Update - September 26, 2008

From: **Stephen Bassett** <PRG.nul>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 21:00:03 -0400
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:57:00 -0400
Subject: PRG Update - September 26, 2008

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

PRG Update - September 26, 2008

ABC Primetime News Special - Seeing Is Believing

PRG has received numerous requests to provide contact information for ABC News to make it easy to send a note regarding the recent UFO special. Here it is:

ABC News
<http://abcnews.go.com/Site/page?id=3052660>

Primetime
<http://abcnews.go.com/Site/page?id=3271346&cat=Primetime>

ABC Network
<http://tinyurl.com/2szdx4>

Two conferences have just recently turned up on PRG's radar.

VA/NC MUFON Smith Mountain Lake Conference!
Huddleston, VA
Saturday, September 27
<http://va-mufon.eventbrite.com>
Those in southern/central Virginia and northern North Carolina please consider attending.

Mysteries Of Space & Sky
Near Annapolis, Maryland
Saturday, November 1, 2008

All-day UFO conference beginning at 9:30 am. Cost is \$30 or higher (depending on residence) For details or to request a flier, contact Dr. Peter Resta (spr100.nul) or call:
410-544-4927 X 8

PRG Media Schedule
www.paradigmresearchgroup.org/speaking&eventschedule.html

October 1
Sirius Radio - Indy_Talk Channel 110 - Me and Vinnie
WOCM 98.1 FM - Bulldog Show - Ocean City
Kerrang Radio - The Night Before - UK
Jerry Pippin Show

October 2
KOMP 92.3 - Morning Show - Las Vegas, NV
Blog Talk Radio - Sedona Talk Radio

October 3
Glastonbury Radio - Now That's Weird - UK
UFO Paranormal Radio - Through the Keyhole
X-Zone Radio - Rob McConnell

October 4
WHFR 89.3 - We are Not Alone - Detroit, MI
Vortex News Network - Progressive Technology Hour
KPHX 1480 - Exopolitics Radio
UFO Paranormal Radio - Eye to the Sky
WBSM 1420 - Spooky South Coast

October 5
Blog Talk Radio - Night Search

October 6
UFO Paranormal Radio - Global Focus

October 7
BBS Radio - Universal Spiritual Connection

October 11
Live From Roswell - Guy Malone

October 14
WBGZ 1570 - Matinee Madness

October 28
After Twilight - Chad Austin & Dianna Avena

November 6
Block Talk Radio - Sedona Talk Radio

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Why Miss The Witness?

From: **Greg Boone** <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 05:23:42 EDT
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:58:00 -0400
Subject: Why Miss The Witness?

Last night on Coast To Coast AM George Noory did something that just drives me crazy. Art used to do it too and I could just scream.

Open lines and a caller brings up the reason for abductions. His explanation rang true with some research I've done and I was bowled over he was being allowed to speak, that was until George cut him off for more of his Twilight Zone meanderings.

The caller brought up a point that is often overlooked regarding human evolution. That major leaps occur and that the abductors, didn't say aliens, the abductors were involved in some means to inhibit our next leap.

Now why would this occur?

I've a feeling we're not the top of the evolutionary tree and that at some point another version of us branched off long ago, more intelligent in some ways to the point of oppressive to our development.

George chimed in at the caller that Zecharia Sitchin explains all this as though the good Mr. Sitchin has the be all and end all of explanations.

Methinks the caller hit a bad chord.

Evolutionary changes occur fast in some species. We've seen this as fact with some fish species in the canyon areas of the southwest. Change their environment and they change their configuration within a short time. One generation if I recall.

One study of longer duration of evolutionary changes but still fast considering previous theories is located here, regarding fish in Lake Victoria that the data proves evolved in just 12,000 years since the lake was created not a million years or so as often assumed.

<http://tinyurl.com/4aq89g>

Here an even more startling proof of fast evolutionary changes that only took a few years with fish from Lake Washington in the Pacific northwest.

http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/363263_oddfish16.html

In just a few short years the creatures adapted to changes in their lake. Reverse evolution as the article calls it but change none the less.

These be fish for sure, but it's just to show an example that we still don't know everything about evolution and we still don't know what's out there and how smart and when.

The first crack usually uttered is where are their civilizations remnants. I think they're still here but attributed to others.

Maybe they're so smart they don't need cities as we call them nor industry on so mass a scale. Just because we'd do it that

way doesn't mean everyone else should. We're still trying to build the best mousetrap aren't we?

If other beings know evolution to the point as to retard our own then we need to address this abduction issue on an emergency scale. We've only been discussing it publicly for 40 years and nice stories are hard to find about it.

Classification of enemy, predator, symbiote, or parasite need to be applied to the abductors unless they finally want to show themselves.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 07:35:41 EDT
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 11:00:00 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>From: Dick Hall <dh12.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 17:04:33 -0400
>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

>>From: Katharina Wilson <K.Wilson.nul>
>>Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 12:23:10 -0500
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Subject: Re: 'Happy-Camper' Abduction Stories?

<snip>

>>You might want to do a little reading, i.e., Hopkins, Mack,
>>Jacobs, Turner, Dennett, Fowler, etc. There are many abduction
>>cases that involve abductees and witnesses who were not in
>>remote or secluded locations when they were abducted.

>>One example is below.

>>Eddie Melvin is an African-American business man who has
>>experienced a lifetime of abduction encounters. This particular
>>article focuses on an abduction that occurred when he was
>>serving in the Army in Panama.

>>HQ Battery 517, Panama: 1965

>>http://www.alienjigsaw.com/Abductees/HO_Battery_517_Panama.html

>>As far as 'happy camper abduction stories' are concerned, The
>>Allagash Four were 'happy campers' until they all got abducted.
>>I would have to say that I have not heard of any 'happy camper'
>>abduction stories.

>I agree with Katharina. Numerous cases contradict the premise
>that all/most abduction reports occur in isolated, remote areas
>without other witnesses.

>In my personal experience I have worked with abductees
>('experiencers') who desperately wanted to believe that
>something positive was involved, but their own experiences
>contradicted that wishful thinking.

That about wraps that up for me!

Abductions during UFO events. Didn't say_alien, just wanted to
classify it as what they are, abductors.

Wherever they come from, enemy, predator, symbiote, parasite are
applicable because friend is no where in the equation.

Best,

Greg

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

See :

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 27](#)

UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:56:37 -0400
Archived: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 11:01:00 -0400
Subject: UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?

Venezuela: A UFO Destroyed By Lightning?

By Hector Escalante =96 Ovnivenezuela

On September 17 of this year, Jairo Esparragoza managed to capture the flight of an alleged unidentified object that appeared to vanish after being struck by a bolt of lightning.

The event was recorded between 6 and 7 p.m. using the camera of a Motorola Motoraz V3 cellphone as the witness drove along the Guarenas-Guatire Expressway in the vicinity of the Buenaventura Shopping Mall in the state of Miranda in north-central Venezuela.

=93The human capacity for astonishment is unending,=94 was the initial statement that opened Jairo Esparragoza=92s story. He explained that he began recorded the lightning bolts in the sky out of sheer curiosity, following a torrential downpour that drenched the Venezuelan capital and its environs for several hours. He became aware of the strange presence only a few minutes later.

=93It rained heavily and there was considerable lightning. This drew my attention, and as I was stuck in traffic, I began recording what was going on. But after a while, I was able to see one or two orbs suspended in the sky through the telephone camera.=94

Startled by what he was seeing through the screen of his cell phone, Jairo Esparragoza stopped focusing the device skyward to concentrate it directly on the strange phenomenon, but was unable to see anything. However, upon resuming focus, the object became visible once again on the mobile phone=92s screen. =93I wasn=92t able to see it with the naked eye, but when I trained the camera on it once more, there it was, suspended and motionless. I checked to see if it was a light post and it wasn=92t. It wasn=92t the camera either,=94 he explained.

The situation remained thus for several seconds, and Jairo Esparragoza, seemingly the only witness to this unusual scene as it played out in the rush-hour tumult common to that time schedule between Caracas and Miranda, still couldn=92t believe what his cell phone camera was picking up.

Suddenly, a lightning bolt struck close to the UFO, causing its apparent and final disappearance.

=93Even though there was only a little bit of power left in the cellphone, I kept recording and after a few seconds, a lightning bolt struck and the object vanished immediately from the sky,=94 he stated.

The still images drawn from the video show how this lightning bolt quickly changes color when it approaches the UFO, changing from bluish white to pale violet.

An analysis was performed on the stills taken from Jairo Esparragoza=92s video shows that there was no trickery involved and that it possibly shows a technological device of unknown

aspect and behavior, discarding the possibility of airplanes, helicopter or other known aircraft.

In the opinion of Jorge Luis Figueiras, a specialist in digital content for the Fundacion Argentina de Ovnilogia (FAO) presided by Luis Burgos, =93there=92s not much that can be done with these photos, since their resolution is too low (0.025 megapixels).=94 He added, however, that after increasing the resolution level on the image, he was able to see two apparent objects that remain visible in several frames, where they can be seen as =93luminous and with a spherical shape.=94

Translation (c) 2008, Scott Corrales, IHU

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:59:48 EDT
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 08:14:05 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 16:29:05 +0200
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 00:25:04 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

><snip>

>>But, you can still talk about both sides of this event even
>>under that constraint, But, Balloon Trains and UFOs with the
>>same mundane descriptions of Balsa Wood and Foil landing in the
>>same vicinity of Earth turns into government UFO cover-up of
>>epic proportions. Evan Bill Brazel uses the word "Splinters" in
>>his original testimony. So, I can't change that,

>Viktor,

>Buy a balsa wood stick and break it with two fingers, as David
>Rudiak said!

