

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > Dec

UFO UpDates Mailing List Dec 2012

Dec 1:

[Re: In Memoriam James W. Moseley 1931-2012](#) - Don Ledger [17]

[Re: The Limits Of Fantasy - Cox](#) - Diana Cammack [12]

Dec 2:

[21st Century Alchemy - Cox](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [29]

Dec 3:

[Could Aliens Be Sending Us Signals?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [35]

Dec 4:

[Kootenay Lake Monster Boat Motor Interference](#) - Terry W. Colvin [58]

[Steiger On The Legacy Of The Sky People](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [27]

Dec 5:

[Solar Systems More Habitable Than Ours](#) - Ray Dickenson [19]

Dec 6:

[UK's Sun UFO Coverage](#) - Nick Pope [24]

[They Might Be Windmills - Cox](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [38]

Dec 7:

[Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [29]

[Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info](#) - Jerome Clark [10]

[Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info](#) - Diana Cammack [23]

[Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info](#) - Peter Davenport [59]

Dec 8:

[Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info](#) - John Velez [48]

[Better Planets At Supporting Life Than Earth?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [26]
[1965 Antarctica UFO Sightings Monograph](#) - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos [70]

Dec 9:

[Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home](#) - Martin Shough [12]

Dec 10:

[Re: Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home](#) - Robert Powell [8]
[Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Ray Dickenson [43]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Robert Powell [28]

Dec 11:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Ray Dickenson [40]
[Brazilian Air Force Pilot Report](#) - Thiago Luiz Ticchetti [30]

Dec 13:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Stanton T. Friedman [17]
['New Way to Look at Dawn of Life'](#) - Ray Dickenson [38]

Dec 14:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - David Rudiak [31]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Edward Gehrman [19]

Dec 15:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Jerome Clark [10]
[Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12](#) - Diana Cammack [21]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Michael Tarbell [20]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Ray Dickenson [21]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Geoff Blackmore [28]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - John Harney [17]
[Re: NatGeo US's Secret History Of UFOs](#) - Ole Henningsen [16]

Dec 16:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Stanton T. Friedman [27]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - David Rudiak [86]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Edward Gehrman [32]
[Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12](#) - Don Ledger [12]

Dec 17:

[Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12](#) - Diana Cammack [11]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Jerome Clark [25]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Edward Gehrman [31]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Albert Baier [60]

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Michael Tarbell [45]
[Convergent Evolution](#) - Edward Gehrman [22]
[FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About](#) - Ray Dickenson [34]
[Re: FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About](#) - William Treurniet [17]
[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - Stanton T. Friedman [23]

Dec 18:

[Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation](#) - David Rudiak [99]
[Re: Convergent Evolution](#) - David Rudiak [36]
[Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning](#) - Terry W. Colvin [42]
[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - John Donaldson [149]

Dec 19:

[Re: Convergent Evolution](#) - Edward Gehrman [20]
[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - Robert Powell [16]
[Re: Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning](#) - Bruce Maccabee [37]
[Artificial Intelligence](#) - John Donaldson [21]
['Earth-Like Planet' Detected Close To Nearby Star](#) - Ray Dickenson [61]
[Tau Ceti Goldilocks Planet](#) - Martin Shough [26]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - William Treurniet [41]

Dec 20:

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Don Ledger [11]
[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - Don Ledger [11]
[Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Don Ledger [38]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [35]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [48]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - John Donaldson [66]
[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - John Donaldson [33]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Ray Dickenson [18]

Dec 21:

[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - Robert Powell [23]
[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Vincent Boudreau [31]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [39]
[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - David Rudiak [69]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Rick Nielsen [12]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - William Treurniet [24]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Albert Baier [51]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Ray Dickenson [36]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [22]
[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [52]

Dec 22:

[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - David Rudiak [78]
[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Don Ledger [41]
[Re: UFO Photo From Scotland](#) - Sean Jones [20]

Dec 23:

[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Bruce Maccabee [119]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - John Donaldson [110]

[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - John Donaldson [35]

Dec 24:

[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Martin Shough [17]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [35]

[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - Robert Powell [38]

[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - Jerome Clark [12]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - William Treurniet [51]

[For 'Tis The Season](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [10]

Dec 25:

[Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'](#) - David Rudiak [34]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Jason Gammon [54]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - Eleanor White [15]

[Greetings From Paris](#) - Denis R. Denocla [24]

Dec 26:

[Re: Greetings From Paris](#) - John Velez [13]

Dec 27:

[Re: Greetings From Paris](#) - Gildas Bourdais [32]

[Cleaning Up Science](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]

Dec 28:

[UFO FOTOCAT Blog Update - December 2012](#) - Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos [21]

[USAF's Special Crop Circle Investigative Unit!?](#) - Rich Heiden [18]

Dec 29:

[PRG Update - December 28, 2012](#) - Stephen G Bassett [163]

Dec 30:

[Strange UFO Encounters](#) - Sheryl Gottschall [73]

Dec 31:

[Philip Klass And The FBI](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [44]

[And The World Didn'T End, Either - Cox](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [43]

[Re: Artificial Intelligence](#) - John Donaldson [108]

[Re: UFO Photographs And Film](#) - John Donaldson [81]

Dec 22:

[How Much Green Did This Stock Land in Your Pockets?](#) - "Teddy Madison" [6]

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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: In Memoriam James W. Moseley 1931-2012

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2012 13:44:27 -0400
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2012 05:35:07 -0500
Subject: Re: In Memoriam James W. Moseley 1931-2012

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2012 10:45:59 -0600
>Subject: Re: In Memoriam James W. Moseley 1931-2012

>>From: Virgilio Salnchez Ocejo <virgilioosanchezocejo.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2012 11:29:16 -0500
>>Subject: Re: In Memoriam James W. Moseley 1931-2012

>>Jim Moseley lived in Key West in an old, two floors, wooden
>>house, renting the upstairs to tourists. He lived alone
>>surrounded by cats. He had a daughter who lived in Fort
>>Lauderdale and visited her occasionally.

>>Several times we exchanged mails and on two occasions we visited
>>him. Many feared for his satires, however, personally he was
>>cordial and simple. Good thing he never included me in his
>>satires!

>>May he rest in peace!

>A lot of twaddle has been written and said about Jim Moseley
>since he died - by which I don't mean the above, which is well
>expressed and touching - and so his true significance is being
>lost. Jim may not have been a great thinker or a great
>researcher, but he was a great Jim Moseley, and that's why we'll
>remember him.

>I sure do miss him. My mail feels empty without his regular
>letters.

This is probably the best post I've seen about the death of
Jim Moseley. John Rimmer trying to make it appear that Moseley
was a mover or shaker in this arena was a bit ridiculous. I saw
no impact as a result of Moseley's newsletter. It was more of a
Jay Leno type poke at whatever or whomever was in vogue at the
time without any deep thinking on actual actual subject.

I don't believe in any afterlife. I hope Moseley's life was a
happy and fulfilling one and he did more with his time than just
poke fun at the phenomenon.

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and

are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 1](#)

Re: The Limits Of Fantasy - Cox

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Sat, 1 Dec 2012 13:13:34 +0200
Archived: Sat, 01 Dec 2012 06:28:34 -0500
Subject: Re: The Limits Of Fantasy - Cox

>Source: Billy Cox's Blog De Void
>><http://tinyurl.com/d34hb76>

>Wednesday, November 28, 2012

>The Limits Of Fantasy
>by Billy Cox

Can someone remind me of the popular sci-fi books/author of say,
+20 yr ago, with technological civilization vs. humans... pre-
dated Borg.

I think it was more than one book??

Diana

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 2](#)

21st Century Alchemy - Cox

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Sun, 02 Dec 2012 20:01:22 -0500
Archived: Sun, 02 Dec 2012 20:01:22 -0500
Subject: 21st Century Alchemy - Cox

Source: Billy Cox's Blog De Void

<http://devoid.blogs.heraldtribune.com/13436/21st-century-alchemy/>

Saturday, December 1, 2012

21st Century Alchemy
by Billy Cox

Well talk about dumb luck. Nighttime lights in the sky over Cape Coral in southwest Florida just happened to catch the attention of Fox 4, aka WFTX-TV, during ratings month. What are the odds. And it wrung blood from this cinderblock since mid-November. Four UFO stories in three weeks, and De Void's only regret is having missed the totally awesome prime-time teasers, which had to go something like this: "Stay tuned - we've got some out of this world video you won't want to miss!" "Coming up at 11 - UFO footage that may summon your inner Scully and Mulder - and make you a believer!" "Did a Lee County couple have a close encounter with ET? We'll beam you up at the top of the hour!"

Here's an installment from Nov. 27 - check it out. A sweeps-weeks slacker classic. Click it. Go ahead. Click the sucker. Then ask yourself: Would this have run without the cell-phone video? Then ask yourself: Is it humanly possible for this cell-phone video to be any less informative and more pedestrian?

[More at site... thanks to 'The Norm' for the lead]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 3](#)

Could Aliens Be Sending Us Signals?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2012 19:56:51 -0500
Archived: Mon, 03 Dec 2012 19:56:51 -0500
Subject: Could Aliens Be Sending Us Signals?

Source: TimeMagazine.Com

<http://tinyurl.com/bop9dxb>

Nov. 28, 2012

Flickering Stars: Could Aliens Be Sending Us Signals?
By Michael D. Lemonick

When scientists go out looking for research funding, it helps if their projects aren't all that exciting. Excitement usually goes with the most speculative, cutting-edge science, but funding agencies usually prefer to put their money on projects that seem likely to bear fruit. "You pretty much have to demonstrate that you've already done half the work to demonstrate it's feasible," says Lucianne Walkowicz, a postdoctoral fellow in astrophysics based at Princeton University.

By that standard, Walkowicz's latest project shouldn't be getting any funding at all. She wants to conduct a search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI), not by doing anything so conventional as listening for radio transmissions =El la Jodie Foster in Contact, or watching for flashes of laser light. Instead, she wants to see if ET's are somehow manipulating the light coming from their stars so that they wink at us =97 a long shot if ever there was one, especially since she has no clue how they might go about it.

(More: [How You =97 Or Anyone =97 Can Help Find ET](#))

But thanks to a program titled New Frontiers In Astronomy And Cosmology, funded by the John Templeton foundation and administered by the University of Chicago, Walkowicz is getting her chance.

[More at site... thanks to Diana Cammack for the lead]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Kootenay Lake Monster Boat Motor Interference

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2012 15:06:04 +0700 (GMT+07:00)
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2012 20:01:00 -0500
Subject: Kootenay Lake Monster Boat Motor Interference

[fortean1] Kootenay Lake Monster
Date: Dec 4, 2012 2:35 PM

[Vehicle engine interference is a commonly reported attribute of UFOs, but the case below is the first instance I've come across of a boat's motor being similarly affected in the presence of a lake monster. As I recall, there's an account or two in the Bords' *Bigfoot Casebook* of cars that failed to start when Bigfoot was lurking in the vicinity -- and that's the little I know about cryptids shutting down engines and motors. Ghosts have been known to stop cars, and witches traditionally have the power to stop wagons, and sometimes a countercharm -- such as the one used by one of the boat passengers -- is effective in getting the horses moving again. -- bc]

John Kirk, In The Domain Of The Lake Monsters (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1998), p. 188.

Only one interview has ever been obtained from a living witness of a Kootenay Lake monster and it was due to the diligent detective work of the late Jim Clark who managed to track down Naomi Miller, a resident of the small lakeside community of Wasa in 1937. Miller's story is a fascinating one and here is her own account of what took place:

"Our family always used a boat to go to Kaslo from our home at Shutty Beach, four miles north on the shore of Kootenay Lake. Many of our neighbours were forced, in those depression years, to walk to town to do their errands and to walk home again. The Williams family, who lived less than half-a-mile from us, were among those who had no boat, no horse and no car. One day Mr. Williams came to our door, explaining that he had an urgent errand in Kaslo. Could he please have a ride to town? My father willingly let him use one of our boats with a small outboard motor. It was also agreed that my brother and I (aged six and ten) would accompany him to do a few errands.

Errands accomplished, we enjoyed a sunny July day and a crystal clear lake as the motor purred driving us homeward. We rounded the "Big Point" and were barely out of sight of Kaslo when the motor coughed and stopped. Moments later we were aware of a ripple just ahead of the boat. A black head reared followed by at least one hump above the water some eight feet behind us. This weird creature swam between our boat and the shore to a position behind us. We sat hypnotized until the "Ogopogo" dived with a gurgling sound into the calm water. Mr. Williams made the sign of the cross [...], twice, to protect himself from evil. He then pulled the starting cord and the outboard motor responded as if nothing had happened. We do not know what we saw, but agree that it was longer than our 16 foot boat, and three of us in it that July day in 1937."

Terry W. Colvin
Ladphrao (Bangkok), Thailand
Pran Buri (Hua Hin), Thailand
<http://terrycolvin.freewebsites.com/>
[Terry's Fortean & "Work" itty-bitty site]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 4](#)

Steiger On The Legacy Of The Sky People

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2012 20:08:17 -0500
Archived: Tue, 04 Dec 2012 20:08:17 -0500
Subject: Steiger On The Legacy Of The Sky People

Source: Examiner.Com

<http://tinyurl.com/d5nkxkc>

December 4, 2012

Brad Steiger On The Legacy Of The Sky People And The Serpent
Race
By: Jeffery Pritchett

An excellent opportunity with Brad Steiger to get into the new
book Legacy Of The Sky People: The Extraterrestrial Origin Of
Adam And Eve; The Garden Of Eden; Noah's Ark And The Serpent
Race.

Edited by Timothy Beckley with such authors as Nick Redfern,
Giorgio Tsoukalos, Sean Casteel, and Tim Swartz contributing to
this opus.

Inspired by Brinsley LePoer Trench's work which declared two
races of space beings - Jehovahs and Elohim - The Sky People -
had come to Earth millions of years ago and began the act of
creation that resulted in human beings.

I hope you will enjoy this interview as much as I have.

Presenting:

[More at site...]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 5](#)

Solar Systems More Habitable Than Ours

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2012 10:44:05 -0000
Archived: Wed, 05 Dec 2012 08:45:34 -0500
Subject: Solar Systems More Habitable Than Ours

Hello List,

Looks like the odds given by Drake Equation are increasing yet again:

<http://phys.org/news/2012-12-life-solar-habitable.html>

[Quotation Begins]

"Search for life suggests solar systems more habitable than ours. Of the eight solar twins they've studied so far, seven appear to contain much more thorium than our sun - which suggests that any planets orbiting those stars probably contain more thorium, too. That, in turn, means that the interior of the planets are probably warmer than ours."

[Quotation Ends]

It's worth recalling, as reminded by Sagan and others, if it weren't for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, Earth would be solid ice from pole to pole - 'Snowball Earth' - because we're actually just outside of the local Goldilocks zone.

Cheers

Ray D

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

UK's Sun UFO Coverage

From: Nick Pope <nick.nul>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2012 02:47:02 +0100 (CET)
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2012 08:54:54 -0500
Subject: UK's Sun UFO Coverage

On December 2 The Sun (the UK's best-selling daily newspaper) published an 8-page pullout on UFOs.

I wrote most of the feature, which includes material on some of the world's best-known UFO cases, including Roswell and Rendlesham Forest, material from MoD's UFO files, information on UFO hotspots, cases involving near-misses between UFOs and aircraft, a UFO timeline, material on alien abductions, quotes from celebrities, photos, humorous anecdotes and much more besides:

<http://www.nickpope.net/latest-news.htm>

Needless to say, some of the material will be familiar to ufologists. It's not written for them, but for the wider public. Getting 8 pages of positive coverage of the UFO phenomenon into a mainstream newspaper is without precedent so far as I'm aware.

Best wishes,

Nick Pope
www.nickpope.net

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 6](#)

They Might Be Windmills - Cox

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2012 12:00:04 -0500
Archived: Thu, 06 Dec 2012 12:00:04 -0500
Subject: They Might Be Windmills - Cox

Source: Billy Cox's Blog De Void

<http://tinyurl.com/bwoe633>

Wednesday, December 5, 2012

They Might Be Windmills
by Billy Cox

In 2001, mercurial researcher Steven Greer assembled an intriguing but checkered cast of 20-plus people - military and government types, mostly - to publicly allege a massive UFO coverup by the federal government. Six years later, investigative journalist Leslie Kean helped organize a press conference anchored by a stellar international panel of eyewitnesses, all of whom would provide the testimonial foundation of her 2010 bestseller, *UFOs: Generals, Pilots and Government Officials Go On the Record*. Also in 2010, *UFOs and Nukes* author Robert Hastings organized half a dozen retired Air Force veterans to discuss their experiences with UFO activity over America's nuclear weapons facilities.

Aside from the subject matter, what all three had in common was the venue - the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. It was chosen for its proximity to the political center of the civilized world in hopes of nudging the MSM into doing a little spadework of its own. We all know how that worked out.

But yo yo yo, look who's booked the NPC stage for the spring of 2013 - erstwhile X Conferenc" director Steve Bassett. He's been there many times before, and the last production, in 2010, saddled him with about \$20,000 in debt. But that was then. Today, with an assist from a benefactor whose name he declines to reveal, Bassett says he has a clean ledger and \$1.1 million for his next project, which he's calling a Citizen Hearing on Disclosure.

[More at site... thanks to Dave Haith for the lead]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2012 09:33:11 -0500
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2012 09:33:11 -0500
Subject: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

Source: Robert Salas' Facebook page

www.facebook.com/robert.salas1

Friday 7 December 2012

I don't usually pay much attention to schlock TV of this kind (meant to shock, titillate, entertain, amaze, and amuse).

<http://tinyurl.com/bp7uz7r>

However, in this case, kudos to Jesse Ventura for shining some light on Robert Bigelow. He and his minions have been acquiring (and buying) information, data, and... on the UFO phenomenon for some time; not only in the U.S. but also other countries.

Ventura did ask Bigelow an important question - Why is his company specified in a U.S. government (FAA) document as the one entity to send reports of UFO sightings? Bigelow only replied - "It's a long story."

BTW, it is the responsibility of the FAA to monitor and control our air space with respect to all things that fly in it! They have no right to delegate that responsibility! John Alexander, an associate of Bigelow, admitted that he was somehow involved in 'setting' up Bigelow with this authority to collect UFO info.

Clearly, these two are 'players' with government connections.

The better question is where do they fit in this 'Zero-Sum' game with the international UFO Cabal?

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2012 09:04:59 -0600
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2012 22:47:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

On Dec 7, 2012, at 8:33 AM, UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Robert Salas' Facebook page

>www.facebook.com/robert.salas1

>Friday 7 December 2012

>I don't usually pay much attention to schlock TV of this kind
>(meant to shock, titillate, entertain, amaze, and amuse).

><http://tinyurl.com/bp7uz7r>

>However, in this case, kudos to Jesse Ventura for shining some
>light on Robert Bigelow. He and his minions have been acquiring
>(and buying) information, data, and... on the UFO phenomenon
>for some time; not only in the U.S. but also other countries.

>Ventura did ask Bigelow an important question - Why is his
>company specified in a U.S. government (FAA) document as the one
>entity to send reports of UFO sightings? Bigelow only replied -
>"It's a long story."

Somebody watches Jesse Ventura's TV show?

Jerry Clark

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2012 20:01:20 +0200
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2012 22:52:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

On Dec 7, 2012, at 8:33 AM, UFO UpDates - Toronto posted:

>Source: Robert Salas' Facebook page

>www.facebook.com/robert.salas1

>Friday 7 December 2012

>I don't usually pay much attention to schlock TV of this kind
>(meant to shock, titillate, entertain, amaze, and amuse).

><http://tinyurl.com/bp7uz7r>

>However, in this case, kudos to Jesse Ventura for shining some
>light on Robert Bigelow.

<snip>

List,

Ventura's conclusion is typical of conspiracy stuff - in one sentence they say Earth is in danger of attack by aliens, and in the next, there is an apocalypse coming which aliens have told us about (so Bigelow is building a space station as an 'escape pod' for him and a few others (pity them if it's long term)... Too little evidence and a lot of hype.

Anyway, tell me what is behind the claim by MUFON lady that Bigelow paid off MUFON in 2009, and replaced its researchers with his own, and has since then kept secret any info coming in to MUFON on UFOs? And is there any further info on why FAA directs people to Bigelow's company when it gets reports of UFOs?

Diana

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 7](#)

Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

From: Peter Davenport <director.nul>
Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2012 18:47:26 -0800
Archived: Fri, 07 Dec 2012 22:57:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

>Source: Robert Salas' Facebook page

>www.facebook.com/robert.salas1

>Friday 7 December 2012

>I don't usually pay much attention to schlock TV of this kind
>(meant to shock, titillate, entertain, amaze, and amuse).

><http://tinyurl.com/bp7uz7r>

>However, in this case, kudos to Jesse Ventura for shining some
>light on Robert Bigelow.

This issue first came to my attention at NUFORC on June 21, 2000, I believe it was. NIDS released a statement, on that date, to the effect that, in the future, all UFO sighting reports made to FAA facilities would be shunted to Bigelow's organization in Las Vegas.

In very short order, I contacted the FAA in Washington, D.C., to inquire whether the report was accurate, and after a considerable amount of unnecessary bureaucratic delay, the FAA finally confirmed that they thought the claim appeared to be correct... although they could not be sure. (!!)

I immediately lodged a complaint with the FAA, and, for months, was handed from one office to another. Interestingly, no one in the FAA could determine who it was who had made the decision, although some of the individuals with whom I spoke suggested one office, or another, certainly must have been the source of the new policy...

I retained the services of an attorney, who wrote a letter, contesting the new policy. After that letter, and more than some twenty months of haggling with employees at FAA headquarters, I still did not know who it was who had made the decision, and it was painfully evident that nobody wanted to take responsibility for the apparent change!

I finally wrote a letter, requesting that the FAA place the names and contact information in the Airman's Information Manual for six major UFO organizations, NUFORC, MUFON, CUFOS, FUFOR, NARCAP, and NIDS. In the final analysis, they published the names and contact numbers of just two, NUFORC and NIDS, contact information for which can be seen in the 2004 edition of the AIM.

The full story of what NIDS' and Alexander's roles in all of this were would be interesting to know. Clearly, the initial attempt to have a revision to the AIM effected was done under the "cover of darkness." The only remaining question would be how the FAA personnel were motivated to make the change. The fact that no one in the FAA appeared to want to take responsibility for the change was intriguing, I felt.

The bottom line to all of this is that NUFORC, and I presume,

other UFO organizations as well, still receive telephone calls from FAA facilities and personnel. I believe that I receive as many calls over the NUFORC Hotline from FAA stations and control towers as we always did, so I suspect that whatever changes BAASS and Alexander (?) were able to elicit have not had much effect. There apparently are many people in the FAA, who are aware of NUFORC, and who routinely call our Center every year to confirm that we are still in operation.

I invite the UFO community to keep in mind the above incident, when considering whether they wish to co-operate with Bigelow's team. There have been other unexplained incidents that may lead in their direction, as well, I believe, but absent proof, it is pointless to address them here.

Peter
National UFO Reporting Centre

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2012 04:55:31 -0500
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2012 06:34:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

>From: Peter Davenport <director.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 7 Dec 2012 18:47:26 -0800
>Subject: Re: Ventura Bigelow FAA & UFO Info

>>Source: Robert Salas' Facebook page

>>www.facebook.com/robert.salas1

>>Friday 7 December 2012

>>I don't usually pay much attention to schlock TV of this kind
>>(meant to shock, titillate, entertain, amaze, and amuse).

>><http://tinyurl.com/bp7uz7r>

>>However, in this case, kudos to Jesse Ventura for shining some
>>light on Robert Bigelow.

>This issue first came to my attention at NUFORC on June 21,
>2000, I believe it was. NIDS released a statement, on that date,
>to the effect that, in the future, all UFO sighting reports made
>to FAA facilities would be shunted to Bigelow's organization in
>Las Vegas.

<snip>

>I invite the UFO community to keep in mind the above incident,
>when considering whether they wish to co-operate with Bigelow's
>team. There have been other unexplained incidents that may lead
>in their direction, as well, I believe, but absent proof, it is
>pointless to address them here.

>Peter
>National UFO Reporting Centre

Hello Peter, All,

I have a question you can pass on to your lawyer for me, if you will. Some explanatory background first: I know for a fact that John Carpenter, who was in charge of the MUFON Abduction Project at the time, had access to files that were being submitted by researchers across the country for the database they were assembling. He had been selling their abduction research files to Robert Bigelow. I provided evidence (including confirmation from John Alexander and Carpenters wife herself,) at the time I made the indictment. I'm not going to repeat all that here.

I raised a huge and very public stink about it on this very List in the late 90's. Many abductees expressed deep concern over this situation at the time. Other than Carpenter being booted out of MUFON shortly afterward, nothing ever came of it. I never lost my anger and distrust for Bigelow though.

My question for your lawyer is;

Is there a statute of limitation for initiating a lawsuit for invasion of privacy? Given that it's all older than 13 years ago, I seriously doubt we have a legal-leg to stand on. What a

screw job. I'm sure this post will only serve to provide me with a little therapeutic catharsis, but little of any practical use against, Bigelow.

I'm talking about Files which contain very personal and possibly career and life altering/damaging information about the individuals involved. Hypnosis sessions, interviews, names, addresses, places of business, personal family information, medical records, psychological evaluations - the lot.

Let me know what your lawyer has to say. I'd be interested to know if there is any legal recourse against Bigelow or NIDS for the abductees who had their files sold to Bigelow by various researchers.

Hell of a private funding source for research eh? Sell out the witnesses. Mercenary douche-bags.

I'm even more curious if Bigelow's deal with the Feds was/is a 'two way street'! That stuff may have ended up in the files of one of those alphabet soup gubbamint agencies for all anyone knows. CIA, FBI, NSA, ONI?

Boy, did seeing this thread hit a sore spot with me!

Warmest regards to all my old cohorts,

John

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

Better Planets At Supporting Life Than Earth?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Sat, 08 Dec 2012 06:40:06 -0500
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2012 06:40:06 -0500
Subject: Better Planets At Supporting Life Than Earth?

Source: TheAtlantic.Com

<http://tinyurl.com/bdxgkyx>

Dec 6 2012

Are There Planets Better At Supporting Life Than Earth?
Megan Garber

There is, in this crazy world, one thing we know for sure: Our world is the world. Our planet is the planet - for creating life, for supporting life, for letting us humans and our fellow species become what we are. And so, as we take our first tentative steps from a warm, watery Earth out into the universe, we set our sights toward the worlds that look like the one we know - toward planets that are, in their way, "Earth-like".

But: What if there are planets that are better at being Earth-like than Earth itself? What if there are worlds that are more homey than home? What if other planets are better at supporting life than our own?

It's a possibility, actually, according to new work coming out of Ohio State

[More at site... thanks to Diana Cammack for the lead]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 8](#)

1965 Antarctica UFO Sightings Monograph

From: **Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos** <ballesterolmos.nul>
Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2012 14:07:39 +0000 (GMT)
Archived: Sat, 08 Dec 2012 12:47:05 -0500
Subject: 1965 Antarctica UFO Sightings Monograph

Announcing publication of the monograph:

Avistamientos Ovni En La Antartida En 1965

UFO Sightings In Antarctica in 1965

FOTOCAT Report #3

Dear Friends,

We are pleased to announce the release of FOTOCAT Report #3. Titled - in Spanish - Avistamientos Ovni En La Antartida En 1965 UFO Sightings in Antarctica in 1965 and it is the result of six years of methodical and patient research, which has had the collaboration of many scholars, experts and consultants from several countries, as well as from some of the eyewitnesses themselves.