>Gildas Bourdais

Thanks Gildas,

I think we have to rely on witness testimony that describes Balsa Wood quite clearly and repeatedly. The key witnesses use the word "Balsa Wood" not me.

Let's not forget that it just happens to have the same physical dimensions, color, and associated material attachments such as foil, paper, tape, and glue - identical with the Mogul balloon accouterments. They also said it bent and was the same weight as balsa wood.

Is this a great coincidence not requiring balanced viewpoints? They were there not you. Now, factor in time, hype, and regret.

Should, I only invoke ET spacecraft without equal weight given to the other more plausible potentials? That is my voice in all of this!

Clearly, irresponsible not to mention the full scale accounts by selectively exaggerating one characteristics over another. And, we know we are dealing with composite material with the potential benefits of added strength.

The naked piece I have Bends 35 degrees without breaking. It is a very remarkable engineering material. Here's the latest Military Humvee. I wonder why they used Balsa Wood?

<http://tinyurl.com/467v2n>

Best,
golubik

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Steve Bass <steven.s.bass.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 10:24:00 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 08:15:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
To: ufoupdates.nul
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2008 09:33:13 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Google News & UFOs

>Is Google News being used to influence public opinion of UFOs?

>A Working Hypothesis: by Franklin Fields

<snip>

>Interestingly, two other authors of UFO articles have
>experienced the same problem and I have had the problem with
>another UFO article.

<snip>

>Google's inclusion of non-news sources such as The Spoof in
>their 'News' listing seems inappropriate for a web service that
>prides itself as being a site for important headlines. However,
>that fact alone is not overly suspicious.

>I did email Google and complain about The Spoof's inappropriate
>inclusion. I was informed that it was labeled as "satire" and
>that they would continue to allow it with no further
>discussion.

>To focus this point, the headlines, as mentioned, above are
>mixed in with real news articles and the subtitle "satire" has a
>smaller font with a light gray color.

>To the sophisticated reader the headlines may not have a
>consequence. However, to those many millions of headline
>browsers these ominous headlines most assuredly have an
>influence. I contend they are subliminal messages. Maybe not
>planned or part of a PSY-OP, but a least something to consider.

I have noticed much the same thing with my stories. Being novice
at this, I figured this was normal. Apparently not, according to
the information you've given.

Also, I too have been momentarily fooled by these "spoof"
headlines. I don't understand why you would include spoofs when
you are supposed to be rendering real news headlines.

Steve Bass

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

See:

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

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:45:07 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 08:43:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 09:26:14 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

<snip>

>Let me give you an example. I just did a search on Google for
>the term "UFO". It came back with a search results page listing
>the top 10 "UFO" sites. There is a text line on the top right
>hand side of the results page that says "Results 1 - 10 of about
>6,280,000 for UFO".

Interesting. From here in Ontario, Canada, my Google search for
UFO returned 55,900,000 finds.

Top one was the Wikipedia entry.

Second one was ufoevidence.org

Third was youtube.com and google video, videos.

Fourth was ufocenter.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

1985 FT Over Utrecht Holland

From: Bert Reijersen van Buuren <bert.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 21:55:37 +0200
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 08:44:08 -0400
Subject: 1985 FT Over Utrecht Holland

1985, Netherland, NATO base Soesterberg, Utrecht: Flying triangle or unknown flying craft above the city of Utrecht.

When the airforce base Soesterberg was active during the Cold War, planes most of the time flew over my house or above the surrounding area to or from the base. When those planes started to land on the airfield their undercarriage extended here too.

This event was during "The cold War" and therefore I kept my mouth shut and almost forgot what I saw. But now I remember this event and "The Cold War" is over.

Around 1985 just after sunset I was stargazing in my backyard, sometimes with binoculars and I do have a telescope with which I made photos, when I saw something very dark moving across the sky. It was a triangler shaped object, dark, horizontally 30 metres and vertically 50 metres away from me, flying in the direction of the base and it made no sound at all. I saw it for some 10 seconds. In that time there were some rumours that there were planes with anti-sound and I don't know if this object was one of those, but why flying that low and soundless?

It flew from south to north above Utrecht towards the base and if you draw a line over the point Highway A2 - Thoriumweg (next to Vleutensebrug/Vleutenseweg) and the Mill Geesina (1853) at the Ruigenhoeksedijk which is west of the Highway A27 (Groenekanseweg) north-east of Utrecht then you can see where it flew.

The object:

Triangular with sides of 4 metres (12 feet) very dark.
No engines.
No exhausts
No ailerons
No cockpit
No smoketrial
No flashing lights
No other lights
No lights made by the engines
No reflection of the citylights on the object

The color lookliked the color of the stealtbomber which was shot down by the Serves during the Cosovo-war.

I listened for a while if I could hear any sound for as the object should come to much down to gain hight but there was nothing at all.

I receive from 1975 magazines on; space travelling, astronomy, archeaology and geology. During that time I received a magazine from the Dutch Ministry of Defense "Herkenning" (herkenning = Recognizing)

In the newsgroup nl.wetenschap (wetenschap = science) or here <http://www.ufoplaza.nl/viewtopic.php?t=3079#38238> you can find that what I wrote about this event.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: **Eleanor White** <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:54:00 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

><http://tinyurl.com/4anyw3>

<snip>

>Craig stated in 1968 that Condon had drafted his recommendations
>"without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the
>report which were by now nearing completion."

It would be kind of nice to think that Condon deliberately put
bogus conclusions on top of a report that showed a very
different situation, deliberately. The idea being, he knew what
conclusions he had to make, but that he realized the full report
would eventually come to light, pointing to the truth.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

SDI #463 Twenty Questions

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <alienview.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 06:58:21 -0500
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:55:00 -0400
Subject: SDI #463 Twenty Questions

SDI #463 Twenty Questions

20 Questions concordantly addressed with wit, penetration, scholarship, and courage by Dave Furlotte, Stuart Miller, and Robert L. Hastings as Errol Bruce-Knapp struggles too, arduously bringing it to us at all, and I ain't talkin' about no problems with no teefusses, aurally rendering EBK's usual Noel Coward into the Elephant Man - Okay, I exaggerated- still ...news at eleven:

1. "Blanchard, Lytle, And Roswell." What, who, where, how, when, and why?
2. Dead Generals don't lie about UFOs?
3. What is a UFO legend?
4. How many "crashes" at Roswell?
5. How many alien "bodies" in the desert?
6. How many alien "survivors" at Corona?
7. Why did General Blanchard even issue the story that a "crashed saucer had been recovered by the Army at Roswell"?
8. How does an active duty Army flight surgeon holding the rank of full Colonel presently remember holding flying saucer pieces in his hand as a child?
9. How many times has "officialdom" issued a bald if not bold lie regarding Roswell?
10. Are some ufologists point-taking adolescents?
11. What Roswell facts are beyond dispute?
12. Is it one thing to profess blindness where one is actually blind but another when ones eyes are merely closed? Is it enough to squeeze a stifled four letter word out of Dave Furlotte?
13. Why is Art Bell touted by the mainstream as an authority on UFOs?
14. Does Stuart Miller hew the "middle ground" with regard to all things Fortean?
15. What does a scarce Paul Kimball have to say on the subject of "honest ExoPols"?
16. Why the strange manipulation of testimony by the Cardiff Police to assuage their odd complicity in the Cardiff UFO affair via a 999 (911) call?
17. What is this strange fascination with Chinese Wedding lanterns preferred to gassy pelicans?
18. What explains the deliberate sabotage of the UFO Hunter program vis a vis Cardiff, if a lantern was the culprit?

19. Why are Condon and Brookings still not contested by the mainstream as a canted ax grind by the decision makers of the time?

20. What can be said about societies millions or even billions of years in advance of our own?

...And sixty minutes remain in tumultuous cavalcade of Stuart's exploration of his perhaps nascent dark-side, that retreat of sensibilities in trepidation... to incredulous disbelief? Then Robert L. Hastings demonstrates how UFOs swoop down and turn our nuclear weapons on and off at will... that's right. Ufological sensibilities empowered are the listener's own! Listen! Know the toad to squeegee that third eye!

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

[_alienview.nul](http://www.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?

From: Carol Maltby <carolmaltby.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 22:36:08 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:55:00 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 08:56:37 -0400
>Subject: UFO Destroyed By Lightning Over Venezuela?

>Suddenly, a lightning bolt struck close to the UFO, causing its
>apparent and final disappearance.

>"Even though there was only a little bit of power left in the
>cellphone, I kept recording and after a few seconds, a lightning
>bolt struck and the object vanished immediately from the sky,"
>he stated.

>The still images drawn from the video show how this lightning
>bolt quickly changes color when it approaches the UFO, changing
>from bluish white to pale violet.

>An analysis was performed on the stills taken from Jairo
>Esparragoza's video shows that there was no trickery involved
>and that it possibly shows a technological device of unknown
>aspect and behavior, discarding the possibility of airplanes,
>helicopter or other known aircraft.

Is the lightning's color change from bluish white to pale violet
what one would expect from lightning striking a craft in the air,
or is that color change in itself anomalous?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: Why Miss The Witness?

From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 16:13:43 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:56:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Why Miss The Witness?

>From: Greg Boone <Evolbaby.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 05:23:42 EDT
>Subject: Why Miss The Witness?

<snip>

>The first crack usually uttered is where are their civilizations
>remnants. I think they're still here but attributed to others.

>Maybe they're so smart they don't need cities as we call them
>nor industry on so mass a scale. Just because we'd do it that
>way doesn't mean everyone else should. We're still trying to
>build the best mousetrap aren't we?

As I've mentioned several times, in the advanced electronic harassment target community, conservatively 40-50 of us experience repeated harassment that appears is being done from a parallel dimension. Things like extremely precise remote physical manipulation, witnessed disappearance of and reappearance of objects, verified as not hypnotic blindness to the object(s). Injection of sounds, signals, and substances like gasses and liquids from any point, even in mid-air.

Our experiences are a lot like poltergeist occurrences, but the total experience set is very different from poltergeist experiencers.

"Maybe they're so smart" they actually live here, but in a parallel dimension set, is what I'm thinking. That would explain a huge number of things, both in our arena and in the UFO/abduction arena.

Personally, I believe that if this is true, it does not rule out ETs using parallel dimension access, as they seem to do from time to 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Swiatek Speaks

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 11:00:00 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 11:00:00 -0400
Subject: Swiatek Speaks

Source: The New River Valley Current - Christiansburg, Virginia, USA

<http://www.roanoke.com/news/roanoke/wb/178489>

Sunday, September 28, 2008

UFO Buffs Sighted At Lake Awhile, Then Vanish

One in seven people claims to have seen one, but the meeting didn't draw much interest.

By Jay Conley
981-3114

MONETA--Robert Swiatek hasn't unraveled the mysteries that shroud many UFO sightings, but he said ignoring them or pretending they don't exist could haunt mankind at some point.

"I don't know what's going on, but something's going on," he said Saturday at Smith Mountain Lake. "We're ignoring stuff that could be of vital importance."

If Swiatek seems a little frustrated, he's not alone. He was among a small but earnest group of UFO investigators attending a conference hosted by the Virginia and North Carolina chapters of the Mutual UFO Network, known as MUFON, at the Mariners Landing Resort and Conference Center.

The 39-year-old organization bills itself as the world's largest civilian UFO research organization. It's mission statement: the scientific study of UFOs for the benefit of humanity.

Swiatek, a MUFON board member who speaks frequently on UFO sightings, said UFO believers, such as former presidential candidate Dennis Kucinich, take some ribbing for going public with their opinions. Kucinich's acknowledgement that he had seen a UFO "was ridiculed across the board," Swiatek said. "It hurt him ultimately."

Swiatek said that while the general public has some interest in UFOs - a recent national poll indicated that 14 percent claim to have seen one - "they're not motivated enough to come to these meetings."

But he maintains they should be.

"The subject has an intrinsic appeal," Swiatek said. "This room should be packed."

Instead, about 15 people attended the conference, many of them MUFON members who say most scientists have no interest in UFOs and have written off any number of confirmed sightings over the years as hoaxes or flights of fantasy.

One local science professor did speak at the conference: Virginia Tech professor Henry Bauer, who once wrote a book about the Loch

Ness Monster.

Jim Hudgins from Bedford County said a story about the conference in a local newspaper piqued his interest.

"I don't know if I'm a believer or a non-believer," he said. "I thought I'd just come out and see what's going on."

While Swiatek and others at the conference said 90 percent of UFO sightings can be explained as either natural occurrences or fraudulent claims, the other 10 percent present real questions about their origins.

That's why Richard Lang, one of MUFON's UFO investigators, always keeps a bag packed. Any UFO sightings that people post on MUFON's Web site are also sent to Lang's BlackBerry, and he can be ready to check out a claim at a moment's notice.

"If something's pretty hot, we might want to deal with it immediately," he said.

Whether you're a believer or a skeptic, you can see Lang in action later this year when he and other MUFON investigators are featured on a show about UFOs on the Discovery Channel.

Lang said he was recently filmed as he attempted to unravel a UFO sighting in North Carolina, where he lives and works as a bank executive.

"It presents us in a very interesting scientific way," he said.

The Discovery Channel used the same special effects artist who worked on the X-Files television show to create images for the program, which is supposed to air in December.

"A lot of people are going to look at this and think it's pretty cool," Lang said.

For more on MUFON, visit www.mufon.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:14:02 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 11:01:00 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

>><http://tinyurl.com/4anyw3>

>>Craig stated in 1968 that Condon had drafted his recommendations
>>"without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the
>>report which were by now nearing completion."

>It would be kind of nice to think that Condon deliberately put
>bogus conclusions on top of a report that showed a very
>different situation, deliberately. The idea being, he knew what
>conclusions he had to make, but that he realized the full report
>would eventually come to light, pointing to the truth.

Indeed, "it would be kind of nice to think that," but it's not
the case, and the sorry lessons to be learned from the episode
are otherwise.

The reality is that Ed Condon considered the UFO phenomenon
illegitimate. Thus, attention to demonstrable evidence and
contrary scientific analysis was deemed unnecessary in any but
the most superficial public-relations sense. Once you've judged
something unworthy of your serious attention, in other words, no
serious attention need be paid.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 28](#)

Something Is Here

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 11:12:55 -0400
Archived: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 11:12:55 -0400
Subject: Something Is Here

Source: Adam Korbitz's Estimate Of Thesituation Blog
- Madison, Wisconsin

<http://tinyurl.com/4ofe4c>

Thursday, September 25, 2008

[Many links in Blog-post]

Something Is Here

Remember those words.

It=92s cool here in Paris, but things are heating up at the SETI symposium currently under way at the UNESCO headquarters, sponsored by the International Academy of Astronautics. This is my third report from the conference.

Tuesday was an intriguing day, particularly the presentation by Alain Labeque of the Institut d'Astrophysique Spatiale in Orsay, France, which took an unexpected and -- for me -- shocking turn.

Entitled "Active SETI and the Zoo Hypothesis," Labeque=92s presentation began conventionally enough with a review of the well-known Fermi Paradox and it=92s possible solutions. (For those of you who don=92t know, the Fermi Paradox is simply the quandary that science tells us the Universe should be teeming with intelligent life, and yet the aliens don=92t seem to be here on Earth =96 or anywhere else that we look. Where are they?)

There are several possible solutions to the Fermi Paradox, including the aliens don=92t exist at all or interstellar travel is impossible or simply too expensive -- even for civilizations that may be millions (or billions) of years more advanced than humans. (I=92ve discussed these proposed solutions before.)

Another possible solution to the Fermi Paradox is the Zoo Hypothesis, which I=92ve also discussed before. Simply put, the Zoo Hypothesis is the suggestion the aliens have imposed a Star Trek-style "Prime Directive" to quarantine the Earth, for any one of many possible reasons:

Maybe they want to study us in our pure state, without us knowing they are watching.

Maybe they consider us to be too primitive and too savage.

Or maybe they are simply marinating us and aren=92t ready to throw us on the grill.

In all seriousness, I find the Zoo Hypothesis the most plausible of the possible solutions, because it is a reasonable speculation on how a scientifically (and hopefully ethically) advanced civilization would behave toward us: they would want to study us, as we study nature, without inserting themselves into the

experiment. In other words, no observational bias!

This is, of course, pure (if informed) speculation, but in his talk yesterday Alain Labeque proposed a possible method for scientists to test the Zoo Hypothesis.

And this is where my jaw dropped.

As I have written about before, I have become accustomed to the searing scorn generally heaped by the American scientific intelligentsia on anyone =96 inside or outside of traditional science =96 who proposes an advanced technological civilization in our galactic neighborhood might venture to travel between the stars =96 including our star, the Sun.

What I am learning at this symposium, however, is that this is a somewhat uniquely American attitude not so widely shared in Europe. (I will leave for another day =96 soon =96 my thoughts on the reasons for this seemingly American derangement that lately passes under the gross misnomer of "skepticism.")

Labeque told his assembled colleagues they should examine UFO sightings for clues as to how to design the SETI experiment.

Suggesting we seriously consider the Zoo Hypothesis as a solution to the Fermi Paradox, Labeque essentially asked his colleagues: if we are being watched, as the Zoo Hypothesis suggests, where are the watchers? (As Labeque put it, where are the "photographers"?)

For a clue, Labeque urged his colleagues consider UFO sightings, including the 1400 or so documented in the Dominique Weinstein catalog. Labeque pointed out that, although many unexplained UFOs appear to behave as if they are under intelligent control, no organized scientific effort to understand the phenomena currently is underway.

In particular, Labeque pointed to the well-known July 1957 RB-47 sighting, during which:

"An Air Force Boeing Stratojet reconnaissance jet RB-47, equipped with electronic countermeasures gear and manned by six officers, was followed by an unidentified object for a distance of well over 700 miles, and for a time period of more than one hour, as it flew from Mississippi, through Louisiana and Texas and into Oklahoma. The object was, at various times, seen visually by the cockpit crew as an intensely luminous light, followed by ground-radar and detected on ECM monitoring gear aboard the RB-47. Of special interest in this case are several instances of simultaneous appearances and disappearances on all three of those physically distinct observation channels, and rapidity of maneuvers beyond aircraft possibilities."

According to Labeque, during the sighting the RB-47 detected a 3 GHz microwave transmission from the unknown craft.

Since the unidentified craft exhibited intelligent maneuvers and appeared to be communicating with someone, Labeque suggests SETI scientists use this data point to design an experiment.

Positing the craft may have been a scout craft sent from an alien station somewhere in our solar system, Labeque proposed SETI scientists transmit a microwave signal at 3 GHz and see if it elicits a reply. Since the possible location of an alien station is unknown, the signal would have to be broadcast in all directions of the sky. After transmitting for a period of time, the signal would be shut off, and scientists would listen for a response.

A few of Labeque's European and Russian colleagues appeared intrigued by the suggested plan and challenged Labeque to clarify several points. In reference to the wealth of unexplained UFO sightings, Labeque concluded, "Something is here."

The American contingent of SETI scientists asked no questions, politely applauding like everyone else at the end of Labeque's talk.

Later in the day, another European scientist =96 Jean-Pierre

Rospars of France -- suggested at the end of his presentation on SETI and terrestrial biological evolution:

"Possible ET presence in our environment should not be neglected. It may be partly accessible to our limited means of investigation."