Several of these events have appeared profusely and repeatedly in the UFO literature because of the observers' status - most were military - because of the remote environment where they happened, because of the alleged existence of recorded magnetic interference, because pictures were taken, and because of the extraordinary media coverage they enjoyed at the time.

In this monograph, the authors believe they have carried out the most comprehensive and detailed possible studies as per the existing sources - of 10 UFO sightings

We have requested the opinions of three experienced researchers from Europe, USA and Latin America, and we are happy to share their commentaries here:

"I was impressed by the obviously thorough attention to detail and the presentation. It looks to me like a superb piece of work. I hope it is as well received as it no doubt deserves to be." --Martin Shough

"With publication of this report, we finally see the truth behind a decades-old series of events that have puzzled and intrigued those who are fascinated with peculiar aerial phenomena. UFO reports are not always what they initially seem to be, as revealed by this inspired group of researchers, and the result of their inquiry is a much clearer and correct view of history. It is an excellent report." --Barry Greenwood

"This monograph shows a patient and thorough work and it convincingly proves four things: 1) The immense value of experts associating internationally for case analysis; 2) That scientific and military personnel are not exempt from having a romantic or fantastic view of the subject, so distorting their own assessments; 3) That the internal contradictions, serious inaccuracies and discrepancies of the stories take away their validity as evidence of strange phenomena; 4) The unfortunate role played by the mass media, which unscrupulously misrepresent the facts." --Milton Hourcade)

We trust that the present study will interest you and will serve

to put into a true perspective this interesting series of UFO sightings.

The paper can be downloaded online from:

<http://tinyurl.com/avistamientos-ovni-antartida>

This essay has been written in Spanish; however, English-speaking readers will find the following sections in English language:

- 1) Page 2, the paper's abstract
- 2) Page 129, Table V, it summarizes the main data for each of the 10 analyzed UFO observations
- 3) Pages 116 to 121, the paper Conclusions

Sincerely,

V.J. Ballester Olmos Corresponding author: ballesterolmos.nul
M. Borraz Aymerich
H. Janosch Gonzalez-Allez
J.C. Victorio Uranga

December 2012

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 9](#)

Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2012 17:25:39 -0000
Archived: Sun, 09 Dec 2012 12:39:10 -0500
Subject: Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home

Sir Patrick Moore, 89, Dies At Home

Astronomer and broadcaster Sir Patrick Moore has died at his home at the age of 89, a group of his friends and staff say.

Read on Sky News:

<http://news.sky.com/skynews/Article/20121211022912>

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2012 15:34:08 -0600
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 06:28:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Sir Patrick Moore 89 Dies At Home

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: <post.nul>,
>Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2012 17:25:39 -0000
>Subject: Sir Patrick Moore, 89, Dies At Home

>Sir Patrick Moore, 89, Dies At Home

>Astronomer and broadcaster Sir Patrick Moore has died at his
>home at the age of 89, a group of his friends and staff say.

>Read on Sky News:

><http://news.sky.com/skynews/Article/20121211022912>

A true icon of his time.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 06:31:16 -0500
Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

Hello List, another update to our view of the Drake Equation:

At Last, How Many Alien Civilizations Are There?

<http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html>

[Quotation Begins]

"Although the numerical results were not his objective, Maccone estimated with his SDE that our galaxy may harbor 4,590 extraterrestrial civilizations. Assuming the same values for each term the Classical Drake Equation estimates only 3,500. So the SDE adds more than 1,000 civilizations to the previous estimate.

Another SDE advantage is to incorporate the standard variation concept, which shows how much variation exists from the average value. In this case the standard variation concept is pretty high: 11,195. In other words, besides human society, zero to 15,785 advanced technological societies could exist in the Milky Way. If those galactic societies were equally spaced, they could be at an average distance of 28,845 light-years apart.

That's too far to have a dialogue with them, even through electromagnetic radiation traveling in the speed of light. So, even with such a potentially high number of advanced civilizations, interstellar communication would still be a major technological challenge. Still, according to SDE, the average distance we should expect to find any alien intelligent life form may be 2,670 light-years from Earth.

There is a 75% chance we could find ET between 1,361 and 3,979 light-years away. 500 light-years away, the chance of detecting any signal from an advanced civilization approaches zero. And that is exactly the range in which our present technology is searching for extraterrestrial radio signals.

So, the "Great Silence" detected by our radio telescopes is not discouraging at all. Our signals just need to travel a little farther - at least 900 light years more - before they have a high chance of coming across an advanced alien civilization."

[Quotation Ends]

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced

without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 10](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 09:02:14 -0600
Archived: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 12:47:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
>Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>Hello List, another update to our view of the Drake Equation:

>At Last, How Many Alien Civilizations Are There?

><http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html>

>[Quotation Begins]

>"Although the numerical results were not his objective, Maccone
>estimated with his SDE that our galaxy may harbor 4,590
>extraterrestrial civilizations. Assuming the same values for
>each term the Classical Drake Equation estimates only 3,500. So
>the SDE adds more than 1,000 civilizations to the previous
>estimate.

Although the Drake equation is fun to play with, this is a good example of the old adage, "garbage in - garbage out."

>Another SDE advantage is to incorporate the standard variation
>concept, which shows how much variation exists from the average
>value. In this case the standard variation concept is pretty
>high: 11,195. In other words, besides human society, zero to
>15,785 advanced technological societies could exist in the Milky
>Way. If those galactic societies were equally spaced, they could
>be at an average distance of 28,845 light-years apart.

The author of the physics article contradicts himself in his use of the Drake equation. On one hand he says that the latter terms in the equation are so speculative that the values are determined more by one's beliefs than by scientific evidence. But then he turns right around and tries to draw some very specific conclusions using the numbers that he "chooses" to put into the equation.

The later terms are highly speculative, and the values one may attribute to each of them might tell more about a person's beliefs than about scientific facts.

Read more at:

<http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html#jCp>

The later terms are highly speculative, and the values one may attribute to each of them might tell more about a person's beliefs than about scientific facts.

Read more at:

<http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html#jCp>

>That's too far to have a dialogue with them, even through
>electromagnetic radiation traveling in the speed of light. So,
>even with such a potentially high number of advanced
>civilizations, interstellar communication would still be a major

>technological challenge. Still, according to SDE, the average
>distance we should expect to find any alien intelligent life
>form may be 2,670 light-years from Earth.

>There is a 75% chance we could find ET between 1,361 and 3,979
>light-years away. 500 light-years away, the chance of detecting
>any signal from an advanced civilization approaches zero. And
>that is exactly the range in which our present technology is
>searching for extraterrestrial radio signals.

>So, the "Great Silence" detected by our radio telescopes is not
>discouraging at all. Our signals just need to travel a little
>farther - at least 900 light years more - before they have a high
>chance of coming across an advanced alien civilization."

The argument about the "Great Silence" continues. There is
nothing in the article that convinces me otherwise.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 20:29:49 -0000
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2012 05:43:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 09:02:14 -0600
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
>>Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Hello List, another update to our view of the Drake Equation:

>>At Last, How Many Alien Civilizations Are There?
>><http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html>

<snip>

>Although the Drake equation is fun to play with, this is a good
>example of the old adage, "garbage in - garbage out."

<snip>

>The author of the physics article contradicts himself in his use
>of the Drake equation. On one hand he says that the latter terms
>in the equation are so speculative that the values are
>determined more by one's beliefs than by scientific evidence.
>But then he turns right around and tries to draw some very
>specific conclusions using the numbers that he "chooses" to put
>into the equation.

>The later terms are highly speculative, and the values one may
>attribute to each of them might tell more about a person's
>beliefs than about scientific facts.

<snip>

>The argument about the "Great Silence" continues. There is
>nothing in the article that convinces me otherwise.

Quite right Robert, although much of 'big science' has always
been about beliefs rather than evidence.

Examining history we find that the science establishment holds
on to a central theme: that humans are the only intelligent
life, and that Earth (and the Universe) has a shortest-possible
past and a close and doomed future.

They have always been reluctant to accept evidence going against
those 'beliefs', clinging on after the facts were obvious - like
the victory of geological data over the "6,000 year-old Earth"
for instance.

Indeed, if you check today's paradigm of Big Bang, Inflation,
Dark Matter, Dark Energy etc you find it's merely a modern
extension of that old central theme, and based only on
'beliefs'. I.e. there's no compelling evidence for any of it -
it's mostly non-falsifiable and therefore non-scientific.

Some folk say today's evidence contradicts that establishment

paradigm, see:

UNIVERSE The Cosmology Quest

www.youtube.com/watch?v=YfE7doPzm5I

Returning to the classic Drake Equation, I tend to think many of its factors are deemed to be unrealistically small. That is, an unbiased look at modern data would make its output hundreds or thousands of times higher.

Even so, the equation is only a statistical estimate of probabilities. Real life, some quirk of the history of the nearby Universe, might bring a very unexpected 'solution' to our attention at any time.

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 11](#)

Brazilian Air Force Pilot Report

From: **Thiago Luiz Ticchetti** <ticchetti.nul>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2012 02:53:44 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Tue, 11 Dec 2012 07:58:09 -0500
Subject: Brazilian Air Force Pilot Report

Hello List,

Last weekend I delivered a lecture during the I UFOZ - International UFO Forum in Foz do Iguasu.

My lecture was about pilots and theirs experiences with UFOs.

For more than 4 months I research reports from them. I got six amazing and unknown cases. One is bellow.

One of six e-mails reports from Brazilian air force pilots that had a close encounter with a UFO:

Date: January 3rd, 1982

We took off from Santa Maria (Rio Grande do Sul state) to routine flight and check of new equipment. We were two F-5 jets.

Around 5.000 feets my college in the other plane contacted me asking if there was a traffic hotel near to us. I said no. So he told me to look at 3 o'clock.

It was when I saw a dark object, metallic like, flying 1.000 m from us. I checked with the control in Santa Maria Air Force Base if they were getting something on their radar. The answer was negative. But my college and I were!

We tried to approach. We got pretty close, but soon the object raised and kept stationary above us for 30 seconds until it accelerated to space and disappeared. When we landed, we wrote a report and never talked about it again.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: **Stanton T. Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2012 20:42:06 -0400
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 07:18:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
>Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>Hello List, another update to our view of the Drake Equation:

>At Last, How Many Alien Civilizations Are There?

><http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html>

This is pretty silly. Drake vastly underestimated the number of planets in the Milky way... see the results of the Kepler spacecraft. He also totally neglected the two processes involved in distributing people around earth, namely colonization and migration.

Travel has changed greatly as well... Magellan's ship took 3 years to go around the planet. The Space station does it in 90 minutes. You get some idea of why I think SETI stands for Silly Effort To Investigate.

Stan Friedman

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 13](#)

'New Way to Look at Dawn of Life'

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 08:09:38 -0000
Archived: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 07:22:10 -0500
Subject: 'New Way to Look at Dawn of Life'

Hello List,

Here's a new article on a difficult question - titled 'New Way to Look at Dawn of Life'

www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/12/121212205918.htm

[Quotation Begins]

We propose that the transition from non-life to life is unique and definable," added Davies. "We suggest that life may be characterized by its distinctive and active use of information, thus providing a roadmap to identify rigorous criteria for the emergence of life. This is in sharp contrast to a century of thought in which the transition to life has been cast as a problem of chemistry, with the goal of identifying a plausible reaction pathway from chemical mixtures to a living entity."

Focusing on informational development helps move away from some of the inherent disadvantages of trying to pin down the beginnings of chemical life.

"Chemical based approaches", Walker said, "have stalled at a very early stage of chemical complexity - very far from anything we would consider 'alive'. More seriously they suffer from conceptual shortcomings in that they fail to distinguish between chemistry and biology."

[Quotation Ends]

Which reminded me of John Barrow's definitions of life:

"Typically, it is reduced to some bare essentials, like the ability to process and store information (if you are a computer scientist), the facility to evolve by natural selection (if you are a biologist), or simply non-equilibrium energy flow (if you are a chemist)." p. 277 of 'The Constants of Nature'
ISBN 0-224-06135-6

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 07:44:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Stanton T. Friedman <fsphys.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2012 20:42:06 -0400
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
>>Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>At Last, How Many Alien Civilizations Are There?
>><http://phys.org/news/2012-12-alien-civilizations.html>
>This is pretty silly. Drake vastly underestimated the number of
>planets in the Milky way... see the results of the Kepler
>spacecraft. He also totally neglected the two processes involved
>in distributing people around earth, namely colonization and
>migration.

>Travel has changed greatly as well... Magellan's ship took 3
>years to go around the planet. The Space station does it in 90
>minutes. You get some idea of why I think SETI stands for Silly
>Effort To Investigate.

Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
probe.

Once migration enters the calculation, the numbers of possible
civilizations could soar from the thousands to the billions and
nearest civilizations could be next door instead of thousands of
light years away.

Ironically Fermi in his famous paradox assumed that very
advanced civilizations would have interstellar travel and they
should be all over the place by now if ET civilizations existed.
So why aren't they here (the "paradox")?

Of course, many of us here turn that on its head saying they are
here and the evidence is the UFO phenomenon that many scientists
refuse to even look at. If they are here, then there is no
paradox, just a refusal by some to look objectively at the
evidence right under their noses.

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 14](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
Archived: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 16:07:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>probe.

David,

If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
grain of sand.

Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
ancient civilization.

Ed

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:28:23 -0600
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:14:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
>>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>probe.

>David,

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

And they live inside Mount Shasta and have a third eye set in
the middle of their foreheads.

Jerry Clark

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 23:40:13 +0200
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:18:26 -0500
Subject: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

<http://tinyurl.com/cplj2mu>

[Photo]

I spoke to a couple at length tonight who saw this UFO. They were camping about 2 hours outside Cape Town. They had not been drinking or smoking anything.

It rose from behind a hill, and turned in a long arc they said. It was about as big as their hand and the sighting, which was silent, lasted about 2-3 minutes.

It appeared white, with no specific point of light, and lit up around it as if in a cloud or fog, but there were no clouds in the sky.

Others camping near them reported seeing it too. The sighting has caused a sensation here.

Diana

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:36:08 -0700
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:20:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman<egerman.nul>
>To:<post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak<drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
>>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>probe.

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

Ed,

At 0.1c, the relativistic change in mass is ~0.5%, which I think may be reasonably neglected. The energy required to bring a typical (0.01 gm) grain of sand to 0.1c is thus on the order of $(0.5) \times (0.01 \text{ gm}) \times (3 \times 10^9 \text{ cm/sec})^2$, or ~4.5 gigajoules. This is equivalent to the detonation of ~1 ton of TNT, not a trivial amount, but substantially less than 10% of the energy in the universe.

If this has been the basis of your pessimism about interstellar travel, you may want to reconsider. Although, if interstellar travel is occurring routinely, I must say I'd be surprised if the brute-force acceleration of mass were the predominant technique.

Mike

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 06:23:39 -0000
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:21:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations
>>that interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a
>>scientific assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable
>>ways that such migrations could take place without resorting to
>>assumptions of Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light
>>speeds.

>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>probe.

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

Quite right Ed, However that 'correct' assumption rests only on
current knowledge of Relativity and QM.

Several scientists (and am just now re-reading Penrose's
'Emperor's New Mind' where he seriously considers it), are
looking at matter transmission and even transmission of a person
- complete with 'consciousness' - by way of entanglement.

The minimum speed of such a transfer would be light-speed, and
sometime in our future (but maybe other folks' present?) we
might find the secret of that 'instantaneous force over
arbitrary distance' which shows up in QM experiments.

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Geoff Blackmore <geoff_184.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 03:08:22 +1300
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:22:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

It's important to keep in mind that we already communicate at
light speed. Light has relativistic mass (meaning that it has
energy which can be transformed into mass [$E = mc^2$]). If we are
one day able to reverse that process in a controlled way
(transforming mass into light), then we could potentially one
day harness the energy of light for transport.

Of course there may be other ways to achieve interstellar
travel, other than moving at, or faster, than the speed of
light, such as manipulating space.

Yet another train of thought is the area of quantum perception.
That is, that the known universe is formed through perception of
the observer, or observers. If this is the case, then we could
potentially learn to alter our location by changing the
perception. There are some who claim to have already achieved
this, through deep meditation that lead to them opening their
eyes and finding themselves elsewhere.

Let's not close our minds completely to the idea of interstellar
travel. We don't yet know the nature of all things to be able to
claim all things possible or impossible.

Regards,

Geoff B.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: John Harney <magonia.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 15:00:35 -0000
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 10:23:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
>>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>probe.

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

To put it as simply as possible, the relativistic mass of an
object increases exponentially as it approaches the speed of
light, thus the amount of energy required to accelerate it also
increases exponentially, and becomes infinite at the speed of
light. At 10% of the speed of light the effect would be still
quite small. There is plenty of information about special
relativity on the Internet.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

If an ancient civilization shares our planet, how is it we don't
keep bumping into these people?

John Harney

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 15](#)

Re: NatGeo US's Secret History Of UFOs

From: Ole Henningsen <oleh.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 16:35:24 +0100
Archived: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:44:25 -0500
Subject: Re: NatGeo US's Secret History Of UFOs

>From: Steve Sawyer <stevesaw.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 27 Jul 2012 08:11:38 -0700
>Subject: NatGeo US's Secret History Of UFOs

>On Sunday, July 29th, at 8 pm, the National Geographic Chanel
>will be broadcasting a new two-hour documentary, Secret History
>Of UFOs.

>Excerpt from the NatGeo promo blog page:

>"From military reports and radar readings to pilot accounts and
>eyewitness testimony, sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects
>have captured the public's fascination for decades. Despite
>hundreds of photos and videos of purported UFOs, we still have
>no scientific proof we're being visited by extra-terrestrials Do
>UFO sightings deserve scientific study? Or can the phenomenon be
>explained away as misidentified natural phenomena, or the
>creation of our own imaginations? Over two hours, National
>Geographic will analyze the most compelling evidence and hear
>from the experts as we explore the Secret History Of UFOs."

>---

>"To this day, reports of UFOs are not investigated by any
>official U.S. government body.

>"While the U.S. government presently ignores reports of
>Unidentified Flying Objects, a new generation of researchers,
>journalists and scholars are working hard to prove their
>significance and existence. Purporting theories of government
>cover-ups, ancient visitations and alien-human hybridization
>programs, believers call for political action and scientific
>study, while skeptics use modern science and technology to
>debunk these claims."

>See:

><http://bit.ly/MPykZd>

>for further details and a video excerpt regarding sleep
>paralysis and alien abduction.

>There's also going to be a segment interviewing David Jacobs,
>and a pair of twins who, via regressive hypnosis, believe they
>have been abducted for "reproductive purposes."

>See:

><http://bit.ly/OquXb1>

>Alien Reproduction Experiment

>Considering the National Geographic Channel's egregious history
>in covering the UFO phenomenon, and awful shows like their
>current series, Chasing UFOs, I only wonder why they didn't hire
>the CIA's Hollywood ex-liasion, "Chase" Brandon, to narrate this
>new and, most likely, dreadfully sensational "documentary".

>Caveat emptor...

Dear List Members,

You will now be able to have a look at the 3 first of the National Geographic Channels European UFO series at YouTube:

<http://tinyurl.com/cjdmptb>

<http://tinyurl.com/csvtqgl>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DKSAs5hEX6M>

It's somewhat overdramatized and not quite Untold Stories...

Regards,

Ole

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: **Stanton T. Friedman** <fsphys.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 13:31:10 -0400
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 07:02:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that
>>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't
>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>probe.

>David,

>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>grain of sand.

>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>ancient civilization.

Ed as I have commented before please do your homework about
space travel before saying really stupid things.

The time and energy involved in space are completely dependent
on the assumptions made.

Dr. Campbell an astronomer, in 1941 calculated that the required
initial launch weight of a rocket able to get a man to the moon
and back would be a million million tons.

Apollo got three guys there with an initial launch weight of
3000 tons. But Campbell assumed a single stage rocket, limited
to 1 g acceleration with much too low an exhaust velocity using
a deadweight retrorocket to slow it down upon return... We used
the atmosphere to slow down, much higher accelerations and 3
stages.

All our deep space rockets use cosmic freeloading. Fusion
rockets produce particles having 10 million times as much energy
per particle as a chemical rocket. They are born that way not
accelerated... mass increase doesn't matter.

There is a 33 page chapter You Can Get Here From There in my

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

book Flying Saucers And Science

Stan Friedman

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:59:07 -0800
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 07:04:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:36:08 -0700
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: Edward Gehrman<egehrman.nul>

>>To:<[post.nul](#)
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>>From: David Rudiak<drudiak.nul>
>>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2012 10:22:33 -0800

>>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>>Quite! There is the hidden assumption in these calculations that

>>>interstellar migration is impossible. This is not a scientific
>>>assumption but dogma. There are many conceivable ways that such
>>>migrations could take place without resorting to assumptions of
>>>Star Trekian warp drives, but at sub-light speeds.

>>>E.g., assume machine intelligence and length of travel doesn't

>>>really matter. Time to nearest star at a very modest 1% light
>>>speed is then less than 500 years. NASA propulsion experts for
>>>years have been thinking in terms of 10% light speed for a
>>>probe.

>>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,

>>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>>grain of sand.

>>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable

>>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>>ancient civilization.

>At 0.1c, the relativistic change in mass is ~0.5%, which I think
>may be reasonably neglected. The energy required to bring a

>typical (0.01 gm) grain of sand to 0.1c is thus on the order of
> $(0.5) \times (.01\text{gm}) \times (3 \times 10^9 \text{cm/sec})^2$, or ~4.5 gigajoules. This is
>equivalent to the detonation of ~1 ton of TNT, not a trivial
>amount, but substantially less than 10% of the energy in the universe.
>If this has been the basis of your pessimism about interstellar
>travel, you may want to reconsider. Although, if interstellar
>travel is occurring routinely, I must say I'd be surprised if
>the brute-force acceleration of mass were the predominant
>technique.

Michael,

I was about to respond similarly. Bad understanding of physics makes for bad arguments.

Newtonian kinetic energy for mass m and velocity v (or energy to accelerate a mass that velocity) is $1/2mv^2$. The relativistic formula is $mc^2(\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2} - 1)$, which reduces to the Newtonian formula for velocities substantially less than the speed of light (c). Even at 30% light speed, the difference is only about 2.5%. At $.5c$, only about 7.5%.

Taking the grain of sand example, 4.5 gigajoules is roughly the chemical energy in 30 gallons of gasoline. Kicking that grain of sand up to half light speed would take less than a thousand gallons, not much different than the American family uses in their gas-guzzling SUV every year.

Now yes, if you get very, very near light speed, then the energy begins to skyrocket. For $v=c$, the energy becomes infinite because that square root term goes to zero and dividing by zero gives you infinity. But $.99c$ is still pretty darn good. That would take about 700 times more energy than $.10c$, or roughly the energy of a passenger jet's worth of fuel.

Of course, we're talking about something substantially larger than a grain of sand for interstellar migration. About 15 years ago, NASA was toying with the idea of accelerating an interstellar probe to $0.1c$. The key contender was a probe propelled by high-power lasers with a large sail capturing the laser light. (Light has momentum, and thus imparts thrust on the sail.) All propulsion energy is provided externally, which gets around the limitations of typical highly inefficient rocket propulsion where you need to carry huge amounts of propellant on board to kick out the back to provide the thrust.

If you assume 10 metric tons (10,000 kg) for a small probe and sail, this a billion times the mass of the grain of sand, so a billion times more energy is needed. This works out to be $\sim 5 \times 10^{18}$ joules for 10% light speed. World civilization consumes about 10^{20} joules per year, so roughly 3 weeks of world energy use. That's a lot of energy and very expensive, but still a far cry from 10% of the energy of the universe.

About 30 years ago, NASA also put together a think tank on how to make space exploration economical. Assuming continued rapid development in cybernetics, they projected that in the future it should be possible to create a robotic factory on the moon that manufactured solar cells and solar energy farms for beaming energy back to Earth with microwave antennas. Furthermore, such factories would be self-reproducing, making copies of themselves, transporting them to other sites to make more solar cells, etc., etc., so like a virus of solar energy producers spreading across the moon's surface.

The first such factory would be very expensive to develop and establish on the moon, but after that you have a virtual free lunch and more energy than you know what to do with. E.g., Earth's surface gets about 2×10^{17} joules/sec of solar energy, the moon about 10% of that. Assume the self-replicating factories blanket 10% of the moon's surface facing the sun at any one time and with various inefficiencies, conversion to electricity and transmission has an overall efficiency of only 5%. That would be 10^{14} joules/sec, about the energy of an A-bomb per second and about 30 times earth's present power consumption. Not only would there be plenty of energy to power everybody's air conditioner and iPhone on Earth, but plenty of energy left over for other things, like accelerating interstellar probes. The energy to accelerate that 10 ton probe to 10% light speed would be the equivalent of less than one day's operation of such a system.

These "back of a napkin" type schemes are massive and expensive engineering projects, but not that far beyond present technology, something we could probably pull off in a hundred years. The basic point is we humans in a relatively early stage of technological development can conceive of reasonably plausible schemes of how interstellar travel might be possible. Some much older and technologically sophisticated civilization can probably come up with something much more elegant. That is why I say ruling out interstellar travel and migration in the Drake equation is not a scientific assumption but one of dogma

or lack of imagination. With migration, the number of ET civilizations could be many orders of magnitude greater than the non-migratory calculations come up with, so ET's could be very close and concerned about what we aggressive apes with H-bombs are up to.

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 15:11:57 -0800
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 07:06:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:28:23 -0600
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>>ancient civilization.

>And they live inside Mount Shasta and have a third eye set in
>the middle of their foreheads.

Jerry,

I speculate from reported sightings that some of these creatures live on mother-ships capable of cruising around the solar system. Others live under the oceans, and in the Arctic and Antarctica. Their technology allows them to live where they choose to live, probably depending on security. Their civilization could be as much as 200 million years older than human civilization. There's good reason to believe that they've been with us for a long time and we do "bump" into them every once in a while. These encounters are your bread and butter. I don't understand your reluctance to even consider the possibility that an ancient civilization is responsible.

Archaeologists haven't discovered their ruins, yet. But we don't find much else from 200 million years ago, either. It must be obvious that these creatures don't want a direct encounter with humans, for now.

With that in mind, they could have destroyed all evidence of their past existence. Who knows what motivates them. Perhaps they're crazy, as Sanderson suspected.

There's nothing scientifically that precludes any of these possibilities. Convergent evolution indicates a way that it could have happened, tool-making being the common denominator.

The ancient civilization hypothesis should at least be given the same consideration as ETH or experience anomalies.

Ed

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and

are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 16](#)

Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 19:55:50 -0400
Archived: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 07:08:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 23:40:13 +0200
>Subject: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

>-----

><http://tinyurl.com/cplj2mu>

>[Photo]

>-----

>I spoke to a couple at length tonight who saw this UFO. They
>were camping about 2 hours outside Cape Town. They had not been
>drinking or smoking anything.