The SETI symposium wraps up today. More to come, tomorrow...

[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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 17:43:20 +0200
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:47:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:59:48 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 16:29:05 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>Viktor,

>>Buy a balsa wood stick and break it with two fingers, as David
>>Rudiak said!

>Thanks Gildas,

>I think we have to rely on witness testimony that describes Balsa
>Wood quite clearly and repeatedly. The key witnesses use the word
>"Balsa Wood" not me.

Viktor,

Key witnesses said that some pieces looked like balsa but were
not balsa.

And there were other, quite different, unidentified materials.
Now, I don't think there is any serious reason to keep discussing
with you.

Sorry about that.

Gildas Brdais

Gildas Bourdais

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: Google News & UFOs

From: Carol Maltby <carolmaltby.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 13:09:14 -0400
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:51:37 -0400
Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:45:07 -0400
>Subject: Re: Google News & UFOs

>Interesting. From here in Ontario, Canada, my Google search for
>UFO returned 55,900,000 finds.

>Top one was the Wikipedia entry.

>Second one was ufoevidence.org

>Third was youtube.com and google video, videos.

>Fourth was ufocenter.com

I did the same Google search on 'UFO' from here in upstate NY
about 4 hours after Eleanor. I got the same order of websites,
but 70,600,000 pages.

Does anyone know how Google decides to pick forum posts to
display out of hundreds a person may make on that forum? Is there
a component of human choice?

I had one (out of hundreds on one space-forum) that was the top
entry for me for a few years, though for no particular reason
that I could see. Then it disappeared totally from the Google
listings.

Yet, I see today that a post I made on Cryptomundo on entoptic
patterns now shows up with 3 bogus triple X references on Google.

<sigh>

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: **Franklin D. Fields** <fields.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 13:46:02 -0400 (EDT)
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:55:23 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:14:02 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>>Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

>>><http://tinyurl.com/4anyw3>

>>>Craig stated in 1968 that Condon had drafted his recommendations
>>>"without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the
>>>report which were by now nearing completion."

>>It would be kind of nice to think that Condon deliberately put
>>bogus conclusions on top of a report that showed a very
>>different situation, deliberately. The idea being, he knew what
>>conclusions he had to make, but that he realized the full report
>>would eventually come to light, pointing to the truth.

>Indeed, "it would be kind of nice to think that," but it's not
>the case, and the sorry lessons to be learned from the episode
>are otherwise.

>The reality is that Ed Condon considered the UFO phenomenon
>illegitimate. Thus, attention to demonstrable evidence and
>contrary scientific analysis was deemed unnecessary in any but
>the most superficial public-relations sense. Once you've judged
>something unworthy of your serious attention, in other words, no
>serious attention need be paid.

Mr. Clark,

I am not disputing your summation. You may very well be correct.
Nevertheless, can you tell us why your version is accurate?

Could it have been that Condon had a mission, paid for by the
Air Force (or CIA), to put a lid on the subject and that his job
was to conclude in a certain way regardless of the data?

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 15:00:38 -0300
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 12:00:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:59:48 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 16:29:05 +0200
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 00:25:04 EDT
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>><snip>

>>>But, you can still talk about both sides of this event even
>>>under that constraint, But, Balloon Trains and UFOs with the
>>>same mundane descriptions of Balsa Wood and Foil landing in the
>>>same vicinity of Earth turns into government UFO cover-up of
>>>epic proportions. Evan Bill Brazel uses the word "Splinters" in
>>>his original testimony. So, I can't change that,

>>Viktor,

>>Buy a balsa wood stick and break it with two fingers, as David
>>Rudiak said!

>>Gildas Bourdais

>Thanks Gildas,

>I think we have to rely on witness testimony that describes Balsa
>Wood quite clearly and repeatedly. The key witnesses use the word
>"Balsa Wood" not me.

>Let's not forget that it just happens to have the same physical
>dimensions, color, and associated material attachments such as
>foil, paper, tape, and glue - identical with the Mogul balloon
>accouterments. They also said it bent and was the same weight as
>balsa wood.

>Is this a great coincidence not requiring balanced viewpoints?
>They were there not you. Now, factor in time, hype, and regret.

>Should, I only invoke ET spacecraft without equal weight given to
>the other more plausible potentials? That is my voice in all of
>this!

>Clearly, irresponsible not to mention the full scale accounts by
>selectively exaggerating one characteristics over another. And,
>we know we are dealing with composite material with the potential
>benefits of added strength.

>The naked piece I have Bends 35 degrees without breaking. It is a
>very remarkable engineering material. Here's the latest Military
>Humvee. I wonder why they used Balsa Wood?

><http://tinyurl.com/467v2n>

Hi Viktor,

Balsa wood is used as a filler; it has no strength and doubles as an airspace between two outer layers of laminated carbon-fiber cloth skins. It's called composite construction.

Early on, Balsa was used in the construction of kit-built/home-built private aircraft - which incidentally led the way with the aircraft companies following along 10-20 years later - wings, flaps, horizontal stabilisers, elevators, etc.

My CP 328 Super Emeraude airplane's flaps and horizontal stabiliser are constructed in this manner.

This type of construction is extremely light and very tough. Most modern airliners have a large percentage of their bodies and control surfaces constructed of composites. But Balsa was abandoned in favor of foam-core - polyurethane, polystyrene, divinyl cell, last-a-foam and styrofoam-small cell.

Balsa wood is too expensive for even small scale private and commercial applications, so high density foam core is now used - see previous paragraph - a high quality styro-type-foam which is not the stuff styrofoam cups or home insulation is made of. The foam is shaped and then the skins are laid up over the foam and then vacume bagged.

Kevlar, Ceramic, Graphite, E and S Glasses and other fiber products can stop bullets but the foam or balsa-wood filler in the sandwich would not stop a straight pin. Hence the fiber application in a Humvee and armored tanks.

Finally, you would not see the Balsa wood nor recognize it as so between the layers of cloth. Additionally, carbon dust is added to the "prime" coat of sealant to defeat the damaging effect of sunlight on polymer fibers and the bonding agents used to bond the fiber layers together.

You can crush Balsa wood between your fingers it is so low-density in nature. But it supports long enough to accept coverings and vacume bagging. Since varnishes and such have no strength on their own it would not support Balsa as a strengthener once coated. It's only value would be water proofing and or decorative not structural other than in the reflector applications used on weather balloons and the Mogal arrays where structural strength was not a consideration.

Just one observation. Back in the 1920s to the 1960s [even now] kids [and grown-ups] built model airplanes out of Balsa wood.

Many of these builders ended up in the airforce or commercial or private aviation. It was commonly known, not a rare model construction material.

I find it hard to believe that Marcel or anyone else associated with aviation would not know it when they saw it.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: Politician And Pilot Spot UFO

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 12:01:00 -0400
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 12:01:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Politician And Pilot Spot UFO

Source: The Irish Independent - Dublin, Ireland

<http://tinyurl.com/3tm6nm>

Monday September 29 2008

We're Not Alone... Politician And Pilot Spot UFO

By Anita Guidera

The truth is out there - and if a senior garda, a Fianna Fail politician and a pilot are to be believed, aliens are keeping a close eye on us from above.

Dramatic eye-witness testimony was heard at a conference over the weekend which, delegates were told, provided "definitive" proof of recent UFO activity in the skies around north Dublin and Meath.

Footage, filmed on a camera phone at 10.35pm on August 3 near Dunboyne was also played and replayed to over 70 delegates who attended the fifth Irish International UFO conference in Carrick-on-Shannon.

The triangular shaped image, with lights at each point, which appeared to send a red laser-type light towards earth, drew gasps of amazement from the 70 or so delegates who attended the world premiere of the footage.

Unusual

A senior garda officer who was driving when he noticed the unusual light formation in the sky stopped to film it.

"There is no footage like this in the world. It is the most amazing and spectacular I have ever seen," said Carl Nally, co-founder of UFO and Paranormal Research Ireland and joint author of 'Conspiracy of Silence'.

Five days earlier, on July 29, an off-duty pilot who photographed lightning from Howth pier just after midnight later noticed what appeared to be a triangular-shaped object to the right of the lightning fork in the developed image.

And Fianna Fail Town Councillor in Trim, Jimmy Peppard, ran indoors for a camera on August 8 when he spotted a triangular-shaped object measuring "about a mile in diameter" in the sky, where it remained static for about half an hour.

"What we have here is sightings of three objects east, west and south-east of Dublin airport, each five days apart by reliable and trained observers and even since I have arrived here I have received another image from a pilot," Mr Nally told the conference.

He later described the laser beam footage as the best footage on the planet and said it would be shown all over the world. "This is what the sceptics are crying out for. What all this footage has in common is that trained observers, honest people, took it. What better could you get than a senior garda, a politician and a pilot," he said.

He added that he would not rule out speculation that increased UFO activity in the north Dublin and Meath areas was linked to the road construction works near Tara. "We cannot rule this out as a possibility. We are talking about a very ancient sacred place," he said.

Ross Hemsworth, who presents a TV show on Sky which investigates the paranormal, said he would reserve judgment until he examined the footage more closely.

"There have been a lot of sightings in Ireland in a lot of strange places and the proximity to the digging of the motorway may have opened things up," he said.

Delegates at the two-day event, organised by Betty Meyler, President of the UFO Society of Ireland, otherwise immersed themselves in talk of orbs, luminosity, crop circles, alien abductions and star children. And ex-oilfield executive Ian Crane warned of plans for a fake alien invasion to be staged at the 2012 Olympics in London by the terrorists behind 9/11 and other atrocities, in their quest for global control.

For organiser Betty Meyler the conference provided an opportunity for like-minded people to come together and make friends.

"Before, people were afraid to report sightings because they did not want to be thought of as 'cuckoo' but that has changed now," 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 29](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:32:32 -0400
Archived: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 12:02:00 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 13:46:02 -0400 (EDT)
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:14:02 -0400
>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>The reality is that Ed Condon considered the UFO phenomenon
>>illegitimate. Thus, attention to demonstrable evidence and
>>contrary scientific analysis was deemed unnecessary in any but
>>the most superficial public-relations sense. Once you've judged
>>something unworthy of your serious attention, in other words, no
>>serious attention need be paid.

>I am not disputing your summation. You may very well be correct.
>Nevertheless, can you tell us why your version is accurate?

>Could it have been that Condon had a mission, paid for by the
>Air Force (or CIA), to put a lid on the subject and that his job
>was to conclude in a certain way regardless of the data?

Condon's job was to rid the Air Force of its UFO albatross, which had proved a public-relations disaster. The AF gave Condon a nod and a wink, and everybody in a decision-making position knew the purpose: to pretend there was an open-minded investigation while the conclusion -- that the AF would get out of the UFO business because there is nothing to it -- was determined at the beginning. Some of the field investigators and office personnel did not get the message, and that's why scientifically valuable investigations were conducted. That's also why the blow-up between Saunders and Levine on one side and Condon and Low on the other occurred. Saunders and Levine were naive enough to believe the p.r.

Condon was chosen because he shared the AF's contempt for the phenomenon and could be counted upon to endorse the AF's dismissive claims. There is not an iota of evidence that Condon was either sympathetic to or even vaguely open-minded about UFOs.

The writing on this subject is voluminous. You might begin with my account of the Condon Committee in my UFO Encyclopedia, hunt up Michael Swords's papers in JUFOS, and go from there. Another authority, who posts here regularly, is Brad Sparks.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 17:40:58 +0100
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 07:10:56 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:32:32 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>Condon was chosen because he shared the AF's contempt for the
>phenomenon and could be counted upon to endorse the AF's
>dismissive claims. There is not an iota of evidence that Condon
>was either sympathetic to or even vaguely open-minded about
>UFOs.

Hi, coincidentally was just watching a few old videos on the
'early years'.

UFO Coverup Documentary - Out Of The Blue Parts 1/2/3/

<http://ca.youtube.com/watch?v=mdZpRcTBwdA>

<http://ca.youtube.com/watch?v=DPrdhvzcS8c>

<http://ca.youtube.com/watch?v=RmN3WGeOzXQ>

It seems fairly obvious that, after 1952, the AF came under
direct orders from the CIA - who'd apparently been tasked by "the
President" or more likely a group of insiders, to de-fuse and de-
bunk the growing public interest in the subject.

The alleged reason was that intense waves of public reportings
(like in 1952) could block official lines of communication.

But I keep being reminded of that reported quote of Eisenhower's,
that "Things are not going to be in the best hands".

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 14:58:16 -0300
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 07:13:44 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:14:02 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>>Source: The Sarasota Herald Tribune - Florida, USA

>>><http://tinyurl.com/4anyw3>

>>>Craig stated in 1968 that Condon had drafted his recommendations
>>>"without benefit of prior reading of the other sections of the
>>>report which were by now nearing completion."

>>It would be kind of nice to think that Condon deliberately put
>>bogus conclusions on top of a report that showed a very
>>different situation, deliberately. The idea being, he knew what
>>conclusions he had to make, but that he realized the full report
>>would eventually come to light, pointing to the truth.

>Indeed, "it would be kind of nice to think that," but it's not
>the case, and the sorry lessons to be learned from the episode
>are otherwise.

>The reality is that Ed Condon considered the UFO phenomenon
>illegitimate. Thus, attention to demonstrable evidence and
>contrary scientific analysis was deemed unnecessary in any but
>the most superficial public-relations sense. Once you've judged
>something unworthy of your serious attention, in other words, no
>serious attention need be paid.

Hi Jerry,

Could also be that Condon was indebted to the government [Truman]
and the Department of Defense after his long battle with the
House Un-American Activities 'hearings' [and Richard Nixon]
hearings over 5 years. Harry Truman went to bat for him and the
DoD re-instated his Security Clearance?

Maybe he felt he owed something to them those many years later.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 04:22:44 EDT
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 07:20:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 15:00:38 -0300
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 09:59:48 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <bourdais.gildas.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 16:29:05 +0200
>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2008 00:25:04 EDT
>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993.nul>
>>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>>Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2008 18:01:33 EDT
>>>>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>><snip>

>snip

>Balsa wood is used as a filler; it has no strength and doubles as
>an airspace between two outer layers of laminated carbon-fiber
>cloth skins. It's called composite construction.

Hi Don,

Yes, composite construction has a long history, whether it was
the intended purpose or not.

It was clearly used as a structural element in this application.

It was used historically as a light weight structural component
in surfboards and has a history.

It is relevant to bring up it's improved strength since it was in
contact with other materials that would clearly do this: The
questioning did not challenge nor clarify enough situational
differences.

"Balsa wood has a long history of being an excellent core
material offering high compression properties, high shear
strength, and great fatigue endurance. It has been used in a wide
variety of applications ranging from recreational boats to high
performance wind turbine blades."

>Early on, Balsa was used in the construction of kit-built/home-
>built private aircraft - which incidentally led the way with the
>aircraft companies following along 10-20 years later - wings,

>flaps, horizontal stabilisers, elevators, etc.

>My CP 328 Super Emeraude airplane's flaps and horizontal
>stabiliser are constructed in this manner.

I've built and flown remote controlled gliders and airplanes. A thin coat of plastic film also adds tremendous strength. Such film prevents the balsa from reaching it's fracture point and serves to evenly distribute an applied force over an arching type bend: glue, tape, paper, and/or foil can serve a similar purpose here.

>This type of construction is extremely light and very tough. Most
>modern airliners have a large percentage of their bodies and
>control surfaces constructed of composites. But Balsa was
>abandoned in favor of foam-core - polyurethane, polystyrene,
>diviney cell, last-a-foam and styrofoam-small cell.

This was 60 years ago and is clearly_SMALL_scale.

>Balsa wood is too expensive for even small scale private and
>commercial applications, so high density foam core is now used -
>see previous paragraph - a high quality styro-type-foam which is
>not the stuff styrofoam cups or home insulation is made of. The
>foam is shaped and then the skins are laid up over the foam and
>then vacume bagged.

>Kevlar, Ceramic, Graphite, E and S Glasses and other fiber
>products can stop bullets but the foam or balsa-wood filler in
>the sandwich would not stop a straight pin. Hence the fiber
>application in a Humvee and armored tanks.

The amount used was clearly not that expensive, not to mention, that it was obviously employed. As far as I can recall, Cavitt used the term "Bamboo" to describe it... and he also rejected that he had seen muted lavender flowered tape... on the elements.

It is clearly used as a light weight structural element in the humvee. In fact, one can make very strong, alternating-grain, plywood from Balsa.

>Finally, you would not see the Balsa wood nor recognize it as so
>between the layers of cloth. Additionall, carbon dust is added to
>the "prime" coat of sealent to defeat the damaging effect of
>sunlight on polymer fibers and the bonding agents used to bond
>the fiber layers together.

It is unclear what was done and these appear to have been made in New York and brought there. This wood may have been pretreated in some fashion or bought that way. The exact glue that was used is also unclear.

>You can crush Balsa wood between your fingers it is so low-
>density in nature. But it supports long enough to accept
>coverings and vacume bagging. Since varnishes and such have no
>strength on their own it would not support Balsa as a
>strengthenener once coated. It's only value would be water proofing
>and or decorative not structural other than in the reflector
>applications used on weather balloons and the Mogal arrays where
>structural strength was not a consideration.

You cannot easily compress 5/16 - 3/8 inch Balsa wood between two fingers in such a manner. Glues will only harden the surface making it less likely to do so.

>Just one observation. Back in the 1920s to the 1960s [even now]
>kids [and grown-ups] built model airplanes out of Balsa wood.

It was not as common then as it is now - see ebay. Nor, was Aluminum foil (Reynolds Wrap,1947).

>Many of these builders ended up in the airforce or commercial or
>private aviation. It was commonly known, not a rare model
>construction material.

>I find it hard to believe that Marcel or anyone else associated
>with aviation would not know it when they saw it.

They clearly use this word repeatedly... and we have to keep in mind that their testimony came 32 years after the events - contamination and exaggerations may have already been

introduced.

Yes, and that is why we need to review the evidence and early witness testimony. It is apparent that tape recorded interviews are lurking somewhere - that may resolve or bring greater definition to these material descriptions. As it stands, we have some ambiguity and a Mogul balloon train is enough to quash it.

Do you feel that this completely supports the existence of Extra Terrestrial life? Unfortunately, I'm similarly observant that it does not meet such standards given the resolution of this testimony - when faced with the nature of the similarities, the hype then/now, and coincidence of events.

Remember, Bessy Brazel recalls Mogul-like items not mentioned in the Roswell Incident (testimony struck) and Bill Brazel describes a synthetic fiber string.

If Mogul Balloons were not coming down in this area, clearly the case would take on a different fortifying level of strength in favor or something highly unusual.

PART 1:

Bill Brazel's Testimony (The Roswell Incident:March, June, and December, 1979):

Bill and Shirley Brazel of Captain, New Mexico, recall the incident well. Bill Brazel is an employee of Texas Instruments and spends the better part of his time working away from home as a geoseismologist in Alaska's North Slope oil region.

Question: Mr Brazel, what can you tell me about your father's experience in discovering the wreckage of some sort of aerial device out on the Ranch?