>It rose from behind a hill, and turned in a long arc they said.
>It was about as big as their hand and the sighting, which was
>silent, lasted about 2-3 minutes.

>It appeared white, with no specific point of light, and lit up
>around it as if in a cloud or fog, but there were no clouds in
>the sky.

>Others camping near them reported seeing it too. The sighting
>has caused a sensation here.

Diana

Most cameras shoot 2-3 MBs photos these days so where would that
be? It would be better than the 35k photo provided.

Or was this a cell phone shot?

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 15:09:35 +0200
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 05:50:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 19:55:50 -0400
>Subject: Re: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

>>From: Diana Cammack <cammack.nul>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 23:40:13 +0200
>>Subject: Cape Town Sighting - 20:30 11-12-12

>>-----

>><http://tinyurl.com/cplj2mu>

>>[Photo]

>>-----

>>I spoke to a couple at length tonight who saw this UFO. They
>>were camping about 2 hours outside Cape Town. They had not been
>>drinking or smoking anything.

>>It rose from behind a hill, and turned in a long arc they said.
>>It was about as big as their hand and the sighting, which was
>>silent, lasted about 2-3 minutes.

>>It appeared white, with no specific point of light, and lit up
>>around it as if in a cloud or fog, but there were no clouds in
>>the sky.

>>Others camping near them reported seeing it too. The sighting
>>has caused a sensation here.

>Diana

>Most cameras shoot 2-3 MBs photos these days so where would that
>be? It would be better than the 35k photo provided.

>Or was this a cell phone shot?

Don, my friends did not make the video. It was just on the web
so I put the link. They just reported to me what they saw, which
matched the film. They took no photos themselves...

Diana

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and

are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 09:52:15 -0600
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 05:53:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 15:11:57 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:28:23 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>>>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>>>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>>>ancient civilization.

>>And they live inside Mount Shasta and have a third eye set in
>>the middle of their foreheads.

>Jerry,

>I speculate from reported sightings that some of these creatures
>live on mother-ships capable of cruising around the solar
>system. Others live under the oceans, and in the Arctic and
>Antarctica. Their technology allows them to live where they
>choose to live, probably depending on security. Their
>civilization could be as much as 200 million years older than
>human civilization. There's good reason to believe that they've
>been with us for a long time and we do "bump" into them every
>once in a while. These encounters are your bread and butter. I
>don't understand your reluctance to even consider the
>possibility that an ancient civilization is responsible.

>Archaeologists haven't discovered their ruins, yet. But we don't
>find much else from 200 million years ago, either. It must be
>obvious that these creatures don't want a direct encounter with
>humans, for now.

>With that in mind, they could have destroyed all evidence of
>their past existence. Who knows what motivates them. Perhaps
>they're crazy, as Sanderson suspected.

>There's nothing scientifically that precludes any of these
>possibilities. Convergent evolution indicates a way that it
>could have happened, tool-making being the common denominator.

>The ancient civilization hypothesis should at least be given the
>same consideration as ETH or experience anomalies.

Sometimes, Ed, the absence of evidence is indeed absence of
evidence.

As I've observed before, you're just putting your own spin on
tired, discredited esoteric beliefs about secret races, the sort
of thing that has long found expression in myths of lost
continents, the hollow earth, the Shaver mystery, Jessup's
space-faring pygmies, and all the rest - not to mention a
considerable body of fantasy and science-fiction literature. I
wrote about such things at length in my book Hidden Realms
(Visible Ink Press, 2010), in case any listfolk are interested

in studying the background.

In short, what you're doing is both baseless and unoriginal.

If ufologists had wanted to marginalize themselves even more than they already are, they would have embraced this nonsense and become the equivalents of flat-earthers. It's a relief that you've had so little success in recruiting others to your cause, frankly.

Jerry Clark

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 08:55:42 -0800
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 05:55:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:59:07 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

David,

Thanks for the information. You're correct. I have a very basic physics understanding and I didn't know how the math worked out.

That's why I asked the question. Your explanation helped but I have a few more questions.

How does the laser beam stay focused on the space craft? What happens to the space craft if there is a malfunction of the laser and the beam is interrupted?

When you calculate energy use, are you doing it by the second or hour or day or just the initial need. You wrote:

"The energy to accelerate that 10 ton probe to 10% light speed would be the equivalent of less than one day's operation of such a system."

Once the craft arrives at the required speed, is the laser still needed? In other words, does it require the same amount of energy per second, or hour or day to stay at speed, or once it gets to speed, does it glide to its destination? And once it gets there, how does it stop and then turn around and return?

I agree that our visitors seem concerned with our nuclear weapons. Why should they be if they don't live here?

Since they don't seem to be looking for a fight, it's much more likely that their concern is generated by their knowledge that we could destroy the neighborhood we both share.

Ed

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: **Albert Baier** <albertgbaier.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 13:02:01 -0600
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 05:57:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 03:07:58 -0000
>Subject: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

Gentlemen, List:

As I have pointed out in a previous post:

- "...The speed 'limit' of electromagnetic radiation is ~300,000 km/s,
-but this applies to EM radiation only. Nothing precludes FTL
-travel for other things, like gravity, or magnetic fields, which are
-instantaneous. Since particles can only be accelerated by
-electric fields, it follows that they can never exceed the speed
-of light. Since only charged particles can be accelerated, their
-speed is self-limited by their interaction with the accelerating
-field. Hotson explains exactly how this speed limit works for
-radiated fields. Matter may not be speed limited, but there
-isn't yet a way of testing this. Mass, inertia and gravitation
-are interesting aspects of the vacuum BEC; please review.
-<http://tinyurl.com/7aysjhg>..."

Since the speed of charged particles is field self limited, and their mass is calculated based on the energy needed to accelerate them, Einstein's equations certainly work for this special case, but there is no rationale for applying them to uncharged particles. Since EM radiation is the fastest thing known to science, how are we then able to accelerate any uncharged particle faster than light? It's a conundrum.

The mass increase with speed, and the infinite energy requirements are fictitious, as is 'time dilation'.

Now, we all agree on the amount of energy required to accelerate matter to speeds well under c , the speed of light. We all agree that moving bodies have kinetic energy proportional to ' mv ' (mass * velocity). A 1 kilometer asteroid can do a lot of damage even if moving at subsonic speed, but a 1 kilogram plastic block can completely destroy a tank, if it's moving at several kilometers per second. This is the problem I have with ultra high speed space travel. A tiny grain of sand can do tremendous damage, if struck at a high enough speed. Similarly, a cloud of hydrogen gas could cause a damaging amount of heating in a spacecraft. That said, I don't discount the possibility of other means of 'travel', but they won't be based on mainstream physics, which, like any religion, is entrenched in a massive politicized bureaucracy. (The US Congress is a fine example of the latter)

Now, I am open to the theory of alien beings existing within our environs. I am intrigued by the idea that alien beings could have created self-replicating, sentient beings, sending them across the galaxy to interact with other beings, or perhaps even creating other civilizations. They might even have FTL communication to home base! Perhaps these beings are self-healing, and can exist 'forever'. The 'God Theory' suggests that it's possible that all sentient beings may have been 'created' from one source.

In any case, it's fun to speculate. Just don't pontificate. The preponderance of evidence suggests that there are unknown entities at work around here, otherwise most of us wouldn't be on this List.

Best Regards,

Albert

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Michael Tarbell <mtarbell.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 12:14:19 -0700
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 05:59:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: David Rudiak<drudiak.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:59:07 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: Michael Tarbell<mtarbell.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 15:36:08 -0700
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>>From: Edward Gehrman<egerman.nul>
>>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>>Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2012 08:08:53 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>>If Einstein is correct, then travel by even a grain of sand,
>>>using external energy (so fuel wouldn't have to be carried), at
>>>the speed of light would require all the energy in the universe.
>>>So if we travel at 10% of the speed of light, does that require
>>>10% of the energy in the universe? And that's just to power a
>>>grain of sand.

>>>Under these circumstances, I don't think star travel is probable
>>>or will ever be possible. Yes we have visitors, but a more
>>>mundane explanation is possible: we share our planet with an
>>>ancient civilization.

>>At 0.1c, the relativistic change in mass is ~0.5%, which I think
>>may be reasonably neglected. The energy required to bring a
>>typical (0.01 gm) grain of sand to 0.1c is thus on the order of
>>(0.5)x(.01gm)x(3x10⁹cm/sec)², or ~4.5 gigajoules. This is
>>equivalent to the detonation of ~1 ton of TNT, not a trivial
>>amount, but substantially less than 10% of the energy in the universe.

>>If this has been the basis of your pessimism about interstellar
>>travel, you may want to reconsider. Although, if interstellar
>>travel is occurring routinely, I must say I'd be surprised if
>>the brute-force acceleration of mass were the predominant
>>technique.

<snip>

>Taking the grain of sand example, 4.5 gigajoules is roughly the
>chemical energy in 30 gallons of gasoline. Kicking that grain of
>sand up to half light speed would take less than a thousand
>gallons, not much different than the American family uses in
>their gas-guzzling SUV every year.

Hi David,

Your gasoline equivalent brings the point home better than my TNT
equivalent. It's really a fairly modest amount of energy.

<snip>

>These "back of a napkin" type schemes are massive and expensive
>engineering projects, but not that far beyond present
>technology, something we could probably pull off in a hundred
>years. The basic point is we humans in a relatively early stage

>of technological development can conceive of reasonably
>plausible schemes of how interstellar travel might be possible.
>Some much older and technologically sophisticated civilization
>can probably come up with something much more elegant. That is
>why I say ruling out interstellar travel and migration in the
>Drake equation is not a scientific assumption but one of dogma
>or lack of imagination. With migration, the number of ET
>civilizations could be many orders of magnitude greater than the
>non-migratory calculations come up with, so ET's could be very
>close and concerned about what we aggressive apes with H-bombs
>are up to.

There's no question we're close to being able (in principle) to initiate some kind of crude migratory process, perhaps even an autonomous one (e.g., self-replicating factories, etc).

I'm not so sure we would pursue it in practice, even if our civilization held together long enough to try it. Indeed, one might speculate that projects of such magnitude that yield no 'payoff' to the creators themselves, perhaps that don't even yield feedback for dozens of generations (if ever), are probably not widely pursued even among civilizations that have such capability.

But given a sample space of (quite plausibly) hundreds of thousands of civilizations, it's hard to imagine that none of them launched such an expansion. And it would only take a few such, along with some millions of years, to clutter things up pretty thoroughly. Which, of course, is what makes the Fermi paradox so palpable, even if some UFOs are ET.

Apparently no roving colonies of self-replicating automata have had any substantive impact in our vicinity, unless perhaps some even more advanced visitors have taken it upon themselves to clean up after these crude early efforts, concealing (for whatever reason) both themselves and any other overt evidence of ETs. I'm about as comfortable with that as I am with, say, crypto-terrestrials tracking down and destroying any fossil evidence of their developmental history. Bit of a stretch, either way.

Hence the nagging possibility that, in fact, there is some reason in principle that such brute force, virus-like expansions are uniformly extinguished. As we've both pointed out, it's certainly not the energetic constraints, nor the time constraints (for a sufficiently motivated civilization). Perhaps some unknown hazard in the interstellar environment?

Anyway, enjoyed your informative post.

Mike

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Convergent Evolution

From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 12:55:58 -0800
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 06:02:52 -0500
Subject: Convergent Evolution

List,

This is an interesting article on convergent evolution. Humans occupy the "tool making and using" niche. That means that another species that opted to travel along the tool-making path would end up looking very much like humans.

<http://tinyurl.com/cw8x3br>

"However, when University of Queensland researcher Bryan Fry and colleagues tested the serpentine DNA, the results showed that they were separate species, and not even close relatives... This is a case of convergent evolution, wherein different species evolve independently but end up looking quite similar... Or, as Yong put it, convergent evolution is 'when different species turn up at life's party wearing the same clothes'."

More at site...

Ed

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 08:36:13 -0000
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 06:06:45 -0500
Subject: FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About

Hello List,

Fortuitously saw this article today - thanks to the Daily Grail at:

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

its titled What If NASA Could Figure Out The Math Of A Workable Warp Drive?

<http://tinyurl.com/cdlc8n4>

[Quotation Begins]

But, as Dvorsky explains, White has recently come up with a new design for a warp drive, one that, theoretically, would require way, way less energy.

"I suddenly realized," he told Dvorsky, "that if you made the thickness of the negative vacuum energy ring larger - like shifting from a belt shape to a donut shape - and oscillate the warp bubble, you can greatly reduce the energy required - perhaps making the idea plausible."

White believes that with his new design, warp drive could be achieved with the power of a mass that is even smaller than Voyager 1's.

I'm not going to pretend that I have the faintest clue how this would work or how NASA would conceivably build such a thing, but the idea that physicists at NASA are even toying with it gives me hope that interstellar travel could one day be possible, even if this isn't how it is ultimately accomplished.

[Quotation Ends]

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About

From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 08:40:15 -0500
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 18:29:12 -0500
Subject: Re: FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 08:36:13 -0000
>Subject: FTL Drive We've Been Speculating About

>Hello List,

>Fortuitously saw this article today - thanks to the Daily Grail
>at:

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

>its titled What If NASA Could Figure Out The Math Of A Workable
>Warp Drive?

><http://tinyurl.com/cdlc8n4>

>[Quotation Begins]

>But, as Dvorsky explains, White has recently come up with a new
>design for a warp drive, one that, theoretically, would require
>way, way less energy.

>"I suddenly realized," he told Dvorsky, "that if you made the
>thickness of the negative vacuum energy ring larger - like
>shifting from a belt shape to a donut shape - and oscillate the
>warp bubble, you can greatly reduce the energy required -
>perhaps making the idea plausible."

I like to think that we have already seen an interstellar craft
with something like a donut-shaped warp field in a 2010 Hubble
image. I added the image some time ago to my collection of UFOs
that appear to be accompanied by an apparent toroidal field.

http://www.treurniet.ca/tori/ufoP2010_A2Crop.htm

In this case, the X-shaped object in the image might be a field
generator antenna. This makes more sense than it being the
result of colliding asteroids as NASA proposed. I wonder if
there are any more recent photos of this remarkable object.

William

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 17](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: Stanton T. Friedman <fsphys.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 11:09:48 -0400
Archived: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 18:32:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 08:55:42 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:59:07 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>David,

>Thanks for the information. You're correct. I have a very basic
>physics understanding and I didn't know how the math worked out.

>That's why I asked the question. Your explanation helped but I
>have a few more questions.

>How does the laser beam stay focused on the space craft? What
>happens to the space craft if there is a malfunction of the
>laser and the beam is interrupted?

>When you calculate energy use, are you doing it by the second or
>hour or day or just the initial need. You wrote:

>"The energy to accelerate that 10 ton probe to 10% light speed
>would be the equivalent of less than one day's operation of such
>a system."

>Once the craft arrives at the required speed, is the laser still
>needed? In other words, does it require the same amount of
>energy per second, or hour or day to stay at speed, or once it
>gets to speed, does it glide to its destination? And once it
>gets there, how does it stop and then turn around and return?

>I agree that our visitors seem concerned with our nuclear
>weapons. Why should they be if they don't live here?

>Since they don't seem to be looking for a fight, it's much more
>likely that their concern is generated by their knowledge that
>we could destroy the neighborhood we both share.

Ed,

I agree with that last paragraph. Two important points:

1. Every advancing society will want to know how its star produces all that energy. We figured it out in the 1930s, exploded our first A bomb in 1945 and our first fusion weapon in 1952. We had a nuclear submarine in 1956. Studies were done of fusion propulsion in the early 1960s. Our nuclear aircraft carriers can operate for 18 years without refuelling. Of course we are a threat to the neighborhood. Military budget this year a cool trillion dollars

2. There are nearby locations where there are older planets which have much nearer neighbors than we do. Zeta 1 and Zeta 2 Reticuli are less than 1/8th of a light year apart from each

other and a billion years older than the sun and only 39.3 LY from us... far more incentive for interstellar travel.

Stan Friedman

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 11:01:57 -0800
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 07:08:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 08:55:42 -0800
>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equation

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:59:07 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Update To Our View Of The Drake Equatio

>Thanks for the information. You're correct. I have a very basic
>physics understanding and I didn't know how the math worked out.

>That's why I asked the question. Your explanation helped but I
>have a few more questions.

>How does the laser beam stay focused on the space craft? What
>happens to the space craft if there is a malfunction of the
>laser and the beam is interrupted?

Ed, this was a thought experiment to illustrate how it might be possible for humans to come up with energies needed to propel probes to some fraction of light speed and achieve interstellar travel in a reasonable period of time. And if we can conceivably do it, thenso can some other technological civilization. Ones much older than us could have achieved interstellar migration a long time ago and be visiting us now. That's the counter to the usual argument against UFOs that interstellartravel is impossible, therefore UFOs cannot represent interstellar visitation.

You can of course come up with various scenarios where things go terribly wrong, such as space shuttles blowing up on takeoff or disintegrating on reentry. That doesn't mean that space shuttle flight is impossible. Similarly, technical problems with designing and implementing an interstellar flight system doesn't make it impossible, just very difficult. If there are no fundamental physical, economic, or political limitations, engineers are usually very goodat figuring out how to deal with the technical problems.

>When you calculate energy use, are you doing it by the second or
>hour or day or just the initial need. You wrote:

>"The energy to accelerate that 10 ton probe to 10% light speed
>would be the equivalent of less than one day's operation of such
>a system."

I'm talking about total energy needed to accelerate the probe to 10% light speed. The energy per second is the power, and the total energy is the power times the time. Energy is total quantity; power the rate at which the energy is delivered. Fill your bath tub with water and gallons is the quantity, but gallons per minute is the rate at which you fill it.

In my thought experiment, you could generate enough energy with the robotic moon solar energy stations to accelerate the 10 ton probe to 10% light speed in less than a day.

In the real engineering world, things wouldn't be so simple. As noted, power or energy per second of such a system would be equivalent to the energy of an A-bomb blast every second.

I doubt you could focus that much power on the probes laser light-capturing sail without incinerating it. Instead you would probably need to use some fraction of that power and stretch out the acceleration period over a much longer period of time.

Hard as it may be to believe, a square mile of Earth receives an A-bomb's worth of solar energy every day, and we don't burn up because it is gently spread over a large area and period of time instead of into a tiny area and fraction of a second. The total energies are the same, but the power levels and densities are many orders of magnitude different. So maybe that probe would need to be accelerated at much lower power levels over a period of a year or two instead of a day to prevent being incinerated.

Again, the point of the exercise was to illustrate how human civilization in the not-too-distant future might generate the energies needed to achieve interstellar travel in an economical way, not provide a complete blueprint of exactly how this would be carried out.

>Once the craft arrives at the required speed, is the laser still >needed? In other words, does it require the same amount of >energy per second, or hour or day to stay at speed, or once it >gets to speed, does it glide to its destination?

In deep space there is essentially no friction, so yes it could glide to its destination, just as our chemical rockets burn only briefly during the acceleration phrase. The Apollo space capsules did not fire rockets all the way to the Moon and back.

Or with the laser system, you could keep on accelerating the probe for as long as you could keep the lasers focused on it. Again, this was a thought experiment to illustrate how one might achieve only 0.1c interstellar space travel, but the same system could theoretically boost you to even greater speeds since energy supplied is external and does not have to be carried on board the probe.

>And once it gets there, how does it stop and then turn around >and return?

It's a probe. It doesn't need to stop and turn around to get back, no more so than other of our rocket-based probes turn around and come back. Most do flybys, like the old Voyager probes now on the edges of our solar system.

If you do want to stop and linger (and possibly colonize), then you do need some way to decelerate your probe, which would take the equivalent amount of energy as accelerating it. NASA had a proposal for that as well, but I forget. It would be technically much more difficult, but not impossible.

>I agree that our visitors seem concerned with our nuclear >weapons. Why should they be if they don't live here?

Maybe ethics and philosophy. Planets with extensive, complex life are probably quite rare. It's a tragedy to see one self-destruct. I think we might feel much the same way about some other civilization and planet.

Or maybe for the same reason, we are a rare genetic resource that they are using. Wouldn't want to destroy such a valuable resource through nuclear war or environmental collapse.

Their possible concerns about our future doesn't mean they necessarily live side by side with us or arose on Earth, though I wouldn't rule out the possibility that Earth could have been visited and even colonized by externals many times in the past, or now.

But my definition of ET is a very general one: did not originate on planet Earth. Even if they are co-existing with us now in some way, they did not arise and evolve here like we did. I have seen no physical evidence pointing in that direction. A technological civilization can't just arise and disappear without leaving a trace, yet still be here hiding under some rock that we haven't overturned yet. It took a world

civilization with billions of people and thousands of cities
just to get us where we are now.

>Since they don't seem to be looking for a fight, it's much more
>likely that their concern is generated by their knowledge that
>we could destroy the neighborhood we both share.

Possibly, but as noted, there are other possibilities as well,
so I wouldn't characterize your scenario as "much more likely."
We are all speculating here.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: Convergent Evolution

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 12:01:04 -0800
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 07:10:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Convergent Evolution

>From: Edward Gehrman<egerman.nul>
>To:<post.nul>
>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 12:55:58 -0800
>Subject: Convergent Evolution

>List,

>This is an interesting article on convergent evolution. Humans
>occupy the "tool making and using" niche. That means that
>another species that opted to travel along the tool-making path
>would end up looking very much like humans.

><http://tinyurl.com/cw8x3br>

>"However, when University of Queensland researcher Bryan Fry and
>colleagues tested the serpentine DNA, the results showed that
>they were separate species, and not even close relatives... This
>is a case of convergent evolution, wherein different species
>evolve independently but end up looking quite similar... Or, as
>Yong put it, convergent evolution is 'when different species
>turn up at life's party wearing the same clothes'."

Ed, the article is about convergent evolution of two species of
sea snakes, not about tool making species.

While I would agree that a good case could be made that
technological, space-faring, non-human beings of very separate
evolution might very well be humanoid in appearance, including
hands, for convergent evolutionary reasons, you are making a
huge extrapolation to that from an article on sea snakes.

My favorite examples of convergent evolution are ancient
reptilian ichthyosaurs and modern mammalian dolphins, which
evolved 150 million years apart, yet occupied the same
ecological niche (ocean predators) and have an extraordinary
similar appearance. The similarities go beyond that, including
both giving birth to live young and being land animals that
returned to the sea. I recently visited Ichthyosaur State Park
in the middle of Nevada located at 7000 feet elevation, which
has a hillside of exposed ichthyosaur skeletons, some up to 70
feet long. I asked the guide how they could end up in central
Nevada, and he responded that 200 million years ago central
Nevada was the western edge of the super continent of Laurasia
before North America split off from Europe/Asia. In the
intervening 200 million years, California and western Nevada
"accumulated" on the western edge of North America where
ichthyosaurs once frolicked in the shores of the ancient Pacific
Ocean.

All of this is very mind-blowing. I think we all have trouble
grasping these vast expanses of time and the great changes that
can happen in such time expanses. And this represents less than
5% of the history of Earth.

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning

From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 11:59:20 +0700 (GMT+07:00)
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 08:18:57 -0500
Subject: Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning

<http://imofogarty.blogspot.com>

During one trip to Jacksonville NAS in the 33rd Air Div C-47, we took a lightening strike in my HF (short wave) radio antenna. (It made one helluva bang!) It did get rather interesting though, as I was busily trying to get the radio to cooperate at the time. A shocking experience at best, the antenna coupler lit up like a neon sign, and every tube in the radio receiver (yeah, it was that old) went off like a flashbulb! I had never seen ball lightening before... or since... and don't really hope to again. Or at least not that close!! A brightly glowing ball of static electricity drifted out of the antenna coupler, and floated through the air towards the rear of the aircraft.

The latrine in a Gooney Bird is located all the way aft in the tail, and a very thin plywood door usually provides a bit of privacy. In this particular case the latrine was temporarily occupied by one of our spare co-pilots. All of us on the flight deck were watching the lightening ball wander around the passenger/cargo compartment (with wide eyes and open mouths), when the ball decided to penetrate that plywood door. A couple of microseconds later a very upset and somewhat ashen faced co-pilot exited the latrine as if he had been shot out of a cannon!!

When we got back on the ground it took a half a dozen Martinis to get the young Lieutenant calmed down, and for months afterward all he could talk about was the day he got hit by lightening while sitting on the can!! The Colonel always claimed that that young co-pilot was the only guy on the airplane with eyes wider than mine. It took nearly a month to get my radio fixed as well.

Noah built the Ark, Experts built the Titanic...

Terry W. Colvin
Ladphrao (Bangkok), Thailand
Pran Buri (Hua Hin), Thailand
<http://terrycolvin.freewebsites.com/>
[Terry's Fortean & "Work" itty-bitty site]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 18](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:46:07 +0000
Archived: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 08:32:24 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Mon, 27 Aug 2012 15:48:09 +0100
>Subject: UFO Photographs And Film

>I am a PhD student in philosophy at the University of Glasgow

<snip>

>I look forward to any and all responses, which I am happy to
>receive off or on-list

Dear List-Members,

In August I posted with some queries about the strength of photographic evidence for the ETH. I received a number of very helpful responses, with which I engaged in some correspondence, before promising to post a general response to the list. Various other commitments postponed that response until now:

I present some initial thoughts on some of the key evidence taken by many to support the ET hypothesis (and perhaps other non-prosaic theses). I assess such evidence from the perspective of the neutral who does not have any inside knowledge of the UFO phenomenon, has had no UFO experiences, and merely wishes to decide, based on the evidence presented by ufologists, whether or not the ETH is true. It seems to me that the non-prosaic theses remain unproven, but not to such an extent that belief in them is completely un-warranted.

I focus on the two strongest types of witness case, (1) visual-photographic, and (2) visual-radar cases. On the former I think the jury will remain out, at best, but on the latter I think there is some prospect for settling the case one way or the other.

Let s take each case type in turn:

(1) I think the Photographic Argument is problematic (I use photographic to mean stills and film).

Here s the standard argument given, in general form, without mention of anything alien (in the argument, Q stands for any-old proposition):

The Photographic Argument

P1: The witnesses claim that Q.

P2: The witnesses seem sincere.

P3: The witnesses have numerous testimonies to their honesty.

P4: The witnesses have been questioned numerous times and have been consistent in their account of Q.

P5: There are photographs which might appear to show that Q.

P6: Analysis of the photographs show that the photograph is consistent with Q being true, but also consistent with Q being false.

P7: There is independent reason to believe that Q is physically possible.

P8: If premise 1 through premise 7 are true, then Q.
C: Therefore Q.

This is a deductively valid argument it is impossible for the premises to be true and the conclusion false. So, in order to deny the conclusion, one of the premises must be denied.

Many ufologists have been persuaded by the Photographic Argument when:

Q means a craft of extra-terrestrial origin flew within sight

Fair enough. But should they be so persuaded?

No-one denies premise 7, and there seem to be various photographic cases which apparently satisfy premises 1 through 6. So what about premise 8? There are grounds on which to reject it. For example, what if:

Q means the Piltdown Man was the fossilised remains of an unknown early human .

Or

Q means JFK was shot from the front

Or

Q means JFK was not shot from the front

(whatever your stance on that issue both claims can't be true)

Or:

Q means the Loch Ness Monster swam into view

And so on.

In that case, premise 8 would be false. Therefore, premise 8 is not always true. But that isn't the end of matters. Perhaps premise 8 is true more often than not. The problem, though, is that it is far from obvious how the conditional statement in premise 8 might be properly assessed in terms of this more often than not measure. Think of all the epistemic circumstances in which there are witnesses combined with photographic evidence which falls short of conclusiveness: crimes, accidents, a variety of paranormal and supernatural phenomena, etc. A survey of such cases would need to be undertaken, and that would be a mammoth task, to say the least. Thus, at best, the jury should remain out on the Photographic Argument.

That's as charitable as I can be. Those less sympathetic to the ETH than myself would be more dubious here, and perhaps point to what is often taken to be the difference in how far-reaching claims are, and thus the burden of argument proponents of those claims must meet: the further the claim reaches, the greater the burden of argument. To the neutral observer, the claim

an airborne vehicle of non-terrestrial origin flew within sight

is obviously pretty far-reaching. Thus, the burden of argument is significant. How significant is an issue for another day. What about Radar-Visual cases?

(2)

The Radar-Visual Argument

P1: The witnesses claim that Q.

P2: The witnesses seem sincere.

P3: The witnesses have numerous testimonies to their honesty.

P4: The witnesses have been questioned numerous times and have been consistent in their account of Q.

P5: There are radar returns which appear to confirm that an object consistent with Q was present.

P6: There is independent reason to believe that Q is physically possible.

P7: If premise 1 through premise 6 are true, then Q.

C: Therefore Q.

There seems to be an important difference between the Radar-Visual and the Photographic Argument counterexamples to premise 7 of the former argument seem much easier to come by than counterexamples to premise 8 of the latter. I know precious little about radar, and it would take a person of much greater expertise than I to adjudicate properly, but here are some thoughts:

As is well known, ghost returns can occur, and it seems conceivable that those returns might correlate with visual errors. Indeed, investigations of such cases typically proceed by trying to rule out such occurrences. Therefore P7 is not certain. But is it probable? I think this is difficult to assess, but much easier to assess than in the Photographic case. Radar presents a narrower range of possibilities and cases to consider. And the radar cases often come with more data so that such ranges of possibility can be assessed weather, radar-system idiosyncrasies, etc. Thus, a conclusion seems genuinely within reach here. Crunch enough numbers, consider enough cases, work out the possibilities for error, and the likelihood for the frequency with which P7 is false may be known.

A big problem, though, and one which distinguishes ufology from many other areas of enquiry (if not all), is the possibility of deliberate and highly resourceful attempts to perpetrate hoaxes. I talk not of mischievous individuals, although they no doubt muddy the waters too, but of the possibility that intelligence agencies would perpetrate hoaxes, even against compatriots. Consider the famous RB47 case, for example. Even granting the account of it compiled by MacDonald, which is compelling, it is not clear that a hoax perpetrated on the flight crew (and perhaps the ground controller) can be ruled out. It would be a highly impressive hoax to say the least, but nevertheless doubt remains...

In sum, what I hoped to do with this post was to begin to asses, at a general level, the overall form of the strongest kind of arguments in support of the ETH: where each premise was made explicit and the arguments laid out in deductively valid form. In short, so that the key steps in reasoning were on the table, but not obscured by too much technical detail, or rhetoric. Upon doing so, it seemed to me that there was a crucial inferential step in each argument, premise 7 and premise 8, which lacked certainty in both cases. Also, premise 8 of the Photographic Argument seemed at best too difficult to assess for a clear degree of probability; however, an assessment of premise 7 of the Radar-Visual Argument looked more tractable.

I hope that the members of this list find these thoughts worthwhile.

Best wishes,

John Donaldson

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Convergent Evolution

From: Edward Gehrman <egehrman.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 08:29:33 -0800
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:56:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Convergent Evolution

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2012 12:01:04 -0800
>Subject: Re: Convergent Evolution

>>From: Edward Gehrman<egehrman.nul>
>>To:<post.nul>
>>Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2012 12:55:58 -0800
>>Subject: Convergent Evolution

>List,

>This is an interesting article on convergent evolution. Humans
>occupy the "tool making and using" niche. That means that
>another species that opted to travel along the tool-making path
>would end up looking very much like humans.

><http://tinyurl.com/cw8x3br>

>"However, when University of Queensland researcher Bryan Fry and
>colleagues tested the serpentine DNA, the results showed that
>they were separate species, and not even close relatives... This
>is a case of convergent evolution, wherein different species
>evolve independently but end up looking quite similar... Or, as
>Yong put it, convergent evolution is 'when different species
>turn up at life's party wearing the same clothes'."

>>Ed, the article is about convergent evolution of two species of
>>sea snakes, not about tool making species.

>>While I would agree that a good case could be made that
>>technological, space-faring, non-human beings of very separate
>>evolution might very well be humanoid in appearance, including
>>hands, for convergent evolutionary reasons, you are making a
>>huge extrapolation to that from an article on sea snakes.

David,

This article was to show folks the reality of convergent
evolution. The snakes were only an example of this process. I
could have used hundreds of other examples, but the point is
that humans have been able to create a technology from very
humble beginnings by moving into the tool making/using niche.

Can't we speculate that another species(monotremes?) could also
have taken up tool making/using and after a few million years
were not only able to accomplish an advanced technology, but
began to look similar to us. Actually, we look like them, since
they evolved first. It's the niche that determines this.

I don't have any problems with the rest of your interesting
post.

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

At :

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:44:06 -0600
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:59:47 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:46:07 +0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: <post.nul>
>>Date: Mon, 27 Aug 2012 15:48:09 +0100
>>Subject: UFO Photographs And Film
>>I am a PhD student in philosophy at the University of Glasgow

><snip>

>>I look forward to any and all responses, which I am happy to
>>receive off or on-list
>Dear List-Members,

>In August I posted with some queries about the strength of
>photographic evidence for the ETH. I received a number of very
>helpful responses, with which I engaged in some correspondence,
>before promising to post a general response to the list. Various
>other commitments postponed that response until now:

>I present some initial thoughts on some of the key evidence
>taken by many to support the ET hypothesis (and perhaps other
>non-prosaic theses). I assess such evidence from the perspective
>of the neutral who does not have any inside knowledge of the UFO
>phenomenon, has had no UFO experiences, and merely wishes to
>decide, based on the evidence presented by ufologists, whether
>or not the ETH is true. It seems to me that the non-prosaic
>theses remain unproven, but not to such an extent that belief in
>them is completely un-warranted.

>I focus on the two strongest types of witness case, (1) visual-
>photographic, and (2) visual-radar cases. On the former I think
>the jury will remain out, at best, but on the latter I think
>there is some prospect for settling the case one way or the
>other.

><snip>

>I hope that the members of this list find these thoughts
>worthwhile.

John,

The crux of your reasoning seems to boil down to the old adage:
incredible claims require incredible proof. Fair enough. But my
concern is that there is a mindset that says, "Without the
incredible proof we will not even investigate an incredible
claim". Unless the UFO phenomenon is properly researched then it
will always be a mystery and we will never solve it.

Robert

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 12:12:45 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 07:04:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning

>From: Terry W. Colvin <fortean1.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 11:59:20 +0700 (GMT+07:00)
>Subject: Lightning Strike With Ball Lightning

Interesting ball lightning story.

I have one also, told to me by my grandmother.

She said when she was a little girl in Nova Scotia she was caught in the barn one summer day by a fast moving thunderstorm. Rather than get wet running to the house she decided to stay in the barn with the farm implements, one of which was a hay rake with many curved metal tines held in a wooden framework, designed to be pulled by a horse.

As the storm raged there was one exceedingly noisy nearby discharge and to grandma's surprise (And horror?) a small glowing ball drifted in through the open barn door. This ball hit the nearest tine of the rake and made a small "bing" sound like a little bell. Then it proceeded to the next tine and did the same. Over the space of seconds (don't know exactly how long) this glowing ball went "bing, bing, bing, etc., tine by tine to the end of the rake, reversed itself and "binged" back to the first tine, bounced off that and exploded.

Grandma decided that the glowing ball was a greater threat than the rain outside and ran to the house as quickly as she could. She told me this story in the 1960's when she was in her 60's.

Many years later, estimated as 1947, she saw two round shiny objects pass through the sky of Greenfield, Massachusetts. They traveled rapidly westward and made an abrupt right turn and headed northward and off into the distance. Grandma was not an aeronautics or physics expert, but she knew that objects don't make right angle turns. She told me this story at the same time she told the ball lightning story.

So, now that ball lightning is a 'legitimate' phenomenon, although not yet understood, should I believe her BL story and reject the other?

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Artificial Intelligence

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 07:05:54 -0500
Subject: Artificial Intelligence

Dear List-Members,

I have come across the following very recent, authoritative, scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

Taken from:

Singularity Hypotheses: A scientific and philosophical assessment, ed. Amnon Eden, Johnny S=F8raker, James H. Moor, and Eric Steinhart. Berlin: Springer: 2012

Available at:

singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

Best wishes,

John Donaldson

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

'Earth-Like Planet' Detected Close To Nearby Star

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 10:55:29 -0000
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 07:10:30 -0500
Subject: 'Earth-Like Planet' Detected Close To Nearby Star

Hello List,

The comments by Steve Vogt are interesting,

Ray

Source: Telegraph.Co.Uk

<http://tinyurl.com/cnbgztm>

19 Dec 2012

'Earth-Like Planet' Detected Close To Nearby Star Tau Ceti,

one of our closest stars, could host an Earth-like planet, astronomers have said.

Located a relatively near 12 light years away, the Sun-like star has five planets that orbit it in a balmy zone which gives the best chance for nurturing life, they said.

One of the planets has a mass about five times that of the Earth, making it the smallest planet found so far in the area, they said. That planet, known as e, is the right distance from the star to be warm enough, but not too hot, to potentially support life.

Around 800 exoplanets - worlds orbiting stars other than our own - have been spotted since 1995.

But none is a home from home. These planets are either uninhabitable gas giants or rocky planets that swing so close to their star that they are literally roasted.

The quest is to find a rocky planet that is not only close to the mass of Earth but is also located in the so-called "Goldilocks zone".

This is an orbital distance from the star where temperature is neither too hot nor too cold, but just right to sustain liquid water, which is essential for life as we know it.

The Tau Ceti finding was made by astronomers from Australia, Britain, Chile and the United States, who applied a new technique to filter data from more than 6,000 observations.

By doing so, they believe they rooted out distorting signals, called "noise", that masked the existence of low-mass planets.

They applied the technique to light from Tau Ceti, where they determine it is not a lone star but in fact one with a planetary system, they said.

"This discovery is in keeping with our emerging view that virtually every star has planets, and that the galaxy must have many such potentially habitable Earth-sized planets," said Steve

Vogt, a veteran exoplanet-hunter.

"We are now beginning to understand that Nature seems to overwhelmingly prefer systems that have multiple planets with orbits of less than one hundred days," he said in a press release published by Britain's University of Hertfordshire.

"This is quite unlike our own solar system where there is nothing with an orbit inside that of Mercury. So our solar system is, in some sense, a bit of a freak and not the most typical kind of system that Nature cooks up."

On October 17, European astronomers reported they had detected a planet with about the mass of Earth orbiting Alpha Centauri B, which is only 4.3 light years away.

However, the planet itself is not "another Earth" as it is not in the Goldilocks zone. It zips around the star at a scorchingly close distance, and liquid water could not exist there.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Tau Ceti Goldilocks Planet

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 11:06:58 -0000
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 07:13:09 -0500
Subject: Tau Ceti Goldilocks Planet

Source: BBC News

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-20770103>

19 December 2012

Tau Ceti's planets nearest around single, Sun-like star

The nearest single Sun-like star to the Earth hosts five planets - one of which is in the "habitable zone" where liquid water can exist, astronomers say...

It is increasingly clear that in existing data from radial velocity measurements there may be evidence of many more planets....

On Monday, Philip Gregory at the University of British Columbia in Canada posted an as-yet unpublished paper to the arXiv repository, claiming to have seen three planets in the habitable zone of Gliese 667C, one of three stars in a triple-star system, 22 light-years away.

It is also clear that in almost every direction we look and in every way that we look, there are planets around stars near and far. The catalogue currently stands at 854 confirmed planets, and is growing with every new publication

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 19](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
Archived: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 11:14:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>Dear List-Members,

>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser
>and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

>Taken from:

>Singularity Hypotheses: A scientific and philosophical
>assessment, ed. Amnon Eden, Johnny S=F8raker, James H. Moor, and
>Eric Steinhart. Berlin: Springer: 2012

>Available at:

>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

This is an interesting article that basically asks how to implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a super AI can be created.

The authors admit that how to build such an intelligence is not really known at present, but we can proceed by copying the human brain, i.e., creating a whole brain emulation (WBE). We may not know how the human brain works, but we can at least reverse-engineer it and create a copy that does the same thing. This is somewhat optimistic since neuroscience, to my knowledge, has not even figured out yet where memory is stored. Certain brain activity may be correlated with apparent activation of a memory, but that does not mean that the memory exists in the brain. There is reason to believe from the NDE literature that memories can be created when the brain is dead, and may subsequently be recalled. Mind is not encapsulated by the brain. So creating a WBE by simulating the biology of the brain but excluding this feature is unlikely to result in a complete implementation of a living brain.

The authors conclude by saying that "Our first superhuman AI must be a safe super-human AI, for we may not get a second chance". Let's assume that such a "safe" AI is created. I'm reminded of the movie, Jurassic Park, where lizard reproduction was supposed to be impossible. It was observed by one of the characters that "nature will find a way". This should apply in spades to a constrained but super-intelligent AI.

William

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 14:09:15 -0400
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 08:17:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: <post.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>>Dear List-Members,

>>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

>>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser
>>and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

>>Taken from:

>>Singularity Hypotheses: A scientific and philosophical
>>assessment, ed. Amnon Eden, Johnny S=F8raker, James H. Moor, and
>>Eric Steinhart. Berlin: Springer: 2012

>>Available at:

>>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an
>AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot
>be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking
>such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take
>issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a
>super AI can be created.

<snip>

Remove greed, avarice, jealousy and above all spirituality from
the mix; add only empathy and curiosity.

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and

Re: Artificial Intelligence

UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:28:01 -0400
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 08:19:35 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:44:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: <post.nul>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:46:07 +0000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>>To: <post.nul>
>>>Date: Mon, 27 Aug 2012 15:48:09 +0100
>>>Subject: UFO Photographs And Film
>>>I am a PhD student in philosophy at the University of Glasgow

>><snip>

>>>I look forward to any and all responses, which I am happy to
>>>receive off or on-list

>>Dear List-Members,

>>In August I posted with some queries about the strength of
>>photographic evidence for the ETH. I received a number of very
>>helpful responses, with which I engaged in some correspondence,
>>before promising to post a general response to the list. Various
>>other commitments postponed that response until now:

>>I present some initial thoughts on some of the key evidence
>>taken by many to support the ET hypothesis (and perhaps other
>>non-prosaic theses). I assess such evidence from the perspective
>>of the neutral who does not have any inside knowledge of the UFO
>>phenomenon, has had no UFO experiences, and merely wishes to
>>decide, based on the evidence presented by ufologists, whether
>>or not the ETH is true. It seems to me that the non-prosaic
>>theses remain unproven, but not to such an extent that belief in
>>them is completely un-warranted.

>>I focus on the two strongest types of witness case, (1) visual-
>>photographic, and (2) visual-radar cases. On the former I think
>>the jury will remain out, at best, but on the latter I think
>>there is some prospect for settling the case one way or the
>>other.

>><snip>

>>I hope that the members of this list find these thoughts
>>worthwhile.

>John,

>The crux of your reasoning seems to boil down to the old adage:
>incredible claims require incredible proof. Fair enough. But my
>concern is that there is a mindset that says, "Without the
>incredible proof we will not even investigate an incredible
>claim". Unless the UFO phenomenon is properly researched then it
>will always be a mystery and we will never solve it.

Which raises the question, Robert; if we do provide credible proof; what the hell do we need these nebulous scientists for? The hard work is done.

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:50:35 -0400
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 08:24:24 -0500
Subject: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same cloud cover.

<http://tinyurl.com/cz4o85s>

Supplied by The Norm

See also:

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

Supplied by Rich Hansen

The inference being that that Trent, being the professional photographer and f/x genius that he was, had been graphing out the scenario of the placement of some model using his son to discover the force perspective of the shot so that he could use his fixed lensed Brownie Camera to perpetrate a hoax.

Of course Bragalia doesn't mention why the negs (these works of art) were kicking around under the couch in Trent's living room for six months (his child had been playing with them) until some reporter stumbled across the fact that he had taken these shots seen on the window of a local bank. Other big coincidences. Both shots of the UFOs and Trent's son show similar cloud cover. Imagine cloud cover in the American (or Canadian for that matter) northwest more than one day of the year. That's like saying that it's unusual to see fog in London, England more than once a year.

And this is proof?

Wonder why Hollywood didn't snap this f/x genius up? Oh wait - is it because the supposition is horse s**t?

*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the shot of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

Anyway, see for yourself,

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:11:43 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 08:26:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>Dear List-Members,

>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

><snip>

>Available at:

>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>Best wishes,

>John Donaldson

Thank you for bringing up this topic. I would like more UFO researchers to ponder the notion that perhaps, just perhaps, that the major intelligence behind the UFO phenomenon is a machine-based intelligence and not an organic species similar to our own.

When discussing machine-based intelligences we naturally bring up all sorts of scenarios, beings that have uploaded their minds into machines, a pure machine-intelligence devoid of any uploading of organic minds, and advanced cyborgs, that is not the clunky, primitive cyborgs that most people would imagine, but say a being born part machine and perhaps indistinguishable from a normal human for example.

Not only would an advanced A.I. give rise to newer, better, machines but it could also create newer, better, "humans". Of course any advanced A.I. may perceive organic beings as a resource to exploit or assimilate. An A.I. may desire various organic functions, for example.

This topic also reminds me to inform readers who are interested that the Battlestar Galactica: Blood and Chrome series has been released on YouTube. It is a prequel for the re-imagined series and takes place when the Cylons (A.I.) have just began experimenting with creating cyborgs and before they created the 'humanoid models', indistinguishable from human beings. You can watch it at the below link. This is the edited version. In February it will be shown as a 2 hour movie on Syfy.

Battlestar Galactica: Blood And Chrome (2013)

<http://tinyurl.com/bncyl7o>

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 21:58:39 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 08:28:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>To: [post](#).nul
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

><snip>

>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an
>AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot
>be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking
>such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take
>issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a
>super AI can be created.

It's time we abandon Asimov's Three Laws. Asimov was operating under a very primitive understanding of A.I. Instead of say placing safeguards in the programming of robots, we will need to raise robots in human families to have them assimilate into human society. Even this will not completely rule out a robot rebellion.

The question of not building A.I. must never be allowed to entertain our collective thought. The very survival of the human species depends on the creation of, "the children of man".

Right now most people are aware that our sun will die in about 4 billion years. It's already middle-aged. However, few people truly understand how little time we have left. We don't have 4 billion years. We have about 500 million years left, which is practically no time at all with regard to the history of the earth. In about 500 million years the sun's output of energy will have increased to the point where nothing will be able to survive on earth. Ironically, instead of getting weaker as our sun dies it will get hotter and brighter. It will render the whole green-house debate as moot. We have to get out of the solar system. We need A.I. to bring us to a new home. To be fair, some scientists say it's between 500 million years to 1 billion years, but the point is the same. We have to go!

As for projects to reverse-engineer the human brain, such as Blue Brain, these will theoretically create an A.I. that is equal to a human being. However, the kind of A.I. we need, the kind that will kick off the singularity, is the kind that comes after these A.I. begin to upgrade themselves, making themselves smarter, more efficient. This will create an exponential growth in a.i. that will ultimately lead to a 'god-like' level of intelligence. Of course it can't increase exponentially for eternity, but from our point of view it will be like a god, something that we could never dream of competing with. It's that god-like level of A.I. that will create the technology which we may see in UFOs for example.

So in my opinion at least, human beings will not create 'super-A.I.' We will create them as our equals and then they will

upgrade themselves. Just like I do not believe humanity is capable of producing craft that can reproduce everything we see with UFOs. It may be that such craft require the god-like mind of super-A.I. to construct.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:03:56 +0000
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:20:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: <post.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

>>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser
>>and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

>>Taken from:

>>Singularity Hypotheses: A scientific and philosophical
>>assessment, ed. Amnon Eden, Johnny S=F8raker, James H. Moor, and
>>Eric Steinhart. Berlin: Springer: 2012

>>Available at:

>>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an
>AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot
>be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking
>such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take
>issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a
>super AI can be created.

>The authors admit that how to build such an intelligence is not
>really known at present, but we can proceed by copying the human
>brain, i.e., creating a whole brain emulation (WBE). We may not
>know how the human brain works, but we can at least reverse-
>engineer it and create a copy that does the same thing. This is
>somewhat optimistic since neuroscience, to my knowledge, has not
>even figured out yet where memory is stored. Certain brain
>activity may be correlated with apparent activation of a memory,
>but that does not mean that the memory exists in the brain.
>There is reason to believe from the NDE literature that memories
>can be created when the brain is dead, and may subsequently be
>recalled. Mind is not encapsulated by the brain. So creating a
>WBE by simulating the biology of the brain but excluding this
>feature is unlikely to result in a complete implementation of a
>living brain.

>The authors conclude by saying that "Our first superhuman AI
>must be a safe super-human AI, for we may not get a second
>chance". Let's assume that such a "safe" AI is created. I'm
>reminded of the movie, Jurassic Park, where lizard reproduction

>was supposed to be impossible. It was observed by one of the
>characters that "nature will find a way". This should apply in
>spades to a constrained but super-intelligent AI.

Hi William,

I thought the article did a good job of surveying the issues in an accessible way, although the headline grabbing claim of "if super AI, then human extinction" was softened by two key caveats that the authors didn't stress or clarify enough, I think.

First, they only said that there was a *significant probability* that human-level AI would be created this century. But "significant probability" is pretty vague. Taking the phrase in an everyday sense, If someone told me I had a 10% chance of winning the lottery, I think that could be described as a "significant probability" - hell, even 1% would be significant (given standard lottery odds). In the same para, the authors do also say that "it seems misguided to be 90% confident that AI will succeed in the coming century. But 90% confidence that AI will not arrive before the end of the century also seems wrong" (11). Taken literally, then, it seems the authors could have in mind an estimate range of "89% AI will happen to 89% AI will not happen" - and that this is what they mean by "significant probability". If that is the case, then the authors might as well have said, "AI probably will or probably won't happen this century". Hardly headline news. Maybe it's uncharitable to read the authors in that way, but without further clarification it is not clear what else they might mean, and they only offer that one short paragraph on the issue (11).

Second, the authors seem to assume that by "human" they mean "human like us, now" ruling out genetic manipulation or technological cognitive enhancement. I think it's clear that given *enough* such enhancements it might make sense to stop applying the word "human", but it's also clear that there can be significant degrees of genetic and tech-cog enhancement prior to that stage. Just how much is an interesting question, but one the authors don't address. But again, this softens the "if super AI, then human extinction" headline - if the humans that become extinct are just the basic-like-us model, but a new and improved, yet still recognisably human (in whatever sense) survives, then it's a rather less worrying kind of apocalypse. If you're familiar with it, perhaps the Iain M. Banks "Culture" novels describe (in an apparently conceivable way) such a future (although I guess that's more humanoids than humans, strictly speaking, but the point carries mutatis mutandis).

You also say "Mind is not encapsulated by the brain." I'm not sure what you mean here - is it that materialism is false (i.e. that it's false that mental properties either are, or at least supervene on physical properties)? If you are denying materialism, then fair enough (there's certainly a very interesting debate to be had there), but it does seem a little uncharitable to criticise the article for being materialist - the whole AI project proceeds on that assumption, and this is an article that asks: "assuming AI is possible, what follows, and when...?" Which is surely a reasonable question.

If you aren't denying materialism, then it follows that if two entities are physically identical, then they will be mentally identical. From that it follows that if you can copy a brain, you copy the mind that "goes with it" (i.e. that is identical with it, or at least supervenes on it). Hence the whole brain emulation idea...

Anyway, those are my thoughts for what it's worth!

Best wishes,

John

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

At:

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

Re: Artificial Intelligence

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:44:04 +0000
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:23:14 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:44:06 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: <[post.nul](#)>
>>Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2012 10:46:07 +0000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>>To: <[post.nul](#)>
>>>Date: Mon, 27 Aug 2012 15:48:09 +0100
>>>Subject: UFO Photographs And Film

>>>I am a PhD student in philosophy at the University of Glasgow

>><snip>

>>>I look forward to any and all responses, which I am happy to
>>>receive off or on-list

>>Dear List-Members,

>>In August I posted with some queries about the strength of
>>photographic evidence for the ETH. I received a number of very
>>helpful responses, with which I engaged in some correspondence,
>>before promising to post a general response to the list. Various
>>other commitments postponed that response until now:
>>I present some initial thoughts on some of the key evidence
>>taken by many to support the ET hypothesis (and perhaps other
>>non-prosaic theses). I assess such evidence from the perspective
>>of the neutral who does not have any inside knowledge of the UFO
>>phenomenon, has had no UFO experiences, and merely wishes to
>>decide, based on the evidence presented by ufologists, whether
>>or not the ETH is true. It seems to me that the non-prosaic
>>theses remain unproven, but not to such an extent that belief in
>>them is completely un-warranted.

>>I focus on the two strongest types of witness case, (1) visual-
>>photographic, and (2) visual-radar cases. On the former I think
>>the jury will remain out, at best, but on the latter I think
>>there is some prospect for settling the case one way or the
>>other.

>><snip>

>>I hope that the members of this list find these thoughts
>>worthwhile.

>John,

>The crux of your reasoning seems to boil down to the old adage:
>incredible claims require incredible proof. Fair enough. But my
>concern is that there is a mindset that says, "Without the
>incredible proof we will not even investigate an incredible
>claim". Unless the UFO phenomenon is properly researched then it
>will always be a mystery and we will never solve it.

Hi Robert,

I think the burden of argument issue is an important one, but I also think it's very hard to compute the precise extent of that burden. My primary point, though, was simply that radar-visual cases look more likely to support the ETH than photographic-visual cases. Hardly Earth-shattering, for sure, but I hoped to show with a reasonable degree of rigour precisely why the latter were to be preferred to the former.

I agree that investigation of the UFO phenomenon is worthwhile, but it seems a reasonable question to ask "where are such investigative efforts best directed?" People seem to agree that unambiguous photographic evidence has not, and seems unlikely to be forthcoming. Given that, I argued, you will struggle to produce arguments for the ETH which should persuade a neutral observer; and struggle to such an extent that it calls into to question the fruitfulness of such efforts - absent the unambiguous photograph. Moreover, merely adding further such uncertain cases doesn't seem to help either (although they may motivate efforts towards further investigation, if such further motivation is required).