Well, actually I can't tell you the whole story about that because I don't know all of it. Father was very reluctant to talk about it at all, and what I know is only what I could manage to get out of him over the years before he died. He took the most part of what he knew to the grave with him. They [the military] swore him to secrecy, you know, and he took that very seriously. A good indication of just how seriously is that he would never even talk to Mother about it. To tell the truth, Shirley here was the closest to him of any of the family and if he was going to tell anyone at all about what he knew, it would have been her. But, he never told her the whole story either, so unless the military chooses to come out in the open with what they know, we're likely never to find out any more about it.

Actually. we first learned about it when we picked up a copy of the Albuquerque Journal one evening and saw Dad's picture on the front page. There was another story about it in the Lincoln County News. Shirley said: "My God, what's he gotten himself into now?" and I said: " I don't know, but maybe we had better go over to the ranch tomorrow and find out." We had just been married at the time and were living in Albuquerque. Anyhow, when we got there Dad wasn't there. There was nobody there. Well, we know he was in Roswell from what the paper had said, so I decided I had better stay and look after the ranch till he got home again. Shirley went on back to Albuquerque that evening. By Monday [July 14] when Dad still hadn't returned, I began to get concerned, and that was when I went over to Corona and made a few phone calls to find out what was going on. I was told not to worry, that Dad was OK and that he ought to be coming back to the ranch the next day or so.

Sure enough, he did, but when he got there, he wouldn't say hardly anything about where he had been or what he had done there. He seemed very disgruntled about it all, and was in no mood to talk about it. "You saw the paper." he said. "What you read there is all you need to know. That way, nobody will bother you about it." Later on, he said that he had :found this thing and turned it in to Roswell" and they shut him up for about a week because of it. I can still hear him: "Gosh, " he said, "I just tried to do a good deed and they put me in jail for it." Then he said that if we had read it in the paper, then we knew all there was to tell. He said they had told him to shut up because it was important to our country and was the patriotic thing to do, and so that's what he intended to do. He did say

that they had shut him up in a room and wouldn't let him out. He was very discouraged and upset about the way they had treated him. They even gave him a complete "head-to-foot army physical" before they would let him come home.

What I finally got out of him came in bits and pieces over the years, and from what I can piece together, what happened was this:

Dad was in the ranch house with two of the younger kids late one evening when a terrible lightning storm came up. He said it was the worst lightning storm he had ever seen [and you can be sure he had seen a lot of them], not much rain with it, just lightning - strike after strike. He said it seemed strange that the lightning kept wanting to strike the same spot time and again, almost as if there was something attracting it to those spots - he thought maybe underground mineral deposits or something. Anyway, in the middle of this storm there was an odd sort of explosion, not like the ordinary thunder, but different. He said he didn't think so much about it at the time because the storm was so bad that he just guessed it was some freak lightning strike, but later he wondered about it. Anyhow, the next morning while riding out over the pasture to check on some sheep, he came across this collection of wreckage scattered over a patch of land about a quarter mile long or so, and several hundred feet wide. He said to me once that it looked like that whatever this stuff had come from had blown up. He also said that from the way this wreckage was scattered, you could tell it was traveling "an airline route to Socorro," which is off to the southwest of the ranch.

At first he didn't recognize the importance of it, and it was only after a day or so of thinking on it that he decided he had better go back and have a closer look.

To be Continued...

golubik

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

See:

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

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 22:02:14 -0400
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 07:23:15 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:32:32 -0400
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>From: Franklin D. Fields <fields.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 13:46:02 -0400 (EDT)
>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 09:14:02 -0400
>>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>>>From: Eleanor White <ewraven1.nul>
>>>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>>>Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2008 15:58:13 -0400
>>>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>Could it have been that Condon had a mission, paid for by the
>>Air Force (or CIA), to put a lid on the subject and that his job
>>was to conclude in a certain way regardless of the data?

>Condon was chosen because he shared the AF's contempt for the
>phenomenon and could be counted upon to endorse the AF's
>dismissive claims. There is not an iota of evidence that Condon
>was either sympathetic to or even vaguely open-minded about UFOs.

>The writing on this subject is voluminous. You might begin with
>my account of the Condon Committee in my UFO Encyclopedia, hunt
>up Michael Swords's papers in JUFOS, and go from there. Another
>authority, who posts here regularly, is Brad Sparks.

Since I wrote the above paragraph in a hurry, I neglected to
mention another major authority on the Condon Committee: Dick
Hall, who also is a regular contributor here.

From his position as NICAP official, Dick had personal dealings
with the committee, knew the players, and followed developments
from a uniquely well placed perspective. Nobody here speaks from
Dick's intimate experience of Condon and crew.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Have You Seen A UFO In Bolton?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 08:25:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 08:25:00 -0400
Subject: Have You Seen A UFO In Bolton?

Source: The Bolton News - Bolton, Greater Manchester, UK

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

Monday 29th September 2008

Have You Seen A UFO In Bolton?
John Hanson

I am currently in the process of completing a second volume of Haunted Skies, which catalogues all manner of strange reports made by the public since the late 1960s, including UFOs and their occasional occupants.

Over the years, I have researched thousands of cases involving the sighting of strange phenomena, which, as a fresh-faced police constable back in the 1960s, I would have not given a second thought.

Without doubt, the most interesting case I have ever come across happened during a spate of UFO activity on January 23, 1976, involving a woman from Bolton who was walking home from work past the local reservoir at 5.15pm when she received substantial injuries to her arms and teeth as a result of an unidentified object seen to hover overhead. Following her report to the authorities, she received a visit from two sinister men who threatened the family and herself to keep quiet.

This may sound like a bizarre story from the X Files, but there is no reason to doubt that this account took place, though the identity of the =93craft=94 and the men who came to see her have never been established.

This woman wants to remain anonymous and get on with her life, but I believe matters like this should not be covered up.

I would like to hear from anyone who has information on UFO sightings around the Bolton area.

I am also seeking the current whereabouts of a woman from Ladybridge who contacted a UFO group after sighting a UFO?

Two days later, Christine Young, of Slaters Field, Bolton, and her sister, Jillian Newtown, saw something unusual during the early hours while on their way home from a club =97 perhaps somebody could put me in touch with these two =93girls=94.

John Hanson, 31 Red Lion Street, Alvechurch, B48 7LG

johndawn1.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

UFO Affects Welsh Woman's TV Reception

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <ufoupdates.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 08:26:00 -0400
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 08:26:00 -0400
Subject: UFO Affects Welsh Woman's TV Reception

Source: The Evening Leader - Wrexham, Wales, UK

<http://tinyurl.com/4chsfd>

30 September 2008

UFO Affected TV Reception - Wrexham Woman Claims

The Evening Leader has once again been besieged with calls and emails from members of the public reporting fresh sightings of strange lights in the night sky over North Wales.

The bizarre objects were spotted by numerous readers in different areas of Wrexham last Wednesday and Thursday evening.

One resident even claimed her television reception was affected as a result.

The sightings come exactly a week after the Evening Leader was handed footage of slow moving lights, arranged in a triangular formation, over Rhos.

The latest reported incidents add fuel to claims Wrexham is now the region's number one UFO hotspot.

Paul Griffiths, of Gwalia Terrace, said he had spotted three red lights over Pen-y-Cae on Thursday, September 25, just before 8.10pm, along with his wife and son.

He said: "At first we thought they were stars but when I looked around there were no other stars in the sky as it was cloudy.

"I believe we have viewed what others have viewed over the same area in the past week - unexplainable red lights in the sky over Rhos, Johnstown and now Pen-y-Cae areas."

Meanwhile Beverley Davies, of Ponciau, reported seeing the same lights over her village at around the same time.

She said: "I was letting the dog out into the garden when I saw a bright red light and when I looked up another two red lights were following it, so I called my husband Heath to come and take a look.

"We watched and after a few minutes as they started to form into a triangle.

"We did not hear a noise like it was an aircraft. It was the strangest thing we have ever seen. Then they just moved across the sky in the triangle."

The lights were also spotted the previous night - Wednesday, September 24 - by a number of residents in the county.

Peter Davies, of Ponciau, said: "I saw the UFOs over the Rhos village at 8.15pm on Wednesday, September 24 - they were

travelling at the pace of a helicopter, yet there was no sound to suggest they were helicopters.

"Me and my sister-in-law watched as the glowing red lights, five in all, sped off across the Pen-y-Cae mountain."

Zoe Morris added: "We saw five flashing lights around quarter past eight around Ponciau.

"Three were making the V-shape and the other two were travelling much faster. We also lost reception on Channel 4."

Sceptics say the lights are nothing more than so-called Chinese lanterns, claims backed by rugby player Simon Hughes, of Rhos, who contacted the Leader on Wednesday evening.

He said: "To put everybody at rest about the UFO sightings - they are definitely lanterns. I saw four in total, three were in the triangle shape that everybody is seeing and there was one on its own only about 30 to 40 feet up.

"You could see very clearly the flame and the lantern shape. It went down in a field at the top end of Pen-y-Cae. There were several people that saw this as we were rugby training for Rhos."

What do you think of the UFO sightings over North Wales.

Have your say, and let us know of any more sightings, by leaving a comment below or emailing digitalnews.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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: Brad Sparks M<RB47x.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 08:02:52 EDT
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 18:36:45 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 17:40:58 +0100
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:32:32 -0400
>>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>>Condon was chosen because he shared the AF's contempt for the
>>phenomenon and could be counted upon to endorse the AF's
>>dismissive claims. There is not an iota of evidence that Condon
>>was either sympathetic to or even vaguely open-minded about
>>UFOs.

<snip>

>It seems fairly obvious that, after 1952, the AF came under
>direct orders from the CIA - who'd apparently been tasked by "the
>President" or more likely a group of insiders, to de-fuse and de-
>bunk the growing public interest in the subject.