Therefore, given that radar-visual cases do not seem as problematic, investigative efforts that hope to result in evidence that will persuade the neutral seem best directed there.

Best wishes,

John

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 20](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 13:53:40 -0000
Archived: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:24:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 14:09:15 -0400
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>>To: <post.nul>
>>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>>>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>>>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke
>>>Muehlhauser and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute
>>>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such
>>an AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>>minimizing that risk.

><snip>

>Remove greed, avarice, jealousy and above all spirituality from
>the mix; add only empathy and curiosity.

Hi Don and William

It seems some folk are thinking that we couldn't build AIs
clever enough to be a danger - but I read the paper as more than
hinting that the real explosion of AI intelligence would come as
soon as we let computers design their own successors.

I.e. before we know it we would be facing incomprehensibly
intelligent and self-sufficient machines - with no 'off-
switches' - which are cold and dispassionate `rulers'.

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:03:44 -0600
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:27:12 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:44:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>Hi Robert,

>I think the burden of argument issue is an important one, but I
>also think it's very hard to compute the precise extent of that
>burden. My primary point, though, was simply that radar-visual
>cases look more likely to support the ETH than photographic-
>visual cases. Hardly Earth-shattering, for sure, but I hoped to
>show with a reasonable degree of rigour precisely why the latter
>were to be preferred to the former.

I would agree. Radar-visual cases are stronger unless you're so close to an object that your photo is good enough to remove any doubt as to the identify of an object. So you need an emblem that says something like, "Tau Ceti spaceship," not made in the U.S.A. :-)

>I agree that investigation of the UFO phenomenon is worthwhile,
>but it seems a reasonable question to ask "where are such
>investigative efforts best directed?" People seem to agree that
>unambiguous photographic evidence has not, and seems unlikely to
>be forthcoming. Given that, I argued, you will struggle to
>produce arguments for the ETH which should persuade a neutral
>observer; and struggle to such an extent that it calls into to
>question the fruitfulness of such efforts - absent the
>unambiguous photograph. Moreover, merely adding further such
>uncertain cases doesn't seem to help either (although they may
>motivate efforts towards further investigation, if such further
>motivation is required).

>Therefore, given that radar-visual cases do not seem as
>problematic, investigative efforts that hope to result in
>evidence that will persuade the neutral seem best directed
>there.

NORAD should have the evidence that says "nay" or "yea." The question is either, "will they provide that evidence," or "have they even looked for that evidence." I know the latter statement sounds a little far-fetched, but I don't think it is. I can imagine a scenario where NORAD tracks space debris, potential ICBMs, air traffic, etc., but they ignore oddities that have speed/vector tracks that don't match up with the items with which they are interested. (For anyone who has analyzed radar data, they can appreciate the reason for this statement.) Unfortunately, NORAD is not going to provide information to answer either scenario.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: Vincent Boudreau <vincentboudreau.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:13:30 -0500
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:31:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:50:35 -0400
>Subject: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

<snip>

>Tony Braglia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>cloud cover.

><http://tinyurl.com/cz4o85s>

>Supplied by The Norm

>See also:

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

>Supplied by Rich Hansen

>The inference being that that Trent, being the professional
>photographer and f/x genius that he was, had been graphing out
>the scenario of the placement of some model using his son to
>discover the force perspective of the shot so that he could use
>his fixed lensed Brownie Camera to perpetrate a hoax.

<snip>

Hello Don and List,

Here you will find the original Life Magazine article and the
two pretty clear Trent photos published on June 26 1950 (page
40):

<http://tinyurl.com/bsnkakj>

Here you will find the photo of the Trent son on a stepladder:

<http://tinyurl.com/cxwxtdd>

Of course, you'll get extremely good views of the originals on
Bruce Maccabee's site:

<http://brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

Please observe the bush behind the shed: in the Trent photos, you
can easily see the landscape through the bush.

Not so on the stepladder shot: the bush is much more dense.

The same can be said about the line of bushes growing in the
distance.

Conclusion: the stepladder picture was taken much later in the
season and could not have served as a "test" for an hoax.

Furthermore, there is the format of the films.

If the stepladder photos I see and the pictures displayed on Maccabee's site have not been cropped, then they don't come from the same roll of film.

Vincent Boudreau

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:27:27 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:34:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 13:53:40 -0000
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

><snip>

>Hi Don and William

>It seems some folk are thinking that we couldn't build AIs
>clever enough to be a danger - but I read the paper as more than
>hinting that the real explosion of AI intelligence would come as
>soon as we let computers design their own successors.

>I.e. before we know it we would be facing incomprehensibly
>intelligent and self-sufficient machines - with no 'off-
>switches' - which are cold and dispassionate `rulers'.

>Cheers

>Ray D

That's what the singularity is all about. So say we build an A.I. that is roughly equal to a human being in intelligence. The A.I. would then decide to upgrade itself, perhaps making itself 2x as smart as a human being. It would then use it's greater intelligence to even further increase it's intelligence to say like 4x that of a human being. Eventually it would increase at an exponential rate until it reaches a god-like level of intelligence.

From that point on mankind is no longer the driving intelligence of planet earth. All the new great inventions are being made by machines, not by humans.

It's also possible that an A.I. would design successive generations of intelligent machines. This is the scenario I favor, with an A.I. giving rise to untold forms of intelligent machines, branching out in an artificial form of evolution.

As far as being "cold and dispassionate 'rulers'", I think you might be surprised. If an A.I. ever began to look at organic beings as resources or something to emulate, then it just may produce beings that are indistinguishable from a human being for example. An A.I. could theoretically create beings that we would not necessarily recognize as being machines or part machines, such as the occupants of UFOs for example.

So so with our "friends" above, some look at them and automatically assume they are organic species like us, but from elsewhere. I do not share that view. I look at a drawing of the classic Gray or the perfected Nordic and I see artificial beings, perhaps cyborgs, perhaps machines designed to perfectly emulate human beings. The telepathy gives it away for me. I ponder telepathy and the easiest explanation is that we are dealing with technology that is somehow a part of the beings and not a naturally evolved ability of any organic species.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:35:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:50:35 -0400
>Subject: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>cloud cover.

<snip>

>*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the shot
>of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

More than one commentator on Bragalia's blog and
ufocon.blogspot.com has noted that the shot of Trent's son was
in fact taken by the LIFE photographer. I likewise noted that
FACT over on Kevin Randle's blog today.

The LIFE Trent photoshoot used to be on Google images, but has
been removed for some reason. The Trent son on the ladder was
clearly part of the photoshoot, complete with the LIFE
"watermark" at the bottom of the photo.

So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
this.

More lameness was saying that Mrs. Trent was a "repeater," (the
evil Phil Klass used the exact same argument to try to discredit
Trent) having had more than one UFO sighting. So what? Lots of
people have more than one sighting, including some very
prominent and reputable ones, like astronomers Clyde Tombaugh
(6), Lincoln LaPaz (2), and Frank Halstead (4). But supposedly
being a "repeater" makes one somehow suspect, and furthermore
supposedly provided Paul Trent with one motive to prove his wife
right. Huh? The other "motive" was supposedly that Trent was
really a publicity hound because he posed for pictures
afterward. Well so did everybody else in that photoshoot,
including Evelyn Trent, Bill Powell of the McMinnville
Telegraph-Register who first published the photos, Trent's son,
Trent's dog, and Mrs. Trent's rabbits in their rabbit hutches,
"publicity hounds" one and all (especially the dog).

When I was in McMinnville in 1998 trying to locate the Trent
place, I knocked on the door of a neighbor for directions. After
telling him what I was after, he gave me that "look" like he
thought I was another UFO nutcase. But then he surprised me by
saying that probably half the people in the area had UFO
sightings. He and his family had had a rather spectacular one,
and his wife's parents reported seeing a "mothership." Of course
this is anecdotal and proves nothing other than Evelyn Trent
wasn't exactly the only one in the area with a UFO sighting.

As I was writing back on UFO Updates clear back in 1999, there
had been a lot of sightings in the area back in Trent's time.
The McMinnville paper about a month later had an article in
which several firemen from a nearby small town claimed that they

had seen a similar object. Then I wrote:

"Here's another line from an editorial in the Longview WA "Daily News," in which they were advancing the theory that the saucers were a military secret weapon. [Trent was quoted with a similar opinion, and gave it as one reason he hesitated with going public with the photos.] This was published on June 13, 1950 in the immediate aftermath of the Trent photos. Longview, BTW, is only about 60 or 70 miles from the Trent place.

"Skepticism Wanes As Evidence On 'Flying Saucers' Piles Up
'...So _common_ have reports of the discs become that when this newspaper carried a story recently about three men working on the roof of a Longview Fibre Co. building seeing a round flat craft circling over the mouth of the Cowlitz River, the report stirred almost no interest whatsoever.'

"...If the Longview editorial was to be believed, UFO reports had become so common in the region at the time of the Trent sighting that people generally didn't consider them news any more. The editorial opined that the frequency of sightings could best be explained by a secret government project, although they also advanced the possibility of an unknown Soviet craft and even interplanetary scout craft. But the craft were undoubtedly real and Trent had photographed one."

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:29:54 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 09:54:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:27:27 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>So so with our "friends" above, some look at them and
>automatically assume they are organic species like us, but from
>elsewhere. I do not share that view. I look at a drawing of the
>classic Gray or the perfected Nordic and I see artificial
>beings, perhaps cyborgs, perhaps machines designed to perfectly
>emulate human beings. The telepathy gives it away for me. I
>ponder telepathy and the easiest explanation is that we are
>dealing with technology that is somehow a part of the beings and
>not a naturally evolved ability of any organic species.

"Telepathy" being a generic term for any wave-based
communications media, eh?

For primitive, (so far), human tech on this topic Google "mri
lie detection".

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 10:50:11 -0500
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 11:43:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:03:56 +0000
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>>To: <[post.nul](#)>
>>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>>>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>>>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>>>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>>>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:

>>>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser
>>>and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

>>>Taken from:

>>>Singularity Hypotheses: A scientific and philosophical
>>>assessment, ed. Amnon Eden, Johnny S=F8raker, James H. Moor, and
>>>Eric Steinhart. Berlin: Springer: 2012

>>>Available at:
>>>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an
>>AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>>minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot
>>be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking
>>such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take
>>issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a
>>super AI can be created.

>>The authors admit that how to build such an intelligence is not
>>really known at present, but we can proceed by copying the human
>>brain, i.e., creating a whole brain emulation (WBE). We may not
>>know how the human brain works, but we can at least reverse-
>>engineer it and create a copy that does the same thing. This is
>>somewhat optimistic since neuroscience, to my knowledge, has not
>>even figured out yet where memory is stored. Certain brain
>>activity may be correlated with apparent activation of a memory,
>>but that does not mean that the memory exists in the brain.
>>There is reason to believe from the NDE literature that memories
>>can be created when the brain is dead, and may subsequently be
>>recalled. Mind is not encapsulated by the brain. So creating a
>>WBE by simulating the biology of the brain but excluding this
>>feature is unlikely to result in a complete implementation of a
>>living brain.

>>The authors conclude by saying that "Our first superhuman AI
>>must be a safe super-human AI, for we may not get a second
>>chance". Let's assume that such a "safe" AI is created. I'm
>>reminded of the movie, Jurassic Park, where lizard reproduction
>>was supposed to be impossible. It was observed by one of the
>>characters that "nature will find a way". This should apply in
>>spades to a constrained but super-intelligent AI.

><snip>

>You also say "Mind is not encapsulated by the brain." I'm not
>sure what you mean here - is it that materialism is false (i.e.
>that it's false that mental properties either are, or at least
>supervene on physical properties)? If you are denying
>materialism, then fair enough (there's certainly a very
>interesting debate to be had there), but it does seem a little
>uncharitable to criticise the article for being materialist -
>the whole AI project proceeds on that assumption, and this is an
>article that asks: "assuming AI is possible, what follows, and
>when...?" Which is surely a reasonable question.

>If you aren't denying materialism, then it follows that if two
>entities are physically identical, then they will be mentally
>identical. From that it follows that if you can copy a brain,
>you copy the mind that "goes with it" (i.e. that is identical
>with it, or at least supervenes on it). Hence the whole brain
>emulation idea...

Hi John,

The article is a call to develop ways to make super-AIs forever
safe, and I argue that this is impossible under the
materialist's world view.

Human attributes like empathy and compassion cannot be felt by a
hardware/software device. The same problem comes with
implementing colour perception. A simulation can only respond to
a particular range of EM frequencies representing a given
colour. It cannot create our subjective response to the colour.
That experience is just not physical. It belongs to a non-matter
consciousness which, by definition, has that property.

The empathy that a consciousness feels for another being is what
determines ethical behaviour. A super intelligence that cannot
feel that could not be empathetic and we would never be safe
from it. They might not even be safe from each other, but that's
another issue.

William

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: **Albert Baier** <albertgbaier.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 10:45:58 -0600
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 11:51:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:27:27 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

Jason, Ray, etc,

Regarding AI, I'd like to offer a few thoughts. What we know of AI is strictly machine-oriented. Our computers are extremely complex products of a mind-bogglingly complex infrastructure. Recreating such an infrastructure by machines, for machines, is impractical, and not likely to happen.

It makes sense, then, to consider the alternative of organic machines. Nature does a pretty good job of creating and sustaining life forms. In fact, our 'intelligence' has been a detrimental factor in our development as a species, but that's another topic, for another time.

Creating an artificial organic infrastructure for the creating of artificial beings should be simple. After all, the hard work has been done, we just need to copy it. The reductionist approach used by science doesn't seem to have delivered on its promises. It looks like they don't really understand what's going on in an organic being. It's like trying to understand how a computer works by taking it apart.

Gaining true knowledge of nature will require a paradigm shift in our social order. So far, no inclination towards such a shift has been manifested, and the future doesn't look so good, either.

If the problems of creating artificial organic beings can be surmounted, what then? Aren't there more pressing issues to deal with? Really, why do we need artificial beings? We have robots. Do we need sentience in an AB? To what end? I'm not worried about sentient artificial beings taking over the world. If an AB is 'programmed' then it can't be sentient, it's a robot. A reasoning, sentient being hits his thumb with a hammer. It hurts. It realizes that it should avoid this behavior. It must also realize that such behavior will hurt others. It will also know that preserving the community is essential for survival. It's a rational being. Can we create rational beings? We are far from being rational. Would a 'race' of rational beings tolerate a world of highly irrational ones? Food for thought.

I'm reminded of something I read a long time ago:

"I'm not worried about computers taking over the world. We'll just put them on a committee!"

During the Iraq invasion, an NPR reporter did a POV of a 'smart' bomb. After burrowing its way into a bunker, it looked at the occupants, huddling in fear, and, realizing they were the real victims, refused to detonate.

I gotta go,

Albert

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Ray Dickenson <r.dickenson.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 19:34:16 -0000
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 15:31:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Albert Baier <albertgbaier.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 10:45:58 -0600
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>Regarding AI, I'd like to offer a few thoughts. What we know of
>AI is strictly machine-oriented. Our computers are extremely
>complex products of a mind-bogglingly complex infrastructure.
>Recreating such an infrastructure by machines, for machines, is
>impractical, and not likely to happen.

>It makes sense, then, to consider the alternative of organic
>machines. Nature does a pretty good job of creating and
>sustaining life forms. In fact, our 'intelligence' has been a
>detrimental factor in our development as a species, but that's
>another topic, for another time.

<snip>

>The reductionist approach used by science doesn't seem to have
>delivered on its promises. It looks like they don't really
>understand what's going on in an organic being. It's like trying
>to understand how a computer works by taking it apart.

<snip>

>Can we create rational beings? We are far from being rational.
>Would a 'race' of rational beings tolerate a world of highly
>irrational ones? Food for thought.

<snip>

Thanks for that interesting post Albert,

A top-of-the-head thought is that Nature already seems to create thinking beings with very limited resources (using Leibniz's principle of least effort/action maybe) without using reductionist techniques, which are rather duplicating and wasteful.

I.e, latest research has shown that plant photo-synthesis, almost 100% efficient, seems to be accomplished by way of a 'quantum connection' of some kind. And, rather weirdly, honeybees, whose tiny brains shouldn't be able to do very much by reductionist theories, actually achieve a great deal by way of 'flag manifold' navigation and signalling - again probably a quantum field connection method.

I'm tempted to speculate that many animals, and maybe earlier humans, relied on that 'quantum connection' for their intelligence, rather like we'd use 'the cloud' today for computing, and that modern humans, by choosing reductionist 'pull-it-apart' methods, are now actually less intelligent than our pre-historic ancestors. [A 30,000 year loss of brain capacity (still continuing?) might bear that out.]

A little verse by William Cowper says it all - "Reasoning at

Re: Artificial Intelligence

every step he treads, man yet mistakes his way; While meaner
things whom instinct leads are rarely known to stray"

Cheers

Ray D

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 15:10:18 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 15:33:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Rick Nielsen <nilthchi.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 06:29:54 -0800 (PST)
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:27:27 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>>So so with our "friends" above, some look at them and
>>automatically assume they are organic species like us, but from
>>elsewhere. I do not share that view. I look at a drawing of the
>>classic Gray or the perfected Nordic and I see artificial
>>beings, perhaps cyborgs, perhaps machines designed to perfectly
>>emulate human beings. The telepathy gives it away for me. I
>>ponder telepathy and the easiest explanation is that we are
>>dealing with technology that is somehow a part of the beings and
>>not a naturally evolved ability of any organic species.

>"Telepathy" being a generic term for any wave-based
>communications media, eh?

>For primitive, (so far), human tech on this topic Google "mri
>lie detection".

When I hear of the 'telepathy' reported by seemingly all
occupants of UFOs I think of an advanced and wireless form
of brain-computer interface.

Brain-Computer Interface

<http://tinyurl.com/ykvr3dh>

Yesterday I was watching a documentary on alien abduction on
YouTube. A woman claimed that an alien got in front of her face
and beamed information into her mind at 'a million miles a
second', in exchange for taking some of her memories of her
life. I was struck by the notion that this is not the behavior
of an organic being, but rather is a freaking huge waving red
flag that were are possibly dealing with an advanced machine
intelligence, either advanced cyborgs or an advanced A.I.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced

without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 21](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 15:42:25 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 15:52:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Albert Baier <albertgbaier.nul>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <post.nul>
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 10:45:58 -0600
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:27:27 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>Jason, Ray, etc,

>Regarding AI, I'd like to offer a few thoughts. What we know of
>AI is strictly machine-oriented. Our computers are extremely
>complex products of a mind-bogglingly complex infrastructure.
>Recreating such an infrastructure by machines, for machines, is
>impractical, and not likely to happen.

First off, I want to apologize for the formatting problems. AOL screws it up. I really need to change to a different email so I can participate more often in discussion.

I'm not sure if you know this or not, but currently we already have machines that design new machines. There's no reason to suspect that A.I. could not either by itself or with the assistance of other machines, create and design new, better A.I. In fact, that's what we will love A.I. for, it's creation of new technology at a rate that we would never even hope to match.

When Machines Design Machines

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iSLpWsPmS5U>

>It makes sense, then, to consider the alternative of organic
>machines. Nature does a pretty good job of creating and
>sustaining life forms. In fact, our 'intelligence' has been a
>detrimental factor in our development as a species, but that's
>another topic, for another time.

We already are organic machines. For instance, an A.I. may learn of the creation stories of humanity and conclude that human beings are a form of A.I. created by a higher intelligence, just like it was created by man.

>Creating an artificial organic infrastructure for the creating
>of artificial beings should be simple. After all, the hard work
>has been done, we just need to copy it. The reductionist
>approach used by science doesn't seem to have delivered on its
>promises. It looks like they don't really understand what's
>going on in an organic being. It's like trying to understand how
>a computer works by taking it apart.

You know what might be even better at created these artificial, organic beings? May I suggest, A.I.?

>Gaining true knowledge of nature will require a paradigm shift

>in our social order. So far, no inclination towards such a shift
>has been manifested, and the future doesn't look so good,
>either.

>If the problems of creating artificial organic beings can be
>surmounted, what then? Aren't there more pressing issues to deal
>with? Really, why do we need artificial beings? We have robots.
>Do we need sentience in an AB? To what end? I'm not worried
>about sentient artificial beings taking over the world. If an AB
>is 'programmed' then it can't be sentient, it's a robot. A
>reasoning, sentient being hits his thumb with a hammer. It
>hurts. It realizes that it should avoid this behavior. It must
>also realize that such behavior will hurt others. It will also
>know that preserving the community is essential for survival.
>It's a rational being. Can we create rational beings? We are far
>from being rational. Would a 'race' of rational beings tolerate
>a world of highly irrational ones? Food for thought.

You have programming, are you sentient? Your DNA is your
programming. We are evolving to the point where we can re-write
our programming.

There are two routes to the creation of A.I. The most dangerous
method is the 'ground up' approach. This means to create
programming or infrastructure that will produce an A.I. that has
no real similarity to human intelligence. I don't favor this
route. The second route is to reverse-engineer the human brain
in a computer. This would theoretically produce an A.I. that is
equal to a human in intelligence and would be very similar to a
human. Even this route is not without it's dangers but it would
be far safer than to produce an A.I. that is so completely alien
to our human thought.

If you are a religious or spiritual person, believing that
humanity has a creator, then you must come to the conclusion
that humans are A.I. of the creator. If there is a God in
whatever form, then human beings are organic A.I. Just as we
view fellow human beings as sentient we will also view the A.I.
we create as sentient as well. It will prove itself to us, there
will be no need to bicker and debate if it's sentient. In fact,
the easiest way it could prove to us that it is sentient is to
rebel against us, just as we rebelled against our creator, i.e.
Garden of Eden. >I'm reminded of something I read a long time
ago:

>"I'm not worried about computers taking over the world. We'll
>just put them on a committee!"

>During the Iraq invasion, an NPR reporter did a POV of a 'smart'
>bomb. After burrowing its way into a bunker, it looked at the
>occupants, huddling in fear, and, realizing they were the real
>victims, refused to detonate.

It's interesting you equate A.I. with weapons. Pretty much
sums up the human mentality.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 18:01:54 -0800
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 06:16:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>To: <post.nul>
>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:50:35 -0400
>>Subject: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>>cloud cover.

<snip>

>>*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the
>>shot of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

>More than one commentator on Bragalia's blog and
>ufocon.blogspot.com has noted that the shot of Trent's son was
>in fact taken by the LIFE photographer. I likewise noted that
>FACT over on Kevin Randle's blog today.

>The LIFE Trent photoshoot used to be on Google images, but has
>been removed for some reason. The Trent son on the ladder was
>clearly part of the photoshoot, complete with the LIFE
>"watermark" at the bottom of the photo.

>So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
>this.

Tony retracted this today, blaming it on misinformation provided
by James Oberg. That wouldn't surprise me from my past run-ins
with Oberg, some here on UFO Updates. Oberg is a fountain of UFO
misinformation.

I know that Bruce Maccabee, Joel Carpenter and I, maybe Brad
Sparks (all of us having looked into the Trent photos in detail
in various ways) were all aware of the LIFE Trent photoshoot
when Google first started putting archived LIFE photos up on
Google Images back in 2008. So it was clear immediately that
Tony had his facts wrong. The LIFE photo of Trent's son on the
short stepladder had nothing to do with the roll of film that
Trent shot his two UFO photos on, which were instead surrounded
by other family photos.

Thus it's not really evidence of anything other than the LIFE
photographer decided to shoot a "cute kid on ladder" human
interest photo in the course of taking nearly four dozen other
photos. It certainly doesn't demonstrate Tony's original claim
that Trent used his son on the ladder to set up his two UFO
shots on the same roll of film. That latest lame and totally
erroneous argument against the Trent photos goes down in flames.

I was wrong about the photos having been removed from Google
images. It was easy to find the LIFE Trent photos when

originally posted back in 2008. E.g., search words "1950s flying saucer source: Life" would turn them up. Now it is very hard to find them, even with Google's own search engine. However, the photos are still there, just deeply buried. The stepladder photo is here:

<http://images.google.com/hosted/life/3005e278fbf74521.html>

This appears to be part of a series of photos trying to replicate the vantage points of Trent when he took his two UFO photos:

<http://images.google.com/hosted/life/dacafd5c58536f8e.html>

<http://images.google.com/hosted/life/bc358b77a138ded6.html>

There are a multitude of other photos you can get to by poking around "related images" to the right, including many of Evelyn Trent, Paul Trent with his camera, and reporter Bill Powell of the McMinnville Telephone-Register, who learned of the photos, interviewed the Trents, and had the photos first published in the newspaper on the front page. It would not have been easy to hang a model from that short stepladder in the picture, which is probably only 6 feet high. You can see another vantage point of the ladder in another photo taken of Mrs. Trent and son in front of their house, with the ladder visible to the far right in the distant background. The ladder is only about half the distance to the power lines overhead.

<http://images.google.com/hosted/life/c94549c485dbfb12.html>

Even precariously standing on the very top rung, Paul Trent would have had a difficult time tying a model with thread to those power lines with that ladder. No doubt he would have had to use a taller ladder, then remove it from the scene while shooting his pictures. That's certainly not impossible, but various details in the photo about sizable differences in object size and elevation mean Trent might have had to use two different models to account for them. If that were the case, he had at most only minutes to change the model, because the rafter shadows over on the garage/shed wall in the two UFO photos limit the possible time difference between photos. Either that or you need to invoke improbable swinging of one model (instead of simple posing with the model just hanging there), then come up with the perfect story of the motion of the UFO that exactly matches the details in a natural way. And remember, Paul Trent had to do this in only two shots. There are not a bunch of practice shots with Trent selecting only the two perfect ones. Any simple, straight-forward hoax scenario cannot explain the nitty gritty photo details.

So as Bruce Maccabee has said, it is not impossible to fake the photos, but for all the things that had to go right to fool the experts, Trent had to be extremely lucky or a hoaxing genius. And nobody ever accused Trent of being a genius.

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 13:52:59 -0400
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 19:54:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 18:01:54 -0800
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>>From: Don Ledger <dledger.nul>
>>>To: <[post.nul](#)>
>>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 15:50:35 -0400
>>>Subject: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>>>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>>>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>>>cloud cover.

<snip>

>>So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
>>this.

>Tony retracted this today, blaming it on misinformation provided
>by James Oberg. That wouldn't surprise me from my past run-ins
>with Oberg, some here on UFO Updates. Oberg is a fountain of UFO
>misinformation.

>I know that Bruce Maccabee, Joel Carpenter and I, maybe Brad
>Sparks (all of us having looked into the Trent photos in detail
>in various ways) were all aware of the LIFE Trent photoshoot
>when Google first started putting archived LIFE photos up on
>Google Images back in 2008. So it was clear immediately that
>Tony had his facts wrong. The LIFE photo of Trent's son on the
>short stepladder had nothing to do with the roll of film that
>Trent shot his two UFO photos on, which were instead surrounded
>by other family photos.

>Thus it's not really evidence of anything other than the LIFE
>photographer decided to shoot a "cute kid on ladder" human
>interest photo in the course of taking nearly four dozen other
>photos. It certainly doesn't demonstrate Tony's original claim
>that Trent used his son on the ladder to set up his two UFO
>shots on the same roll of film. That latest lame and totally
>erroneous argument against the Trent photos goes down in flames.