This is a widespread misconception. The truth was the reverse:

The CIA took orders from the AF and was manipulated and deceived
by the AF. The AF told the CIA that UFO's should be debunked. The
AF lied to the CIA and planted IFO cases on the CIA Robertson
Panel calling them "best" UFO Unknowns, while withholding the
special AF file of UFO Unknowns from the CIA. Naturally, the
Robertson Panel came up with a very nasty negative conclusion on
UFO's, exactly as the AF wanted, when all these supposed "best
UFO's" broke down.

Ruppelt attempted to break through the AF coverup to help get the
truth to the CIA but he was under orders from his boss, Col.
Donald Bower, who forbid him from visiting CIA and delivering the
UFO investigative reports. And Ruppelt was not pro-UFO anyway, so
he was not much motivated to do much further than this.

>The alleged reason was that intense waves of public reportings
>(like in 1952) could block official lines of communication.

This "reason" was manufactured out of whole cloth by an Army
think-tank scientist who wanted more air defense work for the
Army in competition against the AF. The scientist was Thornton
Page and until he was brought in by his friend H. P. Robertson in
late December 1952 to serve on the Robertson Panel, no one had
ever even heard of this preposterous "reason" for debunking UFO's
to the public. There was not a shred of evidence of any "jamming"
of official "lines" of communication in the July 1952 UFO flap.
This is a myth that grew out of Page planting the hogwash on the
Robertson Panel which had no time to study it and merely repeated
the idea without substantiation.

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 > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 15:39:55 +0100
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 18:37:25 -0400
Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: <ufoupdates.nul>
>Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 17:40:58 +0100
>Subject: Re: The Economy's Tanking But...

>It seems fairly obvious that, after 1952, the AF came under
>direct orders from the CIA - who'd apparently been tasked by
>"the President" or more likely a group of insiders, to de-fuse
>and
>de-bunk the growing public interest in the subject.

This is indeed the usual interpretation. But I think the idea of CIA ordering the Defence Department around in 1952 is not realistic. I came independently (but much less rigorously) to basically the same conclusion as Brad Sparks on this point:-

That, on the contrary, Defence Dept interests actually suppressed and manipulated the CIA/OSI into closing down their own ambitions for a major study programme, into putting all their eggs in the basket of the Robertson Panel and into then unwillingly executing a DoD policy. The later outcome may be substantially the same as in Ray's standard scenario, but I think this short period in UFO history is vitally important and could be better understood (I posted some of these same thoughts a few years ago so apologies for ploughing old ground)

The "official" scenario that the CIA responded to Presidential curiosity sounds plausible in the light of the CIA's 1976 statement:

'In order that you may be aware of the true facts concerning the involvement of the CIA in the investigation of UFO phenomena, let me give you the following brief history. Late in 1952, the National Security Council levied upon the CIA the requirement to determine if the existence of UFOs would create a danger to the national security of the United States. The Office of Scientific Intelligence established the Intelligence Advisory Committee to study the matter. That committee made the recommendations found [in] the Robertson Panel Report. At no time prior to the formation of the Robertson Panel and subsequent to the issuance of the panel's report, has the CIA engaged in the study of the UFO phenomenon. The Robertson Panel Report is the summation of the Agency's interest and involvement in this matter.'

But this is a tissue of untruths and half-truths. The agency did not address the problem at the behest of the National Security Council; on the contrary, the CIA's Office of Scientific Intelligence fought hard to get the matter brought before the NSC. And CIA did have a clearly documented interest in the matter before the Robertson Panel Report, and continued to have an interest - though with changed emphasis - subsequently. OSI did not "establish the IAC" to do the Panel study; OSI did not even want the Panel; rather the IAC tasked the CIA/OSI against its better judgment to establish the UFO consultant panel when OSI had already been through expert consultation which it hoped would lead to a much wider inquiry. According to acting ADSI Ralph Clark they had arrived at the view that UFOs merited

community-wide attention as a result of 3=BD years monitoring of the problem, and a special study begun in July 1952 (post-Washington) which had reviewed "a considerable volume" of intelligence reports, conferred with Air Force Special Studies Group and ATIC staff, and brought in a "selected group" of CIA science consultants, "all leaders in their scientific fields", to review the problem.

On September 24, 1952, Assistant Director for Scientific Intelligence (ADSI) Dr. H. Marshall Chadwell sent a report to DCI General Walter Bedell Smith. It was the opinion of his Office, he said, based on internal review and on discussions with ATIC, the Air Force Special Studies Group and CIA science consultants, that the matter was "of such importance that it should be brought to the attention of the National Security Council . . ." This plea was repeated without success. It would hardly seem appropriate for CIA to press that the matter be "brought to the attention" of the NSC if it had been instructed by the NSC. It is of course possible that the Assistant Director of the Office of Scientific Intelligence was not informed that he would be acting at the President's direct request, but this seems very unlikely. Furthermore, Ralph Clark's July 29 memo to the DDCI announcing the formation of a "special study group" implies that the study had been undertaken by OSI unilaterally as a result of "three years' continuous review" as well as "a number of radar and visual sightings" which had occurred in recent weeks. (This obviously includes the Washington incidents, among others.) In other words, the agency - and OSI in particular - appear to have been fully cognizant of the way the problem was developing and of the need for more study, and perhaps required little if any encouragement from the office of the President.

An August 14 CIA document that mentions the White House query to the Air Force is actually the text of an agency briefing following the OSI/consultant review, and states that the review was undertaken because "OSI felt it would be timely" as well as mentioning the "wide interest within the Agency". (An important but remarkably little-known sighting by top CIA staff in May 1952 all but guarantees a lively interest within the agency from at least that date.) It thus seems clear that the CIA was acting on its own initiative to institute the process of review which led directly to ADSI Chadwell's very firm recommendation on September 24 that the CIA urge the National Security Council to attack the problem by a "communitywide coordinated effort".

During the Washington incidents UFOs had been reported in the restricted air zone around the Capitol, so it would be surprising if the White House had not shown at least some curiosity, and in fact on the morning of the 29th before the press conference AF intelligence had received a call from Brigadier General Landry, the President's air aide, relaying Truman's desire to know "what was going on" and this was plainly the "official query" referred to in the August 14 CIA document. Landry was told that the radar targets could have been weather, but that there was no proof. It's quite possible that a similar query was made to the CIA then or subsequently if Truman was unconvinced by the Air Force's public reassurances, although AFAIK there is no documentary evidence for this (?). Howsoever, ADSI Clark was already in a position to report to the DDCI on the 29th, the very same day of the White House query to the AF, that "a special study group has been formed" (my emphasis) and that its report was expected to be finished by August 15. Clearly CIA/OSI was positioned to respond thus because of its own long-standing prior interest in the phenomenon.

So although the potted "history" issued by the CIA in 1976 confirms the impression that the agency was humouring the President and merely delegated responsibility for a ruling on the UFO problem to the Robertson Panel, this was not the case. That Panel was convened some six weeks after strong recommendations for a major study programme - emphatically not another review panel - had been made to the IAC by CIA/OSI in December 1952 as a result of its own internal and consultant reviews. CIA appears to have been bulldozed by DoD into taking part in a sham.

There are many suspicious facts and anomalies, but consider only one point, CIA consultant Frederick Durant's summary in the Panel Report itself, which he opens with the dismissive observation that the CIA's scientific intelligence personnel themselves were "impressed in [sic] the lack of sound data", as were the Panel members. But we now know that OSI, for whom Durant was working,

were urging a "priority project throughout the intelligence and the defense research and development communities" to study "unexplained objects [which] are not attributable to natural phenomena or known types of aerial vehicles." CIA officers do not urge major and expensive programmes on the National Security Council on the basis of what they see as "a lack of sound data"! Why should Durant misrepresent the views of OSI in the Report when those views were well-known to the Report's DoD consumers?

And, most important, why is there no record of any demurral in the CIA record?

So far as I am aware there is not one indication in all the thousands of pages of released CIA docs, many of them trivial internal memos, of any attempt to save face, no attempt to explain OSI's ostensible misjudgement, no reproof, dispute or embarrassment at having given agency sanction to proposals which were brought within an inch of Presidential attention and literally laughed out of court by some of the most prestigious scientists in the land. (Can anyone point to such a document?) As Sherlock Holmes might have observed, the CIA dog did not bark but behaved like a whipped cur; and its internal silence implies IMO a far-reaching policy.

Durant's casual remark, suggesting that OSI were never very concerned anyway, cannot possibly have been expected to impress the Director, the Intelligence Advisory Committee, the Joint Chiefs of Staff or anyone else who knew full well what OSI's real position was. But in 1953, when the passing of a Freedom of Information Act could scarcely have been imagined, the Durant report might have been expected to impress the public, the scientific community, or Congress, all of whom would know only what the CIA chose to tell them. Durant's remark is circumstantial evidence then, internal to the Report itself, that the document may have been a product of conscious deception (as suspected by Dave Saunders and many others), and not therefore a cause of the CIA's unexplained "change of heart", but rather an element in a "change of plan" effectively imposed on the CIA. This might explain why the sanitised report was "accidentally" disclosed to McDonald in 1966 just when the Condon study was being instigated, and why it was then released piecemeal over the coming years.

When, where and with whom would such a ploy have originated? Inasmuch as the obvious watershed of these events was the Intelligence Advisory Committee meeting of December 4, 1952, there is clear evidence that the new CIA policy originated outwith the Office of Scientific Intelligence (who only two days before on December 2 had repeated their urgent recommendation that "immediate [R&D] must be undertaken") and probably outwith the agency, although it required the cooperation of the DCI. Since the composition of the IAC was overwhelmingly dominated by intelligence chiefs of the Department of Defence, the most natural hypothesis is that the new policy originated with interests in, or associated with DoD interests (specifically AF intelligence), and that the true function of the Robertson Panel report was as a set piece to provide internal justification (and plausibly-deniable public cover if and when needed) for a CIA domestic intelligence role (arguably illegal) in the execution of this policy.