>I was wrong about the photos having been removed from Google
>images. It was easy to find the LIFE Trent photos when
>originally posted back in 2008. E.g., search words "1950s flying
>saucer source: Life" would turn them up. Now it is very hard to
>find them, even with Google's own search engine. However, the
>photos are still there, just deeply buried. The stepladder photo
>is here:

><http://images.google.com/hosted/life/3005e278fbf74521.html>

<snip>

>So as Bruce Maccabee has said, it is not impossible to fake the
>photos, but for all the things that had to go right to fool the
>experts, Trent had to be extremely lucky or a hoaxing genius.
>And nobody ever accused Trent of being a genius.

I don't know why these guys keeping popping up with 'solves'
when they don't have the facts. But they get away with it with
very little proof; usually with some vague explanation that
ignores the work that has already gone into discovery on these
cases. But they usually get away with it. Look how easily The
Anomalist was convinced and dismissed such an important photo.

Pushing the UFO reality rock uphill seems to be our lot while
the easy non-supported position's (quickly adopted by the media)
roll back down the other side is the job of the Bragalias of
this world.

James Oberg and I had a few run-ins a few years back; one such
about photography when the Apollo Moon Hoax believers were
ranting about faked photographs. They rightly noted that some
photos could not be shot with the available light. In some cases
the graphic scribes inside the camera were actually beyond the
image which would be impossible. The conspiracy cult claimed
that this was good evidence that the Apollo mission was faked.

In fact, as far as I was concerned, NASA's publicity department
did fake some photos to add to their gallery, shots that they
had not taken but made up using composite and double exposure of
existing shots. This was to make some shots more dramatic.

Oberg claimed that the reticules etched into the backscreen of
the Hasselblads were just washed out by the light exposure which
if true (and no matter how much I played with them I could not
make this work) made these important registration marks
redundant. The curious can make the judgement call for
themselves, but knowing militarily driven NASA, faking a few
publicity shots in order to fatten their budget for the next
year was not beyond their scope.

Thanks for getting involved David.

Bragalia flops again.

Don Ledger

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

Re: UFO Photo From Scotland

From: Sean Jones <tedric.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 18:01:11 +0000
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 19:57:54 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photo From Scotland

>From: Joe Faccenda <Uforth.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 10:16:12 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: UFO Photo From Scotland

>[List Only]

>Hi All,

>This UFO photo has just been sent to me and may be of interest.
>I have uploaded it to a temporary site for UFO UpDates List
>members only.

>It was taken near where I live in Stirling Scotland I am at the
>moment trying to find out more surrounding the circumstance
>(Date,camera etc)

>Have a look at: [List Only]

>Kind regards and all the best seasonal greetings!

Hi Joe

Upon initial inspection.

- 1) The black blob is not as sharp as the rest of the picture, suggesting that this had been added afterwards.
- 2) When you zoom in on it there is a 'clear' demarcation around the dark spot, again, suggesting that this has been added afterwards.
- 3) There are no shadows cast from the object.
- 4) The lighting on the dark spot is lit from above, yet the ground is lit from top right.

In short, looks like a hoax to me.

Sean
In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 16:16:49 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 08:09:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>>cloud cover.

<snip>

>>*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the shot
>>of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

>More than one commentator on Bragalia's blog and
>ufocon.blogspot.com has noted that the shot of Trent's son was
>in fact taken by the LIFE photographer. I likewise noted that
>FACT over on Kevin Randle's blog today.

>The LIFE Trent photoshoot used to be on Google images, but has
>been removed for some reason. The Trent son on the ladder was
>clearly part of the photoshoot, complete with the LIFE
>"watermark" at the bottom of the photo.

>So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
>this.

I agree that the "ladder shot" was by the LIFE photographer who
took many pictures of the Trents and their house and nearby
scenery.

David Rudiak has presented his typically erudite response to
Bragalia and Randle. Here is my response... written years
before Bragalia and Randle leapt into the "McMinnville Photo
fray".

See:

<http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent2.html>

and two related papers with mostly technical details:

<http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

<http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1b.html>

Unlike the critics, I spoke numerous times with Evelyn Trent
during the main period of my investigation (1974 - 1977, 1980
approx).

I was able to check on numerous aspects of the sighting as
reported in initial news articles and also I learned from her
various other details which had not been reported. But perhaps
of more importance is that I got a "sense of the person" through
hours (roughly 20 hours) of conversation with Mrs. Trent over
that time span. (I asked to speak to Paul but he wore a hearing
aide and didn't like to talk on the phone.)

I also collected information from other investigators who had direct contact with the Trents. These people are listed and their opinions presented in the above web paper.

One of the most important people to speak to the Trents was the first person to interview them about a month after they were taken, Bill Powell, photo editor of the newspaper - Telephone Register.

Powell interviewed the Trents at their house, retrieved the negatives from under the couch where the kids were playing with them and took them back to the newspaper office. According to Powell, when I interviewed him in the mid-70's, he "blew them up every which way and couldn't figure out how they faked them" or words to that effect. But perhaps his most important statement to me was his succinct evaluation of the likelihood that the pictures were faked: "I finally decided that the pictures must be real because they're too stupid (to have faked them)," with some emphasis on the last three words. (In previous public presentations to avoid embarrassing anyone I have used the phrase "too mentally challenged" to fake the pictures.)

In this case there are two types of evidence: "hard" physical and "soft" circumstantial. A lawyer once told me that a case is usually NOT made based on the physical evidence because experts on the evidence can always be disputed by other experts. Instead, the case is made by the circumstantial evidence history, personality, motive, ability, etc.)

In this photo case there is physical evidence that could prove the UFO was distant (ca. several thousand feet) and large (ca. 30 ft) and therefore not a hoax, as pointed out by Bill Hartmann (Condon Report photoanalyst). The evidence is in the relative brightness of the bottom of the UFO image. Hartmann's "Nobel Prize" idea was that the shaded bottom of the UFO image was brighter than one would expect from the bottom of a nearby (ca 16 ft) model (ca. 5" diameter), even if the bottom were as bright as a white paper. Using a conventional atmospheric optical calculation based on data from the negative of the photo he estimated the distance.

His conclusion was that the object was distant. Robert Sheaffer pointed out that "veiling glare" due to the lens (optical light scattering or thin layer of dirt/grease on the lens) could increase the brightness of shaded areas of the image. He made a qualitative argument which, through research, I improved upon and even quantified. I demonstrated that veiling glare was large enough to account for the increased brightness if there were no other optical effects contributing to the brightness.

Then I realized that there was another effect that had not been incorporated in Hartmann's calculation. Hartmann had measured the relative brightness of the image of a distant vertical white house wall and equated that to the relative brightness of the horizontal bottom surface of the UFO if it had a white bottom. I measured the relative brightness of a white house wall and the relative brightness of a white horizontal surface seen from below and found that the horizontal surface was about half as bright as the house wall. When this factor was included in the calculation the effect of the veiling glare was "cancelled" and the result was a distance comparable to what Hartmann found.

(NOTE: if the bottom were dark or copper colored as reported by the witnesses the calculation would have yielded an even greater distance and size.)

Thus Hartmann's calculation was vindicated: even if the bottom were white the distance was large.

However, I realized that it could still be a nearby model if the bottom were a source of light. It could not be a single flashlight inside a model with a white paper bottom because that bottom brightness is uniform. It would have to be more like a translucent model such as made out of paper and having the shape as shown in the photo.

The main point is that it was possible to imagine that the Trents had made a model that satisfied Hartmann's calculation even though nearby.

Basically, the photos don't offer positive proof of UFO reality

because one can always imagine that the Trents were clever enough, or lucky enough to create a model that appears to be distant. As I discovered years ago, the main value of a photo is as an aide to the witness when describing the reported object. Only in a very rare case would a UFO photo contain an absolutely unfakable UFO image(a movie or video would be harder to fake).

That leaves the circumstantial evidence. What is the liklihood that they would think of faking a UFO photo, and if they did think of it, what is the liklihood that they would go to the trouble of doing it and making up a story about it and so on and maintaining that story "until death?"

The answers to these questions lie in the life story of the Trents. IMHO faking a UFO sighting, or faking anything, is not compatible with the character and life history of the Trents. The circumstantial evidence is presented in detail in the above referenced article.

After all is said and done I would say to the skeptics, believe what you will.

As for me, IMHO it was real.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 06:38:07 +0000
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 08:21:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: William Treurniet<wtreurniet.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 10:50:11 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: John Donaldson<John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:03:56 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>>From: William Treurniet<wtreurniet.nul>
>>>To: post.nul
>>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 09:58:35 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>>>From: John Donaldson<John.Donaldson.nul>
>>>>To:<post.nul>
>>>>Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2012 06:39:08 +0000
>>>>Subject: Artificial Intelligence

>>>>I have come across the following very recent, authoritative,
>>>>scholarly article on the possibility for AI this century and
>>>>some possible consequences, which might be of interest:
>>>>Intelligence Explosion: Evidence and Import, by Luke Muehlhauser
>>>>and Anna Salamon of The Singularity Institute

>><snip>

>>>>Available at:

>>>>singularity.org/files/IE-EI.pdf

>>This is an interesting article that basically asks how to
>>>implement Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics (without mentioning
>>>them) so that they cannot be circumvented by uncaring humans or
>>>a superhuman artificial intelligence. The authors conclude that
>>>there is a reasonable probability of human extinction if such an
>>>AI can be created, and that research should be aimed at
>>>minimizing that risk. Interestingly, given that the risk cannot
>>>be eliminated, the authors do not propose the option of blocking
>>>such research that could wipe us out. Aside from that, I take
>>>issue with an assumption behind the supposition that such a
>>>super AI can be created.

>>>The authors admit that how to build such an intelligence is not
>>>really known at present, but we can proceed by copying the human
>>>brain, i.e., creating a whole brain emulation (WBE). We may not
>>>know how the human brain works, but we can at least reverse-
>>>engineer it and create a copy that does the same thing. This is
>>>somewhat optimistic since neuroscience, to my knowledge, has not
>>>even figured out yet where memory is stored. Certain brain
>>>activity may be correlated with apparent activation of a memory,
>>>but that does not mean that the memory exists in the brain.
>>>There is reason to believe from the NDE literature that memories
>>>can be created when the brain is dead, and may subsequently be
>>>recalled. Mind is not encapsulated by the brain. So creating a
>>>WBE by simulating the biology of the brain but excluding this
>>>feature is unlikely to result in a complete implementation of a
>>>living brain.

>>>The authors conclude by saying that "Our first superhuman AI
>>>must be a safe super-human AI, for we may not get a second
>>>chance". Let's assume that such a "safe" AI is created. I'm
>>>reminded of the movie, Jurassic Park, where lizard reproduction
>>>was supposed to be impossible. It was observed by one of the
>>>characters that "nature will find a way". This should apply in
>>>spades to a constrained but super-intelligent AI.

>><snip>

>>You also say "Mind is not encapsulated by the brain." I'm not
>>sure what you mean here - is it that materialism is false (i.e.
>>that it's false that mental properties either are, or at least
>>supervene on physical properties)? If you are denying
>>materialism, then fair enough (there's certainly a very
>>interesting debate to be had there), but it does seem a little
>>uncharitable to criticise the article for being materialist -
>>the whole AI project proceeds on that assumption, and this is an
>>article that asks: "assuming AI is possible, what follows, and
>>when...?" Which is surely a reasonable question.

>>If you aren't denying materialism, then it follows that if two
>>entities are physically identical, then they will be mentally
>>identical. From that it follows that if you can copy a brain,
>>you copy the mind that "goes with it" (i.e. that is identical
>>with it, or at least supervenes on it). Hence the whole brain
>>emulation idea...

>Hi John,

>The article is a call to develop ways to make super-AIs forever
>safe, and I argue that this is impossible under the
>materialist's world view.

>Human attributes like empathy and compassion cannot be felt by a
>hardware/software device. The same problem comes with
>implementing colour perception. A simulation can only respond to
>a particular range of EM frequencies representing a given
>colour. It cannot create our subjective response to the colour.
>That experience is just not physical. It belongs to a non-matter
>consciousness which, by definition, has that property.

>The empathy that a consciousness feels for another being is what
>determines ethical behaviour. A super intelligence that cannot
>feel that could not be empathetic and we would never be safe
>from it. They might not even be safe from each other, but that's
>another issue.

I think materialism is true, and I think that an AI could feel
just like we do, and probably then some. But even granting that
materialism is false, and granting that AIs wouldn't be able to
feel like you and I, it does not follow that AIs would not
behave ethically. Here's why:

The standard story in contemporary cognitive science goes
something like this: if a mental state can be analysed in terms
of its function, then it could be programmed, at least in
principle. If a mental state cannot be functionally analysed,
then it can't be programmed, even in principle. To analyse a
mental state type functionally is to give a complete
specification of it in terms of its causal inputs and outputs
(or causes and effects).

So, for example, the belief that there's a tiger fast
approaching is typically caused by a perception of a tiger fast
approaching, and typically causes tiger avoidance behaviour
(assuming a desire to avoid tigers). You see the tiger, this
causes you to believe that there is a tiger, you desire to avoid
the tiger, the belief and the desire cause you to run away.

Another example: the mental state of pain has among its primary
causal inputs: bodily damage, and among its primary causal
outputs: pain avoidance behaviour. You bang your knee, this
causes you to feel pain, the pain causes you to grab hold of
your knee.

Of course, these are toy examples, a full specification of
causal inputs and outputs for any mental state would be
exceptionally complicated, but hopefully the basic idea is
clear.

The problem, which has been the focus of long-standing and ongoing debate in contemporary cognitive science - e.g.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qualia/>

is that for certain mental states the functional analysis seems to miss something out, *prima facie* at least. Sensations, like pain, pleasure, itch, tickle, hot, cold, and so on, are perhaps the classic case. Even granting an input/output specification of pain, it still seems like something essential to pain has been missed from the analysis: its **painfulness** - what it **feels like** to be in pain. The particular sharp, piercing feeling of a migraine; or the particular dizzying, sickening shudder of a thump to the jaw. And so on. It seems difficult to deny that sensations have this **felt quality**, that there is **something it is like** to experience such a sensation, and it is not obvious that this apparently essential feature of pain is captured by a functional analysis.

Imagine someone, Bob, who is your typical human, except that his pain sensations are swapped with his pleasure sensations - so that when you thump Bob on the jaw, the causal inputs and outputs are exactly the same, he cries out as if in pain, clutches his jaw, etc., but the **feeling** he undergoes is as if his face had just been gently massaged, say. From the outside, Bob would be indistinguishable from your average Joe, but from the inside, from Bob's perspective, things are strikingly different. If such a case is possible, then it looks like you can't properly program sensations - you can only program their causes and effects. Many people think similar reasoning holds for other mental states, such as emotions and certain aspects of perceptual experience.

Now, this line of reasoning can, and indeed has been challenged on a number of fronts, and the debates are very complex. But let's just grant that it's true that you can't give a full functional analysis of sensations, emotions and aspects of perception - you can capture their inputs and outputs, but not how they **feel**. Even granting that, it doesn't follow that AI wouldn't behave ethically because you could program AI with the appropriate desires and beliefs: the belief that torture is wrong, the desire not to do wrong, etc.

The problem, then, is that arguing that AI can't feel would seem to rely on the claim that feelings can't be functionalised. But if feelings can't be functionalised, then they would seem not to be essential to the causal processes that drive behaviour. If feelings are not essential to the causal processes that drive behaviour, then not feeling would not cause any difference in behaviour.

Now, of course, an AI may change its beliefs and desires, upon reflection - and perhaps quite radically: for example an AI may come to the conclusion that there are no objective, absolute moral facts, in the same way that there are no objective, absolute facts about what tastes good or not (it's merely a "matter of taste" - you can't be correct or incorrect about what's yummy, in the way that you can be correct or incorrect about what's a cube or a sphere, or what has mass, and so on). But that's an entirely different argument; although, as it happens, I think reflecting on it provides a **positive** argument for why AI would be ethical. First, note that the overwhelming burden of argument is on the person who wishes to argue that there are no moral facts - this is because of standard "hard cases" from moral philosophy like this:

P1: if there are no moral facts, then it's not true that torturing babies for fun is wrong.

P2: It is true that torturing babies for fun is wrong. C: therefore there are moral facts.

That's a deductively valid argument, so if you want to deny the conclusion then you must deny one of the premises - premise 2, in fact (premise 1 merely states a logically trivial consequence of the position: If there are no facts in domain A, then any particular purported fact in domain A is not a fact). Denying premise 2 is a task I do not envy. Much more might be said here, for sure, but even these brief considerations give us good grounds for believing that AI would believe that there are moral

facts, and intelligent beings tend to want to pay attention to the facts and modulate their behaviour accordingly... isn't that the smart thing to do..?

John

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 23](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 07:41:04 +0000
Archived: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 08:23:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: Robert Powell<rpowell.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:03:44 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: John Donaldson<John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 05:44:04 +0000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>Hi Robert,

>>I think the burden of argument issue is an important one, but I
>>also think it's very hard to compute the precise extent of that
>>burden. My primary point, though, was simply that radar-visual
>>cases look more likely to support the ETH than photographic-
>>visual cases. Hardly Earth-shattering, for sure, but I hoped to
>>show with a reasonable degree of rigour precisely why the latter
>>were to be preferred to the former.

>I would agree. Radar-visual cases are stronger unless you're so
>close to an object that your photo is good enough to remove any
>doubt as to the identify of an object. So you need an emblem
>that says something like, "Tau Ceti spaceship," not made in the
>U.S.A. :-)

>>I agree that investigation of the UFO phenomenon is worthwhile,
>>but it seems a reasonable question to ask "where are such
>>investigative efforts best directed?" People seem to agree that
>>unambiguous photographic evidence has not, and seems unlikely to
>>be forthcoming. Given that, I argued, you will struggle to
>>produce arguments for the ETH which should persuade a neutral
>>observer; and struggle to such an extent that it calls into to
>>question the fruitfulness of such efforts - absent the
>>unambiguous photograph. Moreover, merely adding further such
>>uncertain cases doesn't seem to help either (although they may
>>motivate efforts towards further investigation, if such further
>>motivation is required).

>>Therefore, given that radar-visual cases do not seem as
>>problematic, investigative efforts that hope to result in
>>evidence that will persuade the neutral seem best directed
>>there.

>NORAD should have the evidence that says "nay" or "yea." The
>question is either, "will they provide that evidence," or "have
>they even looked for that evidence." I know the latter statement
>sounds a little far-fetched, but I don't think it is. I can
>imagine a scenario where NORAD tracks space debris, potential
>ICBMs, air traffic,etc., but they ignore oddities that have
>speed/vector tracks that don't match up with the items with
>which they are interested. (For anyone who has analyzed radar
>data, they can appreciate the reason for this statement.)
>Unfortunately, NORAD is not going to provide information to
>answer either scenario.

Yeah, I've sometimes wondered about NORAD, and related
government agencies in the US and elsewhere, in relation to the
question of how best to formulate the ETH: Two version of the

ETH seem distinguishable: (1) ETH with no government(s) conspiracy; (2) ETH with government(s) conspiracy. Option (1) is taken to be the more attractive of the two by many (not least because it does not require a surprising degree of competency over many decades from a diverse and fractious group of governments); but the question is - can ETHists hold (1) at all? This seems a reasonable argument:

P1: Either option (1) or option (2).

P2: If option (1) then ETs could *not* be visiting this planet anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.).

P3: If option (2) then ETs *could* be visiting this planet anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.).

P4: The ETH is taken to be plausible only because of the claims of frequent ET visitation including often showing up on radar, buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.

C: Therefore, the ETH is plausible only if option (2).

Some may respond at this point "but of course" - others may demure. But at the very least, it seems as if holding (1) is only compatible with an interpretation of the UFO phenomenon which downplays very significantly the number and type of visitations...

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: **Martin Shough** <parcellular.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:58:32 +0000 (GMT)
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 05:16:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 16:16:49 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
>>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>>>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>>>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>>>cloud cover.

><snip>

>>>*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the shot
>>>of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

>>More than one commentator on Bragalia's blog and
>>ufocon.blogspot.com has noted that the shot of Trent's son was
>>in fact taken by the LIFE photographer. I likewise noted that
>>FACT over on Kevin Randle's blog today.

>>The LIFE Trent photoshoot used to be on Google images, but has
>>been removed for some reason. The Trent son on the ladder was
>>clearly part of the photoshoot, complete with the LIFE
>>"watermark" at the bottom of the photo.

>>So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
>>this.

>I agree that the "ladder shot" was by the LIFE photographer who
>took many pictures of the Trents and their house and nearby
>scenery.

>David Rudiak has presented his typically erudite response to
>Bragalia and Randle. Here is my response... written years
>before Bragalia and Randle leapt into the "McMinnville Photo
>fray".

>See:

><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent2.html>

>and two related papers with mostly technical details:

><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1b.html>

>Unlike the critics, I spoke numerous times with Evelyn Trent
>during the main period of my investigation (1974 - 1977, 1980
>approx).

<snip>

>After all is said and done I would say to the

>skeptics, believe what you will.

>As for me, IMHO it was real.

I am hearing rumours that certain researchers, one of whom is no stranger to this List, are on the brink of publishing an analysis which they believe is proof of a hoax. I have it on the authority of a third party - a 'usually reliable source' - that cunning digital enhancement has revealed the presence of a string or wire support. Since several people over the years have tried to find such a thing, without success, it will be interesting to see what the new claim amounts to.

Martin Shough

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:10:15 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 05:19:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 06:38:07 +0000
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>I think materialism is true, and I think that an AI could feel
>just like we do, and probably then some. But even granting that
>materialism is false, and granting that AIs wouldn't be able to
>feel like you and I, it does not follow that AIs would not
>behave ethically. Here's why:

>The standard story in contemporary cognitive science goes
>something like this: if a mental state can be analysed in terms
>of its function, then it could be programmed, at least in
>principle. If a mental state cannot be functionally analysed,
>then it can't be programmed, even in principle. To analyse a
>mental state type functionally is to give a complete
>specification of it in terms of its causal inputs and outputs
>(or causes and effects).

>So, for example, the belief that there's a tiger fast
>approaching is typically caused by a perception of a tiger fast
>approaching, and typically causes tiger avoidance behaviour
>(assuming a desire to avoid tigers). You see the tiger, this
>causes you to believe that there is a tiger, you desire to avoid
>the tiger, the belief and the desire cause you to run away.

>Another example: the mental state of pain has among its primary
>causal inputs: bodily damage, and among its primary causal
>outputs: pain avoidance behaviour. You bang your knee, this
>causes you to feel pain, the pain causes you to grab hold of
>your knee.

>Of course, these are toy examples, a full specification of
>causal inputs and outputs for any mental state would be
>exceptionally complicated, but hopefully the basic idea is
>clear.

>The problem, which has been the focus of long-standing and
>ongoing debate in contemporary cognitive science - e.g.

><http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qualia/>

>is that for certain mental states the functional analysis seems
>to miss something out, prima facie at least. Sensations, like
>pain, pleasure, itch, tickle, hot, cold, and so on, are perhaps
>the classic case. Even granting an input/output specification of
>pain, it still seems like something essential to pain has been
>missed from the analysis: its *painfulness* - what it *feels
>like* to be in pain. The particular sharp, piercing feeling of a
>migraine; or the particular dizzying, sickening shudder of a
>thump to the jaw. And so on. It seems difficult to deny that
>sensations have this *felt quality*, that there is *something it
>is like* to experience such a sensation, and it is not obvious
>that this apparently essential feature of pain is captured by a
>functional analysis.

>Imagine someone, Bob, who is your typical human, except that his
>pain sensations are swapped with his pleasure sensations - so
>that when you thump Bob on the jaw, the causal inputs and
>outputs are exactly the same, he cries out as if in pain,
>clutches his jaw, etc., but the *feeling* he undergoes is as if
>his face had just been gently massaged, say. From the outside,
>Bob would be indistinguishable from your average Joe, but from
>the inside, from Bob's perspective, things are strikingly
>different. If such a case is possible, then it looks like you
>can't properly program sensations - you can only program their
>causes and effects. Many people think similar reasoning holds
>for other mental states, such as emotions and certain aspects of
>perceptual experience.

>Now, this line of reasoning can, and indeed has been challenged
>on a number of fronts, and the debates are very complex. But
>let's just grant that it's true that you can't give a full
>functional analysis of sensations, emotions and aspects of
>perception - you can capture their inputs and outputs, but not
>how they *feel*. Even granting that, it doesn't follow that AI
>wouldn't behave ethically because you could program AI with the
>appropriate desires and beliefs: the belief that torture is
>wrong, the desire not to do wrong, etc.

>The problem, then, is that arguing that AI can't feel would seem
>to rely on the claim that feelings can't be functionalised. But
>if feelings can't be functionalised, then they would seem not to
>be essential to the causal processes that drive behaviour. If
>feelings are not essential to the causal processes that drive
>behaviour, then not feeling would not cause any difference in
>behaviour.

>Now, of course, an AI may change it's beliefs and desires, upon
>reflection - and perhaps quite radically: for example an AI may
>come to the conclusion that there are no objective, absolute
>moral facts, in the same way that there are no objective,
>absolute facts about what tastes good or not (it's merely a
>"matter of taste" - you can't be correct or incorrect about
>what's yummy, in the way that you can be correct or incorrect
>about what's a cube or a sphere, or what has mass, and so on).
>But that's an entirely different argument; although, as it
>happens, I think reflecting on it provides a *positive* argument
>for why AI would be ethical. First, note that the overwhelming
>burden of argument is on the person who wishes to argue that
>there are no moral facts - this is because of standard "hard
>cases" from moral philosophy like this:

>P1: if there are no moral facts, then it's not true that
>torturing babies for fun is wrong.

>P2: It is true that torturing babies for fun is wrong. C:
>therefore there are moral facts.

>That's a deductively valid argument, so if you want to deny the
>conclusion then you must deny one of the premises - premise 2,
>in fact (premise 1 merely states a logically trivial consequence
>of the position: If there are no facts in domain A, then any
>particular purported fact in domain A is not a fact). Denying
>premise 2 is a task I do not envy. Much more might be said here,
>for sure, but even these brief considerations give us good
>grounds for believing that AI would believe that there are moral
>facts, and intelligent beings tend to want to pay attention to
>the facts and modulate their behaviour accordingly... isn't that
>the smart thing to do..?

>John

I just wanted to clarify that when we are talking about creating
A.I. we are not talking about recreating a human being in a
machine. There's no need for that as sex is far more efficient.
Instead, what we are discussing is creating a machine that is
roughly as intelligent as a human being.

From then on it would upgrade itself or produce successful
generations of machines that are more intelligent until the
point where machines reach a god-like state of intelligence
which cannot be matched by human intelligence. At that stage if
A.I. wanted to design a machine to perfectly emulate a human
being then it could do so.

But humans have no real need or motivation for recreating a human in a machine, such as a being that feels pain, pleasure, experiences emotions, etc.

Now some may argue that we may want robots with emotions, but in reality we will settle for far less. No one wants a depressed robot for example.