The Robertson Panel study was well described, by Hynek I think, as a mere "round-table discussion". It was inadequate to its advertised purpose and it is difficult to believe that it was ever expected to be adequate.

The unseemly haste of the CIA's subsequent total capitulation does not ring true and strongly suggests a requirement of policy. On the whole the initial impression is of a set-up, a fait accompli with which the CIA/OSI found itself presented at the December 4 1952 IAC meeting - a meeting dominated by Defence Department interests.

Recall the CIA's 1976 summation of agency interest, a response which took eight months to formulate but which, in one paragraph, manages to create all kinds of confusion. That letter contained this apparent error: "The Office of Scientific Intelligence established the Intelligence Advisory Committee to study the matter. That committee made the recommendations found [in] the Robertson Panel Report." So the IAC dictated the recommendations of the Robertson Report?? Hmmm ...Mere confusion, or a revealing

slip?

Martin Shough

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2008](#) > [Sep](#) > [Sep 30](#)

Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 13:59:34 -0300
Archived: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 18:41:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>From: Viktor Golubik <Diverge247.nul>
>To: ufoupdates.nul
>Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2008 04:22:44 EDT
>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: ufoupdates.nul
>>Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2008 15:00:38 -0300
>>Subject: Re: Blanchard, Lytle And Roswell

<snip>

>>Balsa wood is used as a filler; it has no strength and doubles as
>>an airspace between two outer layers of laminated carbon-fiber
>>cloth skins. It's called composite construction.

>Hi Don,

>Yes, composite construction has a long history, whether it was
>the intended purpose or not.

>It was clearly used as a structural element in this application.

>It was used historically as a light weight structural component
>in surfboards and has a history.

>It is relevant to bring up it's improved strength since it was in
>contact with other materials that would clearly do this: The
>questioning did not challenge nor clarify enough situational
>differences.

Balsa wood has no strength to weight ratio. It needs a binding or
cloaking agent to give it any structural strength.

>"Balsa wood has a long history of being an excellent core
>material offering high compression properties, high shear
>strength, and great fatigue endurance. It has been used in a wide
>variety of applications ranging from recreational boats to high
>performance wind turbine blades."

Yeah, not so much these days.

>>Early on, Balsa was used in the construction of kit-built/home-
>>built private aircraft - which incidentally led the way with the
>>aircraft companies following along 10-20 years later - wings,
>>flaps, horizontal stabilisers, elevators, etc.

>>My CP 328 Super Emeraude airplane's flaps and horizontal
>>stabiliser are constructed in this manner.

>I've built and flown remote controlled gliders and airplanes. A
>thin coat of plastic film also adds tremendous strength.

What do yo mean by plastic film? Certainly not a binding agent
used to glue layers together. On it's own the binding agent has
no strength. If that were so more aircraft would be built using
it as a structural material rather than as a filler agent over
which to form the coverings I mentioned above including
fiberglass for boats, etc.

Just painting it with varnish -available in 1947 - would have not given it any strength whatsoever.

>Such film prevents the balsa from reaching it's fracture point and
>serves to evenly distribute an applied force over an arching type
>bend: glue, tape, paper, and/or foil can serve a similar purpose
>here.

Again you are not saying varnish but some film; such as what?

>>This type of construction is extremely light and very tough. Most
>>modern airliners have a large percentage of their bodies and
>>control surfaces constructed of composites. But Balsa was
>>abandoned in favor of foam-core - polyurethane, polystyrene,
>>diviney cell, last-a-foam and styrofoam-small cell.

>This was 60 years ago and is clearly_SMALLL_scale.

No this is present day and not the least small scale. Balsa wood
mind you is small scale.

>>Balsa wood is too expensive for even small scale private and
>>commercial applications, so high density foam core is now used -
>>see previous paragraph - a high quality styro-type-foam which is
>>not the stuff styrofoam cups or home insulation is made of. The
>>foam is shaped and then the skins are laid up over the foam and
>>then vacume bagged.

>>Kevlar, Ceramic, Graphite, E and S Glasses and other fiber
>>products can stop bullets but the foam or balsa-wood filler in
>>the sandwich would not stop a straight pin. Hence the fiber
>>application in a Humvee and armored tanks.

>The amount used was clearly not that expensive, not to mention,
>that it was obviously employed. As far as I can recall, Cavitt
>used the term "Bamboo" to describe it... and he also rejected
>that he had seen muted lavender flowered tape... on the elements.

Again I was referring to present day uses of balsa not the smaal
amounts used in the construction of radar reflectors and model
airplanes.

>It is clearly used as a light weight structural element in the
>humvee. In fact, one can make very strong, alternating-grain,
>plywood from Balsa.

Alternating-grain, plywood from Balsa is not what was used in
radar reflectors. As a plywood, it does not come close to be as
strong as - for example - finnish plywood used in both aviation
and marine applications. Finnish ply [as an example] is made from
spruce and poplar etc. Marine applications will use mahogany. No
one would trust their lives to balsa wood as a structural agent.

>>Finally, you would not see the Balsa wood nor recognize it as so
>>between the layers of cloth. Additionall, carbon dust is added to
>>the "prime" coat of sealent to defeat the damaging effect of
>>sunlight on polymer fibers and the bonding agents used to bond
>>the fiber layers together.

>It is unclear what was done and these appear to have been made in
>New York and brought there. This wood may have been pretreated in
>some fashion or bought that way. The exact glue that was used is
>also unclear.

I think you are reaching for an X-factor that did not exist by
introducing some unknown glue or varnish.

>>You can crush Balsa wood between your fingers it is so low-
>>density in nature. But it supports long enough to accept
>>coverings and vacume bagging. Since varnishes and such have no
>>strength on their own it would not support Balsa as a
>>strengthener once coated. It's only value would be water proofing
>>and or decorative not structural other than in the reflector
>>applications used on weather balloons and the Mogal arrays where
>>structural strength was not a consideration.

>You cannot easily compress 5/16 - 3/8 inch Balsa wood between
>two fingers in such a manner. Glues will only harden the surface
>making it less likely to do so.

Again it might make it harder but the glue or varnish has no shear or tension advantage.

>>Just one observation. Back in the 1920s to the 1960s [even now]
>>kids [and grown-ups] built model airplanes out of Balsa wood.

>It was not as common then as it is now - see ebay. Nor, was
>Aluminum foil (Reynolds Wrap,1947).

Oh yes it was. They were wrapping gum with "tin" foil in the 30s. And aluminum foil was not new. It is simply aluminum stock rolled to super thin layers. This technology had been around for years and was an outgrowth of aviation aluminum which is layered up from various alloys which either gives it strong shear or breaking qualities from. the most common is 2024-T3 used in many applications because of its ability to twist and endure flexing and vibration. There are many grades between that and 6061-T6 which is commonly used in military aircraft applications. It's very strong but will fail under predictable conditions which can be avoided.

Anyway this pressure layering of aluminum sheet to create various properties has been around since the mid 1920s.

>>Many of these builders ended up in the airforce or commercial or
>>private aviation. It was commonly known, not a rare model
>>construction material.

>>I find it hard to believe that Marcel or anyone else associated
>>with aviation would not know it when they saw it.

>They clearly use this word repeatedly... and we have to keep in
>mind that their testimony came 32 years after the events -
> contamination and exaggerations may have already been
>introduced.

I doubt that.

>Yes, and that is why we need to review the evidence and early
>witness testimony. It is apparent that tape recorded interviews
>are lurking somewhere - that may resolve or bring greater
>definition to these material descriptions. As it stands, we have
>some ambiguity and a Mogul balloon train is enough to quash it.

If you can prove one was there and stretch credibility as to air force personnel not knowing aluminum foil or weather balloons. The latter is ignored BTW. Neoprene balloons would have been collapsed and laying around on the desert floor and very obvious.

>Do you feel that this completely supports the existence of Extra
>Terrestrial life? Unfortunately, I'm similarly observant that it
>does not meet such standards given the resolution of this
>testimony - when faced with the nature of the similarities, the
>hype then/now, and coincidence of events.

Why would I think it supports ET life?

>Remember, Bessy Brazel recalls Mogul-like items not mentioned in
>the Roswell Incident (testimony struck) and Bill Brazel describes
>a synthetic fiber string.

How would Brazel come up with synthetic string? Nylon string is still string. It was used all through the war.

>If Mogul Balloons were not coming down in this area, clearly the
>case would take on a different fortifying level of strength in
>favor or something highly unusual.

Plural. Again, nothing different here than weather balloons so why would experienced Air Force personnel be in awe of balsa wood and neoprene balloons which they had seen every day.

<snip>

I'm really not interested enough in Roswell to get into what Brazel experienced or saw. My interest is in air force personnel suddenly getting excited about weather balloons. I don't know what happened at Roswell but the Mogul Balloon theory has been shot down ad nauseum for ten years now, chiefly because one can't be proved to even be in the area.

Anyway I put my two cents in there for what it's worth re balsa and aluminum foil. Seems damn silly to me that no one on an air force base would have not said, "What's all the excitement about, it's just a bunch of goddamn weather ballons."

As for being secret. The purpose behind Mogal might have been secret but not the trains themselves. The AF could have just claimed that they were testing new weather balloon technology to map the Jet Stream or something. The whole Mogal explanation is horse manure if you ask me.

There were any number of techs around that base that could load, arm and deliver an atomic bomb in a sophisticated aircraft maintained by well trained techs at a base loaded with other technicians who serviced radar bomb sights, radar, avionics, launched weather observation balloons but they couldn't identify a bunch of weather balloons. The whole idea is absurd.

Don Ledger

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