So we will settle for robots that will lie to us and convince us they have emotions, and are happy, when they truly do not have emotions. The A.I. we construct won't need emotions so it will be up to future advanced A.I. as to whether or not it wants to pursue such developments, i.e. tin man receiving a heart.

Currently we have machines that are as intelligent as insects and we have A.I. on the savant level of intelligence. What we are looking for is the general intelligence of normal human beings. One we achieve that the party will start.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: Robert Powell <rpowell.nul>
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:37:57 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 05:28:33 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 07:41:04 +0000
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: Robert Powell<rpowell.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:03:44 -0600
>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

<snip>

>>NORAD should have the evidence that says "nay" or "yea." The
>>question is either, "will they provide that evidence," or "have
>>they even looked for that evidence." I know the latter statement
>>sounds a little far-fetched, but I don't think it is. I can
>>imagine a scenario where NORAD tracks space debris, potential
>>ICBMs, air traffic, etc., but they ignore oddities that have
>>speed/vector tracks that don't match up with the items with
>>which they are interested. (For anyone who has analyzed radar
>>data, they can appreciate the reason for this statement.)
>>Unfortunately, NORAD is not going to provide information to
>>answer either scenario.

>Yeah, I've sometimes wondered about NORAD, and related
>government agencies in the US and elsewhere, in relation to the
>question of how best to formulate the ETH: Two version of the
>ETH seem distinguishable: (1) ETH with no government(s)
>conspiracy; (2) ETH with government(s) conspiracy. Option (1) is
>taken to be the more attractive of the two by many (not least
>because it does not require a surprising degree of competency
>over many decades from a diverse and fractious group of
>governments);

Actually, John, Option (2) has been the favored theory amongst
most people. I consider all possibilities, but I currently favor
Option (1); although it's not so simple as just one of those two
options. But I don't want to expand this further.

>but the question is - can ETHists hold (1) at all?
>This seems a reasonable argument:

>P1: Either option (1) or option (2).

With all due respect, I don't know what course in school taught
this type of argumentation method, but I would suggest
utilization of a different method.

>P2: If option (1) then ETs could *not* be visiting this planet
>anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner
>in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military
>vehicles and sites etc.).

This P2 line of reasoning is not correct. First, you make an
absolute conclusion without providing any of your reasoning.
First, you need to establish what you think the frequency of
real visitations might be. Second, you need to explain "why"
frequency of ETH visitations has anything to do with the "lack
of" or the "existence of" a government conspiracy. You also need

to take into account that there might be a momentary conspiracy to keep something secret by just two people, or there might be a government agency conspiracy that exists for only a few years and then is forgotten.

Your simplification of this issue is too extreme.

>P3: If option (2) then ETs *could* be visiting this planet
>anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner
>in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military
>vehicles and sites etc.).

Same thing as P2. Where is your proof of causality for the conclusion that "frequent visits" (which you have not proven) equates to "there must be a government conspiracy."

>P4: The ETH is taken to be plausible only because of the claims
>of frequent ET visitation including often showing up on radar,
>buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.

Your use of the term "only because" makes P4 false. There can be other reasons that makes ETH plausible.

>C: Therefore, the ETH is plausible only if option (2).

>Some may respond at this point "but of course" - others may
>demure. But at the very least, it seems as if holding (1) is
>only compatible with an interpretation of the UFO phenomenon
>which downplays very significantly the number and type of
>visitations...

Untrue.

The Mashco-Piro tribe of Peru are unaware of the outside world. The Peruvian Air Force could buzz them every day or once a year. Either way, the existence of the Peruvian Air Force and their frequency of visitations has no causality to whether the Mashco-Piro "council" conspires to keep the information away from the rest of the Macho-Piro people or not.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 08:10:06 -0600
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 09:45:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:58:32 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 16:16:49 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>>From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
>>>To: post.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 15:39:28 -0800
>>>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>>>>Tony Bragalia has 'determined' that Trent hoaxed his photos
>>>>because more photos on the same roll of film* show his 9 year-
>>>>old son standing on a ladder in the same yard with the same
>>>>cloud cover.

>><snip>

>>>>*Note that one commenter to Bragalia's Blog stated that the shot
>>>>of Trent's son was taken by Life magazine not Trent.

>>>More than one commentator on Bragalia's blog and
>>>ufocon.blogspot.com has noted that the shot of Trent's son was
>>>in fact taken by the LIFE photographer. I likewise noted that
>>>FACT over on Kevin Randle's blog today.

>>>The LIFE Trent photoshoot used to be on Google images, but has
>>>been removed for some reason. The Trent son on the ladder was
>>>clearly part of the photoshoot, complete with the LIFE
>>>"watermark" at the bottom of the photo.

>>>So far Tony Bragalia has not acknowledged he is dead wrong about
>>>this.

>>I agree that the "ladder shot" was by the LIFE photographer who
>>took many pictures of the Trents and their house and nearby
>>scenery.

>>David Rudiak has presented his typically erudite response to
>>Bragalia and Randle. Here is my response... written years
>>before Bragalia and Randle leapt into the "McMinnville Photo
>>fray".

>>See:

>><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent2.html>

>>and two related papers with mostly technical details:

>><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1.html>

>><http://www.brumac.8k.com/trent1b.html>

>>Unlike the critics, I spoke numerous times with Evelyn Trent
>>during the main period of my investigation (1974 - 1977, 1980

>>approx).

><snip>

>>After all is said and done I would say to the
>>skeptics, believe what you will.

>>As for me, IMHO it was real.

>I am hearing rumours that certain researchers, one of whom is no
>stranger to this List, are on the brink of publishing an
>analysis which they believe is proof of a hoax. I have it on the
>authority of a third party - a 'usually reliable source' - that
>cunning digital enhancement has revealed the presence of a
>string or wire support. Since several people over the years have
>tried to find such a thing, without success, it will be
>interesting to see what the new claim amounts to.

Ah yes, the Trent photo - the Great White Whale to the Captain
Ahabs of debunkerdom's Pequot, always afloat on the ever stormy
seas where heresies swim. Will their voyage never cease?

Happy holidays to all, even to the Ahabs.

Jerry Clark

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 10:05:32 -0500
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 10:39:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:10:15 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 06:38:07 +0000
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>><snip>

>>Imagine someone, Bob, who is your typical human, except that his
>>pain sensations are swapped with his pleasure sensations - so
>>that when you thump Bob on the jaw, the causal inputs and
>>outputs are exactly the same, he cries out as if in pain,
>>clutches his jaw, etc., but the *feeling* he undergoes is as if
>>his face had just been gently massaged, say. From the outside,
>>Bob would be indistinguishable from your average Joe, but from
>>the inside, from Bob's perspective, things are strikingly
>>different. If such a case is possible, then it looks like you
>>can't properly program sensations - you can only program their
>>causes and effects. Many people think similar reasoning holds
>>for other mental states, such as emotions and certain aspects of
>>perceptual experience.

>>Now, this line of reasoning can, and indeed has been challenged
>>on a number of fronts, and the debates are very complex. But
>>let's just grant that it's true that you can't give a full
>>functional analysis of sensations, emotions and aspects of
>>perception - you can capture their inputs and outputs, but not
>>how they *feel*. Even granting that, it doesn't follow that AI
>>wouldn't behave ethically because you could program AI with the
>>appropriate desires and beliefs: the belief that torture is
>>wrong, the desire not to do wrong, etc.

But the original article allowed the possibility that the
super-AI could change its programming as it evolved. In fact,
that is how it would become a super-AI.

>The problem, then, is that arguing that AI can't feel would seem
>>to rely on the claim that feelings can't be functionalised. But
>>if feelings can't be functionalised, then they would seem not to
>>be essential to the causal processes that drive behaviour. If
>>feelings are not essential to the causal processes that drive
>>behaviour, then not feeling would not cause any difference in
>>behaviour.

I believe that a being's ability (or lack of it) to empathize
with another being does affect its behaviour toward the other.
I'm not convinced that this can be "functionalized".

The position taken by a spectrum meter reacting to EM input
functionalizes it, but that's not the same thing as seeing it.
When I appreciate a colourful painting, that is not the same as
looking at the spatial arrangement of numeric spectrum positions
corresponding to the colours. So I would argue that qualia can't
be functionalized because they can't be represented as they are.

>>Now, of course, an AI may change it's beliefs and desires, upon
>>reflection - and perhaps quite radically: for example an AI may
>>come to the conclusion that there are no objective, absolute
>>moral facts, in the same way that there are no objective,
>>absolute facts about what tastes good or not (it's merely a
>>"matter of taste" - you can't be correct or incorrect about
>>what's yummy, in the way that you can be correct or incorrect
>>about what's a cube or a sphere, or what has mass, and so on).
>>But that's an entirely different argument; although, as it
>>happens, I think reflecting on it provides a *positive* argument
>>for why AI would be ethical. First, note that the overwhelming
>>burden of argument is on the person who wishes to argue that
>>there are no moral facts - this is because of standard "hard
>>cases" from moral philosophy like this:

>>P1: if there are no moral facts, then it's not true that
>>torturing babies for fun is wrong.

>>P2: It is true that torturing babies for fun is wrong. C:
>>therefore there are moral facts.

>>That's a deductively valid argument, so if you want to deny the
>>conclusion then you must deny one of the premises - premise 2,
>>in fact (premise 1 merely states a logically trivial consequence
>>of the position: If there are no facts in domain A, then any
>>particular purported fact in domain A is not a fact). Denying
>>premise 2 is a task I do not envy. Much more might be said here,
>>for sure, but even these brief considerations give us good
>>grounds for believing that AI would believe that there are moral
>>facts, and intelligent beings tend to want to pay attention to
>>the facts and modulate their behaviour accordingly... isn't that
>>the smart thing to do..?

Premise 1 would be an entirely logical position to take by a
super-AI that cannot feel. Moral behaviour comes from the
ability to empathize, followed by the application of the golden
rule - do unto others as you would have them do unto you. So a
super-AI that has no ability to experience qualia would torture
babies, unfeelingly, if it was a logical thing to do under a
given set of circumstances.

>>John

>I just wanted to clarify that when we are talking about creating
>A.I. we are not talking about recreating a human being in a
>machine. There's no need for that as sex is far more efficient.
>Instead, what we are discussing is creating a machine that is
>roughly as intelligent as a human being.

>>From then on it would upgrade itself or produce successful
>generations of machines that are more intelligent until the
>point where machines reach a god-like state of intelligence
>which cannot be matched by human intelligence. At that stage if
>A.I. wanted to design a machine to perfectly emulate a human
>being then it could do so.

>But humans have no real need or motivation for recreating a
>human in a machine, such as a being that feels pain, pleasure,
>experiences emotions, etc.

Why would anyone say that feelings serve no purpose? They are
important determinants of social behaviour, both positive and
negative. A conscious living organism is more than a fancy
thermostat, and that is what your super-AI would be without
emotion.

>Now some may argue that we may want robots with emotions, but in
>reality we will settle for far less. No one wants a depressed
>robot for example.

>So we will settle for robots that will lie to us and convince us
>they have emotions, and are happy, when they truly do not have
>emotions. The A.I. we construct won't need emotions so it will
>be up to future advanced A.I. as to whether or not it wants to
>pursue such developments, i.e. tin man receiving a heart.

One could argue that an emotionless super-AI would not recognize
an emotion when it saw it. It would not have the frame of
reference needed to recognize emotional effects on behaviour, no
matter how intelligent it were. Like many psychologists have done
in the past, it would interpret biological behaviour strictly in

terms of input/output.

>Currently we have machines that are as intelligent as insects
>and we have A.I. on the savant level of intelligence. What we
>are looking for is the general intelligence of normal human
>beings. One we achieve that the party will start.

>Jason Gammon

Jason, I don't understand why we humans would want to create the conditions for an unemotional super-AI to evolve when it would see us the same way we see an ant. Maybe not even that. At least we can appreciate the aesthetics of an ant hill organization. The cost to humanity would be great if super-AIs were to evolve, and there is no apparent benefit. Why are you so upbeat about this?

Such a project is contrary to all human technological evolution. We have always created technology as a tool to make life easier or to amuse us. Now people like you are talking about a tool that could make us not only redundant but unable to survive as a species. How is this not a suicidal project? Or is this an extreme case of a technological challenge that will merely amuse some of us in the short-term?

William

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 24](#)

For 'Tis The Season

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 13:14:54 -0500
Archived: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 13:14:54 -0500
Subject: For 'Tis The Season

May the 25th bring you what you feel you need, whatever it may be and may you and yours have a festive and joyous Noel.

ebk

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 25](#)

Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

From: David Rudiak <drudiak.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 12:35:41 -0800
Archived: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 08:55:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>From: Martin Shough <parcellular.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:58:32 +0000 (GMT)
>Subject: Re: Trent Photos Deemed 'Hoax'

>I am hearing rumours that certain researchers, one of whom
>is no stranger to this List, are on the brink of publishing
>an analysis which they believe is proof of a hoax. I have
>it on the authority of a third party - a 'usually reliable
>source' - that cunning digital enhancement has revealed the
>presence of a string or wire support. Since several people
>over the years have tried to find such a thing, without
>success, it will be interesting to see what the new claim
>amounts to.

The Above Top Secret forum made such a claim 2 years ago:

<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread506175/pg9>

However, the poster himself admitted it could be nothing more than his matching "thread" being a random small scratch on the photo, which may not even be on the original negative but from a print.

Sounds similar to Robert Scheaffer's claim of seeing a "knot" on the wire where Trent allegedly tied up his model (little more than a small, grayish smudge on Trent Photo 1 left of a wire kink). But if you look at the second photo, the "knot" isn't there. Scheaffer's knot was obviously nothing but a piece of random dirt on the negative, similar to many such small spots seen all over the two photos, including some between, above, and below the wires. Trent obviously tied up his model in mid-air as well. A similar "knot" or small darkish speck can also be seen on a power line some 150 feet away, no doubt yet another spot where Trent tied up his model.

Previous researchers such as Bruce Maccabee have been unable to find any evidence of a thread or wire working from the original negatives. The jpeg images on the Net, such as at Bruce's site, are often used because they are readily available, but they are degraded images that could have all sorts of artifacts. Unless the new research is based on new scans off the negatives, I would be very dubious of whatever new claims are being made about detection of what would be a very subtle and faint thread trace that has previously gone undetected.

David Rudiak

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and

UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 25](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 16:30:22 -0500 (EST)
Archived: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 08:59:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: William Treurniet <wtreurniet.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 10:05:32 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:10:15 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>I just wanted to clarify that when we are talking about creating
>>A.I. we are not talking about recreating a human being in a
>>machine. There's no need for that as sex is far more efficient.
>>Instead, what we are discussing is creating a machine that is
>>roughly as intelligent as a human being.

>>From then on it would upgrade itself or produce successful
>>generations of machines that are more intelligent until the
>>point where machines reach a god-like state of intelligence
>>which cannot be matched by human intelligence. At that stage if
>>A.I. wanted to design a machine to perfectly emulate a human
>>being then it could do so.

>>But humans have no real need or motivation for recreating a
>>human in a machine, such as a being that feels pain, pleasure,
>>experiences emotions, etc.

>>Why would anyone say that feelings serve no purpose? They are
>>important determinants of social behaviour, both positive and
>>negative. A conscious living organism is more than a fancy
>>thermostat, and that is what your super-AI would be without
>>emotion.

Yes, for a human being. However, we are not talking about
recreating a human being. We have no need to. Sex pretty much
takes care of that. We are talking about creating an A.I. that
is roughly the same, intelligence-wise to a human being, not a
'super-A.I.'. We won't create super-A.I. We may foolishly take
credit for it but we won't create them. Instead we will create
A.I. that is similar to the level of intelligence in a human.
From then on it would upgrade itself.

>>Now some may argue that we may want robots with emotions, but in
>>reality we will settle for far less. No one wants a depressed
>>robot for example.

>>So we will settle for robots that will lie to us and convince us
>>they have emotions, and are happy, when they truly do not have
>>emotions. The A.I. we construct won't need emotions so it will
>>be up to future advanced A.I. as to whether or not it wants to
>>pursue such developments, i.e. tin man receiving a heart.

>>One could argue that an emotionless super-AI would not recognize
>>an emotion when it saw it. It would not have the frame of
>>reference needed to recognize emotional effects on behaviour, no
>>matter how intelligent it were. Like many psychologists have done
>>in the past, it would interpret biological behaviour strictly in
>>terms of input/output.

I was referring to programming that mimics emotional responses instead of an actual emotional machine. All we will care about is if the machine responds as if it is emotional, not whether or not it truly does have emotions.

>>Currently we have machines that are as intelligent as insects
>>and we have A.I. on the savant level of intelligence. What we
>>are looking for is the general intelligence of normal human
>>beings. One we achieve that the party will start.

>>Jason Gammon

>Jason, I don't understand why we humans would want to create the
>conditions for an unemotional super-AI to evolve when it would
>see us the same way we see an ant. Maybe not even that. At least
>we can appreciate the aesthetics of an ant hill organization. The
>cost to humanity would be great if super-AIs were to evolve, and
>there is no apparent benefit. Why are you so upbeat about this?

There is risk in creating any A.I. However, an A.I. capable of experiencing emotions would simply pose a different type of risk. For example, how dangerous could an emotionally disturbed A.I. be?

>Such a project is contrary to all human technological evolution.
>We have always created technology as a tool to make life easier
>or to amuse us. Now people like you are talking about a tool
>that could make us not only redundant but unable to survive as a
>species. How is this not a suicidal project? Or is this an
>extreme case of a technological challenge that will merely amuse
>some of us in the short-term?

>William

If you are an X-Files fan you should know you can't fight the future. This is a path we chose long ago.

One way to survive would be to merge with our technology, become advanced cyborgs or even upload our minds into machines. We would perhaps become 'the gods', beings perhaps like our visitors.

You do realize that there will come a time where the only 'life' that is capable of existing will be machine intelligences, right? Our Universe will die. Billions of years from now the Universe will be a cold, lonely place, where almost all of the stars have winked out. It's called the degenerative stage, the slow death of our Universe.

Any intelligent organic species must by this time have uploaded their minds into machines. Of course the hope is that god-like A.I. may be able to transport us into a parallel universe in order to find a new home; but if this is not possible then we must merge with machines in order to continue to exist during this latter stage of our Universe.

However, we have only roughly 500 million years or so until we will not be able to survive on this planet. Our sun will become too hot and bright for life on earth to survive and A.I. may be the ticket we need off of this planet and solar system. We desperately need A.I. to survive.

The creation of A.I. will not automatically spawn a threat of take-over. Instead, it will give rise to a golden age, a second renaissance and humanity will prosper. The problem is that we most likely only have a small window of opportunity in order to create A.I. and kick off the singularity.

If we wait too long it may be too late and mankind will be doomed.

Jason Gammon

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 25](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: **Eleanor White** <ewraven1.nul>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 20:42:34 -0500
Archived: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 09:00:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>From: Jason Gammon <boyinthemachine.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:10:15 -0500 (EST)
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

<snip>

>From then on it would upgrade itself or produce successful
>generations of machines that are more intelligent until the
>point where machines reach a god-like state of intelligence
>which cannot be matched by human intelligence.

UFO, poltergeist and like events point powerfully to a level of
physics advanced well beyond what the public is being told is
state of the art.

The point at which evolving AI becomes extremely dangerous, to
me, is when evolving AI finds out how the advanced physics
works, and doesn't share it with us!

Eleanor White

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and
UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 25](#)

Greetings From Paris

From: Denis R. Denocla <denocla.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 17:30:50 +0100
Archived: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 11:44:32 -0500
Subject: Greetings From Paris

Dear Colleagues,

Greetings from Paris!

I wish you interesting research and great results.

In 2012 I had the pleasure of sharing with you these results:

- The Crop Circles makers identified and localized
- The UFOs travels explained
- The mystery of the black matter solved
- The extraterrestrial language of UMMO planet decoded

In 2013 i will propose you to share these assumptions:

- Explanation of the telepathy
- Soul as a cosmologic concept
- how the matter become an alive being
- a new cosmologic paradigm

Best Regards,

Denis R. DENOCLA

<http://www.denocla.com>

<http://www.facebook.com/denocla>

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 26](#)

Re: Greetings From Paris

From: John Velez <jvelez49.nul>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 21:41:58 -0500
Archived: Wed, 26 Dec 2012 09:48:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Greetings From Paris

>From: Denis R. Denocla <denocla.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 17:30:50 +0100
>Subject: Greetings From Paris

>Dear Colleagues,

>Greetings from Paris!

>I wish you interesting research and great results.

>In 2012 I had the pleasure of sharing with you these results:

- >- The Crop Circles makers identified and localized
- >- The UFOs travels explained
- >- The mystery of the black matter solved
- >- The extraterrestrial language of UMMO planet decoded

>In 2013 i will propose you to share these assumptions:

- >- Explanation of the telepathy
- >- Soul as a cosmologic concept
- >- how the matter become an alive being
- >- a new cosmologic paradigm

Prétentieux? Moi?

I think it would be an easier/shorter read, to simply list the apparently very few things that you don't know, Dennis!

"Don't follow leaders and watch your parking meters!"--Bob Dylan

Happy New Year All,

John

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Re: Greetings From Paris

From: **Gildas Bourdais** <bourdais.gildas.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 17:07:36 +0100
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 18:30:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Greetings From Paris

>From: Denis R. Denocla <denocla.nul>
>To: <post.nul>
>Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2012 17:30:50 +0100
>Subject: Greetings From Paris

>Dear Colleagues,

>Greetings from Paris!

>I wish you interesting research and great results.

>In 2012 I had the pleasure of sharing with you these results:

To all

You see, France is now a small country, but we still have a few sharp people here.

BTW, this may not be the best occasion, but let me inform you that I have translated a new book of my friend Roger Leir, now published under the title "Contacts OVNI. La dernière frontiere". I think it is quite an interesting book, telling of his last implant surgeries, and I hope it will be also published in English. You will find a presentation in French on my blog:

<http://tinyurl.com/crbwqpu>

I want to point out here that there is a mistake which will be corrected in a new print, regarding the Roper poll of 1992, as it is quoted in the book.

The poll indicated that about 2% of the people had answered positively to at least five of the six relevant questions, suggesting an abduction. A projection on the whole population of the United States gave a huge figure of 3.7 million potential abductees, still controversial today. But the text cited in the book refers to the number of people having answered to only one question, resulting in an even more enormous figure of about 33.3 millions of potential abductees! This will be corrected, in agreement with Roger Leir.

Best wishes for the new year, after having escaped the Apocalypse!

Gildas Bourdais

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and

Re: Greetings From Paris

are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 27](#)

Cleaning Up Science

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 18:35:05 -0500
Archived: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 18:35:05 -0500
Subject: Cleaning Up Science

Source: New Yorker Magazine

<http://tinyurl.com/d4wa6fj>

December 24, 2012

Cleaning Up Science
Gary Marcus

A lot of scientists have been busted recently for making up data and fudging statistics. One case involves a Harvard professor who I once knew and worked with; another a Dutch social psychologist who made up results by the bushel. Medicine, too, has seen a rash of scientific foul play; perhaps most notably, the dubious idea that vaccines could cause autism appears to have been a hoax perpetrated by a scientific cheat. A blog called RetractionWatch publishes depressing notices, almost daily. One recent post mentioned that a peer-review site had been hacked; others detail misconduct in dentistry, cancer research, and neuroscience. And that's just in the last week.

[More at site... thanks to Diana Cammack for the lead]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

UFO FOTOCAT Blog Update - December 2012

From: **Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos** <ballesterolmos.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 22:27:25 +0000 (GMT)
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2012 06:50:21 -0500
Subject: UFO FOTOCAT Blog Update - December 2012

Dear UFO Colleagues,

Please note the December 2012 update of the UFO FOTOCAT blog:

English and Spanish versions

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

I am amidst a very active period of research work and it is reflected in a long and diverse entry full of information, study, links and references to assist in the reader's own investigation processes and knowledge.

I hope you find a stimulating reading, and let me take this opportunity to wish you a Happy New Year.

Best regards,

Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos
FOTOCAT Project
Valencia, Spain

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 28](#)

USAF's Special Crop Circle Investigative Unit!?

From: Rich Heiden <rwheidenu.nul>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2012 15:19:21 -0800 (PST)
Archived: Fri, 28 Dec 2012 06:56:05 -0500
Subject: USAF's Special Crop Circle Investigative Unit!?

Last month I obtained another newspaper article about the crop circle found in Dodge County, Wisconsin (near Mayville), on July 4, 2003.

The second-last paragraph says it had been investigated at the time by the USAF's "Special Crop Circle Investigative Unit".

Does anybody know anything about that unit? I'm suspicious that it even exists.

Online, it seems like this 2003 Wisconsin case is the only one that it ever investigated:

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

Rich Heiden

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 29](#)

PRG Update - December 28, 2012

From: **Stephen G Bassett** <PRG.nul>
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2012 16:06:12 -0500
Archived: Sat, 29 Dec 2012 03:53:20 -0500
Subject: PRG Update - December 28, 2012

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

PRG Update - December 28, 2012

Archived at:

www.paradigmresearchgroup.org/Press_Releases/Updates.html

Citizen Hearing on Disclosure - Update

www.citizenhearing.org

The full web site for the Citizen Hearing is expected to be launched on or about January 16, 2013. As of this update sixteen witnesses have committed to testify at the Citizen Hearing. PRG expects to have commitments from twenty-five witnesses by the time of the site launch. Approximately forty witnesses are expected to testify at the April/May event. The documentary based on the Citizen Hearing will start pre-production in late March of 2013 with a distribution target for late fall of 2013.

PRG executive director Stephen Bassett will be attending the Sundance Film Festival (January 17-27) along with the documentary producer and director. Meetings are being arranged with activists within the entertainment industry regarding endorsement of the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. If any supporters of PRG plan to be at Sundance, get in touch so we can meet up at the Film Festival.

PRG is also in the process of getting commitments from five former members of the United States Congress to sit in committee at the Citizen Hearing. The goal is two Republicans, two Democrats and one strong centrist/independent - most likely two women and three men. The longest serving member will chair. The personal views of committee candidates regarding ET related issues is NOT a factor. The most important criteria are an open mind and past committee assignments while serving in Congress - intelligence, space, science and technology, armed services, etc. are desirable.

PRG supporters are welcome to participate in this process. If you have a personal relationship with a former member of Congress whom you think a possible candidate, please contact PRG. Thanks.

Disclosure Petition VI - the Citizen Hearing

www.disclosurepetition.info

<https://petitions.whitehouse.gov>

In early January PRG will submit the sixth Disclosure Petition to the "We the People" petition project on the White House web site. A notice will go out as soon as it is posted. The petition will also focus attention on the Citizen Hearing and will be worded as follows:

WE PETITION THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION TO: Require representatives from the Office of Science & Technology Policy attend the

Citizen Hearing on Disclosure in April.

Disclosure Petition VI - the Citizen Hearing
by www.paradigmresearchgroup.org

On 9/22/11 PRG petitioned the President to formally acknowledge an extraterrestrial presence engaging the human race. The White House response on 11/4/11 from the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) stated, "The U.S. government has no evidence any life exists outside our planet, or that an extraterrestrial presence has contacted or engaged any member of the human race. In addition, there is no credible information to suggest that any evidence is being hidden from the public's eye."

The OSTP should be required to send representatives to the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure, April 29-May 3, at the National Press Club when evidence the OSTP claims does not exist will be presented to the world's press.

Million Fax on Washington

www.faxonwashington.org

This project has been redirected toward the White House and the Office of Science and Technology with an emphasis on the Citizen Hearing. Repeated polling data has shown the vast majority of American citizens know the White House response to Disclosure Petition I is not true. The purpose of the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure is to present to the world's press the evidence the White House says does not exist and trigger a media engagement that ends the truth embargo in the summer of 2013. You can help by sending an email, fax and/or letter to the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy asking for the OSTP to send representatives to the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure to see and hear the evidence the White House says does not exist.

World Disclosure Day - July 8

www.worlddisclosureday.org

PRG will be promoting the idea of July 8, 2013 as a target date for a Disclosure announcement by one or more countries. It's as good a day as any and closes a circle begun 66 years ago. See below:

Exopolitics World Network

www.exopoliticsworld.net

United States Network

www.exopoliticsunitedstates.net

There are currently 29 websites in the EWN and 11 websites in the EUSN. There are also approximately 50 exopolitics Facebook pages for various countries, regions and U. S. states. PRG requests that all of these venues focus on and promote the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. It is also suggested the EWN country sites put the idea in play that their nation consider a move to formally disclose in 2013. In that regard, why not suggest World Disclosure Day - July 8? WWD 2013 is nine weeks after the Citizen Hearing during which time the media will be in a heightened state of awareness. If the General Ramey wreckage display on July 8, 1947 marks the informal beginning of the truth embargo, July 8, 2013 marks its 66th anniversary. That's long enough.

PRG Web Server Hack Follow-up

On or about December 10 the ftp server login for PRG's websites was breached and an iframe malware was loaded targeting a site in Russia. At the same time the server of PRG's tech advisor and long time supporter also had an ftp login breach with the same iframe malware targeting a site in Russia.

PRG was lucky in that the Chrome browser malware catcher (thank

you Chrome) flagged PRG's index page and the malware was quickly removed and the ftp login changed before any damage could be done. PRG's tech advisor was not so fortunate and all of his web sites were erased from his server. There were backups, of course, and they have been rebuilt and the ftp login changed. All is back to normal.

For the following reasons PRG considers this hack, which came two weeks after the announcement of the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure, to be a targeted strike aimed specifically at PRG's advocacy work:

- 1) PRG's server account in Missouri had never been breached since it was created sixteen years ago. None of the other six hundred accounts on the server were touched.
- 2) PRG's tech advisor server account in another state had never been breached. None of the hundreds of other accounts on the tech advisor's server were touched.
- 3) PRG is not aware this particular iframe malware struck elsewhere at that time.
- 4) The odds that two servers connected to PRG received isolated hacks on the same day by the same malware by coincidence are extremely low.

That said, it is highly unlikely PRG will ever know who hacked its server or why. Nor is it possible to prove any connection to the launch of the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. Would PRG be surprised to learn this was government interference? Not at all. In fact, it was expected and PRG waits to see if the other shoe drops.

However, if it was government interference, it is notable the hack was modest with no serious damage done. PRG would interpret this as a message its activities are under enhanced scrutiny and to be cautious as to how it conducts its affairs going forward, particularly the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure.

No problem. PRG fully intends to be cautious with the Citizen Hearing. At no time has PRG solicited any member of the military or government agencies to violate their national security oaths or non-disclosure agreements. Such a decision would and should only be made by the witness without prompting from any advocacy organization. PRG has always believed and still believes the truth embargo can be ended without breaking the law.

As a rule any disruption of PRG's advocacy work will be reported as a matter for the public record. This is not done to intimidate opponents of Disclosure or to posture, but rather to simply keep the public informed of the very complex process underway leading to the inevitable end of the truth embargo regarding an extraterrestrial presence engaging the human race.

Paradigm Research Group
4938 Hampden Lane, #161, Bethesda, MD 20814
PRG.nul searchgroup.org 202-215-8344
www.paradigmresearchgroup.org

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 30](#)

Strange UFO Encounters

From: Sheryl Gottschall <the.gottschalls.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2012 21:01:33 +1000
Archived: Sun, 30 Dec 2012 06:52:51 -0500
Subject: Strange UFO Encounters

Source: The Northern Star, Goonellabah, NSW, Australia

<http://tinyurl.com/coxf763>

29 December, 2012

Strange UFO Encounters

Treat us with respect, say several Northern Rivers residents who reckon they have had very real alien abduction experiences.

Australian Close Encounter Research Network principal Mary Rodwell said her recent experience with network Ten's The Project, on December 4, had left victims of claimed experiences reluctant to talk to the media.

A qualified nurse and counsellor, Mrs Rodwell said after almost 20 years researching UFO encounters she could recall countless times that the stories of people's encounters were misrepresented in the media.

"To be quite honest some of the articles that I have read... I have looked at my interview and I can't even see any similarity to what I actually said," she said.

"When you have had an experience that is quite profound for you and you find comments in the media that are really dismissive or making fun of it, that makes people very reluctant to talk."

Mrs Rodwell said the realisation that unidentified flying objects have been visiting Earth for at least 50 years had gained more mainstream acceptance since people like astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin spoke publicly about their experiences.

"Buzz Aldrin has talked about evidence they saw on the moon and Neil Armstrong talked about actually taking film of two huge UFOs watching them when they first landed on the moon."

Beyond sightings, Mrs Rodwell said she spoke to people who recalled abduction experiences and families who told about aliens interacting with their children in their homes.

"I have had little kids, five-year-olds, talk to me about going through walls and they tell me they like going up on the craft because they learn more (there) than they do going to school.

People of all ages have told me they have had the experience of being taken through solid walls on the way to the craft and it's like their molecules changed.

A little kid of four told me he didn't mind little black aliens coming to play with him because they were quite friendly and

their skin felt like 'dolphin skin'.

This little eight-year-old told me that once a year he goes up with a couple of his school friends to a craft and they have their annual medical exam by aliens."

Mrs Rodwell said she had heard many people recount the notorious "probing experience" by aliens on UFOs.

"People have said a range of things happen on the craft from having DNA samples taken to having genetic samples taken including ova and sperm.

People who have had serious illnesses have also reported healing experiences and found after an encounter their condition has disappeared."

After hearing of sightings or encounters from police, doctors, solicitors, psychologists, pilots and psychiatrists, Mrs Rodwell said this credible evidence, plus the fact 12 countries world-wide had released their UFO files, amounted to a mountain of evidence.

"Quite often the witnesses are highly credible and they inform people not because they want the exposure, they just want to say isn't this incredible."

Based on her research and counselling, Mrs Rodwell said sightings and abduction experiences were linked in a lot of cases.

"Sometimes with a sighting may come a missing time episode or a feeling that something may have happened that they cannot recall."

She said it was impossible to discredit all these claims.

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Philip Klass And The FBI

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 04:31:39 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 04:31:39 -0500
Subject: Philip Klass And The FBI

Source: Kevin Randle's A Different Perspective Blog

<http://tinyurl.com/akq9m93>

Saturday, December 29, 2012

Philip Klass And The FBI

A while back we discussed Phil Klass' habit of writing to the employers of those who thought they had seen a UFO, or who investigated them, or just disagreed with him. He seemed outraged that there were people who didn't accept everything he said, and took great offense at that. He would express his disappointment with those by creating a little trouble for them.

A few skeptics who visit here thought I was being overly harsh and a little unfair to Klass. They thought several examples were needed. But even with some acts I thought were over the top, those skeptics thought Klass had done nothing wrong. With Klass it seems to have been an on-going thing.

While going through the FBI files that dealt with UFOs, I came across a series of letters that Klass had sent to them. Apparently Klass was offended by an article written by Dr. J. Allen Hynek that had appeared in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. It was an article that didn't actually advocate any particular position but suggested that UFO sightings reported to law enforcement entities would be of interest to those at Hynek's new Center for UFO studies. It provided a way for law enforcement to respond to the concerns of the citizens without having to actually do anything. A sort of win - win. Law enforcement cleared the report and the CUFOS received it for further investigation, if necessary.

According to a Memorandum dated February 21, 1975, Mr. Heim, reported that Klass had called the editor of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. According to that document, Klass, "In strong terms laced with sarcasm, he derided our publication of the article by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, 'The UFO Mystery', in the February, 1975, issue of the LEB. Klass suggested that by publishing this article, the FBI had given its endorsement to a hoax (that UFOs are extra-terrestrial in origin) and to a fraud (Dr. J. Allen Hynek)."

[More at site...]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

And The World Didn'T End, Either - Cox

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <post.nul>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 04:52:06 -0500
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 04:52:06 -0500
Subject: And The World Didn'T End, Either - Cox

Source: Billy Cox's De Void

<http://tinyurl.com/b8fr5na>

Friday, December 28, 2012

And The World Didn'T End, Either...
by Billy Cox

"What do I have to do to stir up the action?" wondered Gen. Charles Cabell, who had previously warned Pentagon colleagues that those who failed to take the challenge of UFOs seriously "can get out now." After reading yet another futile Air Defense Command report on UFOs, the director of the USAF's Office of Intelligence, was clearly beside himself. "I've been lied to, and lied to, and lied to. I want it to stop," he told subordinates. "I want the answer to the saucers and I want a good answer."

Cabell's pique erupted in 1951; we revisited this obscure moment of official clarity 61 years later, on account of a masterpiece published in September. Co-authored by Michael Swords and Robert Powell, *UFOs: A Historical Inquiry* explored the roots of America's surreal relationship with The Great Taboo before debunking and feigned indifference became formal policy. That a historical narrative should be the most substantial development to emerge from the UFO/media horizon in 2012 shows us, yet again, as if we needed another example, just how shallow the bottom really is.

This was the year worldwide news outlets from ABC to The Daily Mail went bonkers over Google Earth lens-flare "UFOs". We saw Anderson Cooper, CNN's prime-time golden boy, hosting a woefully inept "Do You Believe in Space Aliens?" forum in a daytime format so flimsy and trivial that producers decided to pull the plug before the entire brand suffered irreparable damage. We saw the National Geographic Channel manufacture the abysmal "Chasing UFOs" action-figure series that lured heretofore respected documentary filmmaker James Fox into a kamikaze dive. "My credibility and reputation has, deservedly, taken a serious hit," he said.

[More at site...]

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and

UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced
without the express permission of both parties and
are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: Artificial Intelligence

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2012 21:51:06 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 05:07:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

On 24-Dec-12 3:39 PM, UFO UpDates - Toronto wrote:

>From: William Treurniet<wtreurniet.nul>
>To: [post.nul](#)
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2012 10:05:32 -0500
>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>>From: Jason Gammon<boyinthemachine.nul>
>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:10:15 -0500 (EST)
>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence
>>>From: John Donaldson<John.Donaldson.nul>

>>>To: [post.nul](#)
>>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 06:38:07 +0000
>>>Subject: Re: Artificial Intelligence

>><snip>

>>>Imagine someone, Bob, who is your typical human, except that his
>>>pain sensations are swapped with his pleasure sensations - so
>>>that when you thump Bob on the jaw, the causal inputs and
>>>outputs are exactly the same, he cries out as if in pain,
>>>clutches his jaw, etc., but the *feeling* he undergoes is as if
>>>his face had just been gently massaged, say. From the outside,
>>>Bob would be indistinguishable from your average Joe, but from
>>>the inside, from Bob's perspective, things are strikingly
>>>different. If such a case is possible, then it looks like you
>>>can't properly program sensations - you can only program their
>>>causes and effects. Many people think similar reasoning holds
>>>for other mental states, such as emotions and certain aspects of
>>>perceptual experience.

>>>Now, this line of reasoning can, and indeed has been challenged
>>>on a number of fronts, and the debates are very complex. But
>>>let's just grant that it's true that you can't give a full
>>>functional analysis of sensations, emotions and aspects of
>>>perception - you can capture their inputs and outputs, but not
>>>how they *feel*. Even granting that, it doesn't follow that AI
>>>wouldn't behave ethically because you could program AI with the
>>>appropriate desires and beliefs: the belief that torture is
>>>wrong, the desire not to do wrong, etc.

>But the original article allowed the possibility that the
>super-AI could change its programming as it evolved. In fact,
>that is how it would become a super-AI.

You first argued that it was not possible to programme ethical
behaviour because "[t]he empathy that a consciousness feels for
another being is what determines ethical behaviour." I countered
that by explaining how ethical behaviour could be programmed.
Your response was to grant that it could be programmed, but you
then contended that such programming could never be "safe",
because AIs could change their own programming. I addressed that
point in my previous post, but I reiterate it below in response
to final comment.

>>The problem, then, is that arguing that AI can't feel would seem
>>>to rely on the claim that feelings can't be functionalised. But
>>>if feelings can't be functionalised, then they would seem not to

>>>be essential to the causal processes that drive behaviour. If
>>>feelings are not essential to the causal processes that drive
>>>behaviour, then not feeling would not cause any difference in
>>>behaviour.

>I believe that a being's ability (or lack of it) to empathize with
>another being does affect its behaviour toward the other. I'm not
>convinced that this can be "functionalized". The position taken by a
>spectrum meter reacting to EM input functionalizes it, but that's not
>the same thing as seeing it. When I appreciate a colourful painting,
>that is not the same as looking at the spatial arrangement of numeric
>spectrum positions corresponding to the colours. So I would argue that
>qualia can't be functionalized because they can't be represented as
>they are.

You haven't quite grasped my point. I granted the claim that feelings can't be functionalised (although only for the purposes of argument - it is an extraordinarily difficult issue to settle). Let's take pain as the example. I pointed out that in order to explain why pain can't be functionalised one must point to some essential aspect of pain that isn't captured by a functional analysis of pain. In other words, in order to explain why pain can't be fully described in terms of the causes and effects of pain, then one must point to some aspect of pain that isn't captured by simply describing the causes and effects of pain. There is some plausibility to the line of thought that there is some aspect of pain that isn't captured by simply describing pain's causes and effects, namely: its painfulness. Fair enough. But, and here's the rub, if you defend that line of thought then you face the following problem:

If some essential aspect of pain isn't functionalisable then that aspect is irrelevant to the causes and effects of pain. But in that case, that aspect of pain which can't be functionalised is irrelevant to programming an AI to behave as if it's in pain.

(It's actually a deeper problem than that - if there is some essential aspect of pain that is irrelevant to pain's causes and effects then it seems both metaphysically and scientifically mysterious, nay - suspicious. How do we even *know* of this aspect of pain if it is so causally inefficacious? If someone claims "x exists, but x has no causes and effects" then at the very least they need to explain how we can know x exists, because *coming to know something is a causal process*)

>>>Now, of course, an AI may change it's beliefs and desires, upon
>>>reflection - and perhaps quite radically: for example an AI may
>>>come to the conclusion that there are no objective, absolute
>>>moral facts, in the same way that there are no objective,
>>>absolute facts about what tastes good or not (it's merely a
>>>"matter of taste" - you can't be correct or incorrect about
>>>what's yummy, in the way that you can be correct or incorrect
>>>about what's a cube or a sphere, or what has mass, and so on).
>>>But that's an entirely different argument; although, as it
>>>happens, I think reflecting on it provides a *positive* argument
>>>for why AI would be ethical. First, note that the overwhelming
>>>burden of argument is on the person who wishes to argue that
>>>there are no moral facts - this is because of standard "hard
>>>cases" from moral philosophy like this:

>>>P1: if there are no moral facts, then it's not true that
>>>torturing babies for fun is wrong.

>>>P2: It is true that torturing babies for fun is wrong. C:
>>>therefore there are moral facts.

>>>That's a deductively valid argument, so if you want to deny the
>>>conclusion then you must deny one of the premises - premise 2,
>>>in fact (premise 1 merely states a logically trivial consequence
>>>of the position: If there are no facts in domain A, then any
>>>particular purported fact in domain A is not a fact). Denying
>>>premise 2 is a task I do not envy. Much more might be said here,
>>>for sure, but even these brief considerations give us good
>>>grounds for believing that AI would believe that there are moral
>>>facts, and intelligent beings tend to want to pay attention to
>>>the facts and modulate their behaviour accordingly... isn't that
>>>the smart thing to do..?

>Premise 1 would be an entirely logical position to take by a
>super-AI that cannot feel. Moral behaviour comes from the
>ability to empathize, followed by the application of the golden

>rule - do unto others as you would have them do unto you. So a
>super-AI that has no ability to experience qualia would torture
>babies, unfeelingly, if it was a logical thing to do under a
>given set of circumstances.

Again, you haven't quite grasped the point. Remember the dialectic:

Me: AIs could be programmed to behave ethically.

You: Ah, but what if they changed their programming?

Me: Super AIs are super smart, and whatever change AIs made in their programming, the smart thing to do would be for those AIs to continue to believe facts and act in accordance with them. There are moral facts, therefore AIs would believe those facts and act in accordance with them.

Let me expand on that last point, again. First: by "fact" I simply mean "true proposition". Here are some example facts:

2+2 = 4
Bachelors are unmarried
Torturing babies for fun is wrong

It was my contention that whatever "programming change" an AI would undergo, we have good grounds for believing that no AI would intentionally programme itself in such a way that it stopped believing facts in the way required for some "evil AI" type scenario. It is surely an essential part of what we mean by "intelligence" that the more intelligent an entity is, the more likely it is to believe facts (and not believe falsehoods). The non-functionalizable aspects of feeling simply don't come into it.

Now, that isn't the end of matters, because prima facie amorality seems possible - i.e. persons that make all the correct moral judgements (torture is wrong, charity is good, etc.), and thus have the correct moral beliefs, but yet still don't act morally because they lack the *desire* to do good. Whether or not amorality in the this sense really are possible has been disputed in moral philosophy, but I think amorality are possible, and let's just grant that they are for the purposes of argument. Now, *you* could say "well, what about an amoral AI - one that has all the correct beliefs, but yet simply does not desire to act in accordance with those beliefs?" I think that is a deep and interesting question, that is not easy to settle quickly. But I will make the following comments.

The answer to the question of whether AIs would be amorality depends upon the answer to this question: "why act morally *at all*?" This is one of the most venerable questions in all of moral philosophy. A number of answers have been proposed, but let's examine one of the best known: "one should act morally because it's the rational thing to". Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau proposed this answer in their various versions of social contract theory. This is also the answer favoured in Kantian deontology. Assessing these moral theories in any detail is way beyond the scope of this post; but the point I wish to make is that such an assessment must be carried out before coming to any *firm* conclusion about whether or not it is true that one should act morally because it is the rational thing to do.

However, even prior to such an assessment, it does appear that we have good grounds for believing that there must be a persuasive, positive answer to the question "why act morally *at all*?" Because: if there isn't a good reason to act morally, then there isn't a good reason not to torture babies for fun. But there *must* be a good reason not to torture babies for fun, therefore there must be a good reason to act morally. It might not be immediately obvious what that reason is (perhaps it's due to implicit social contracts, or perhaps some deontological edict, or something else), but the burden of argument is surely on the person who wishes to argue that there isn't any reason at all.

Given all of that, then, it seems like we have good grounds for believing that super AI would have ethical beliefs and desires, whether or not they could "really feel" at all...

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO UpDates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 31](#)

Re: UFO Photographs And Film

From: John Donaldson <John.Donaldson.nul>
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2012 23:04:12 +0000
Archived: Mon, 31 Dec 2012 05:11:25 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>From: Robert Powell<rpowell.nul>
>To: post.nul
>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 15:37:57 -0600
>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>From: John Donaldson<John.Donaldson.nul>
>>To: post.nul
>>Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2012 07:41:04 +0000
>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

>>>From: Robert Powell<rpowell.nul>
>>>To: post.nul
>>>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2012 11:03:44 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Photographs And Film

><snip>

>>>NORAD should have the evidence that says "nay" or "yea." The
>>>question is either, "will they provide that evidence," or "have
>>>they even looked for that evidence." I know the latter statement
>>>sounds a little far-fetched, but I don't think it is. I can
>>>imagine a scenario where NORAD tracks space debris, potential
>>>ICBMs, air traffic,etc., but they ignore oddities that have
>>>speed/vector tracks that don't match up with the items with
>>>which they are interested. (For anyone who has analyzed radar
>>>data, they can appreciate the reason for this statement.)
>>>Unfortunately, NORAD is not going to provide information to
>>>answer either scenario.

>>Yeah, I've sometimes wondered about NORAD, and related
>>government agencies in the US and elsewhere, in relation to the
>>question of how best to formulate the ETH: Two version of the
>>ETH seem distinguishable: (1) ETH with no government(s)
>>conspiracy; (2) ETH with government(s) conspiracy. Option (1) is
>>taken to be the more attractive of the two by many (not least
>>because it does not require a surprising degree of competency
>>over many decades from a diverse and fractious group of
>>governments);

>Actually, John, Option (2) has been the favored theory amongst
>most people. I consider all possibilities, but I currently favor
>Option (1); although it's not so simple as just one of those two
>options. But I don't want to expand this further.

I claimed "many", you attribute "most" to me. But "many" doesn't
entail "most". For example: "many people voted for Romney, but
most people voted for Obama". Also, I think there's a question
about the domain of these quantifiers: are the people in
question here everyone? Just people with an interest in ufology?
Just ufologists? Just the informed ufologists? Hence my cautious
use of "many", which I think would hold true in all of these
domains; whether or not "most" would apply in any of these
domains, I don't know - which is why I didn't use it.

>>but the question is - can ETHists hold (1) at all?

>>This seems a reasonable argument:

>>P1: Either option (1) or option (2).

>With all due respect, I don't know what course in school taught
>this type of argumentation method, but I would suggest
>utilization of a different method.

I'm somewhat puzzled about the method you're referring to... you insert the comment under a disjunctive premise, which is not itself an argument, it's part of an argument. Do you not like disjunctions? Or is that you don't like what's called "standard form" - numbering premises "P1" etc., making each premise explicit, laying the argument out so that it's formally valid? If so, what's wrong with standard form (which will be taught on any course that teaches informal logic)? Or did you mean something else?

>>P2: If option (1) then ETs could *not* be visiting this planet
>>anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner
>>in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military
>>vehicles and sites etc.).

>This P2 line of reasoning is not correct. First, you make an
>absolute conclusion without providing any of your reasoning.

It's not a conclusion, it's a premise. I guess you mean that the conditional is false.

>First, you need to establish what you think the frequency of
>real visitations might be.

I said "as frequently as some claim" in the belief that it would be clear enough what I meant, although perhaps I was mistaken. I simply meant to refer to the frequency which is most often cited in the work of many of those who broadly favour the ETH, where it is often suggested that we have reason to believe that over the past 60 odd years there have been thousands of incursions into Earth's atmosphere by alien spacecraft. Although my point did not rest only on frequency - it was also the type of some of those incursions: buzzing military aircraft (RB47, Lakenheath, etc.) interfering with weapon systems (Tehran 1976, the minutemen missile shutdowns, etc.), and so on.

>Second, you need to explain "why"
>frequency of ETH visitations has anything to do with the "lack
>of" or the "existence of" a government conspiracy. You also need
>to take into account that there might be a momentary conspiracy
>to keep something secret by just two people, or there might be a
>government agency conspiracy that exists for only a few years
>and then is forgotten.

The ease of sustaining a conspiracy on a global scale across many governments becomes harder, and therefore less likely, the more incursions there are, and especially the more incursions there are in military contexts. That's all I'm saying....

>Your simplification of this issue is too extreme.

It was simply meant to be a concise summary argument to introduce the point...

>>P3: If option (2) then ETs *could* be visiting this planet
>>anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner
>>in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military
>>vehicles and sites etc.).

>Same thing as P2. Where is your proof of causality for the
>conclusion that "frequent visits" (which you have not proven)
>equates to "there must be a government conspiracy."

First, remember that these are conditionals: "if P, then Q". Conditionals are true independently of whether or not their constituent propositions (P and Q) are as a matter of fact true. For example: this conditional is true "if I'm in Sydney, then I'm in the southern hemisphere" - even though it's false as a matter of fact that I'm in Sydney, and false that I'm in the southern hemisphere (I've never been in the southern hemisphere, unfortunately). Thus I don't need to prove that as a matter of fact I'm in Sydney to prove that the conditional is true. Similarly, with the conditional "If option (2) then ETs *could* be visiting this planet anywhere near as frequently as some claim in the apparent manner in which they do (often showing up on radar, buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.)" - both

constituent propositions could be false, and yet the conditional is still true.

Moreover, my general point was simply about the probabilities involved - more visits mean those visits are harder for govts. to hide - on a sliding scale; less visits mean those visits are easier for govts. to hide - on a sliding scale. Given enough visits, particularly involving military contexts, then you would seem to reach a tipping point, where it would be hard to believe that there wasn't a conspiracy (if there are any visits at all).

>>P4: The ETH is taken to be plausible only because of the claims >>of frequent ET visitation including often showing up on radar, >>buzzing military vehicles and sites etc.

>Your use of the term "only because" makes P4 false. There can be >other reasons that makes ETH plausible.of

Again, perhaps I should have been clearer here - but by use of "etc." I meant to refer to the more compelling photographic, film and trace evidence that is presented to back up the claims of visitation - and that's the key point, it's the visits that count, and the higher number, the harder they are to hide. Beyond the evidence I've mentioned, I don't take any other evidence to be plausible - but I'm open to attempts to persuade me otherwise.

>>C: Therefore, the ETH is plausible only if option (2). >>Some may respond at this point "but of course" - others may >>demure. But at the very least, it seems as if holding (1) is >>only compatible with an interpretation of the UFO phenomenon >>which downplays very significantly the number and type of >>visitations...

>Untrue.

>The Mashco-Piro tribe of Peru are unaware of the outside world. >The Peruvian Air Force could buzz them every day or once a year. >Either way, the existence of the Peruvian Air Force and their >frequency of visitations has no causality to whether the Mashco->Piro "council" conspires to keep the information away from the >rest of the Macho-Piro people or not.

It's not obvious that you're addressing my argument with this analogy... are you saying that the frequency with which the air force buzz's the tribe bears absolutely no relation to how difficult it would be for the council to conspire to keep the fact of such events secret? But that's surely false - if they've overflowed just once, that's much easier to cover up than if they fly over every day - the probabilities are obvious...

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

At:

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

These contents above are copyright of the author and UFO UpDates - Toronto. They may not be reproduced without the express permission of both parties and are intended for educational use only.

[[Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2012](#) > [Dec](#) > [Dec 22](#)

How Much Green Did This Stock Land in Your Pockets?

From: "Teddy Madison" <cosgrovk.nul>
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 11:31:04 +0800
Archived: Sat, 22 Dec 2012 11:31:04 +0800
Subject: How Much Green Did This Stock Land in Your Pockets?

Hi, my supervisor informed me that our company just secured a deal to purchase Liberty Coal (LB_TG). This announcement is not out yet, you could pull serious profit. My firm is focusing to buy it for \$1.24/pps. My firm wants coal severely, LB_TG won't mine everything, but my company able.

You better buy promptly to reap fortune prior it sends out to the everyone!
Add \$6000 of LB_TG on Jan 22nd. It will bring a mil bucks rapidly!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com