

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2001](#) > Mar

UFO UpDates Mailing List Mar 2001

Mar 1:

[UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01](#) - Diane Harrison Director AUFORN [250]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [40]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [12]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [41]
[Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Mackay](#) - Glennys Mackay [84]
[Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [20]
[Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'](#) - Glennys Mackay [82]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [63]
[Re: Writings, Symbols and Emblems - Anthony](#) - Gary Anthony [43]
[Re: Lakenheath - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [100]
[Protocols Plus](#) - Dennis Stacy [35]
[Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [37]
[Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [178]
[The Watchdog E-Update - 02-28-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [31]

Mar 2:

[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [144]
[Canadian Crop Circle Research Network](#) - Paul Anderson [138]
[Re: Writing, Symbols and Emblems - Velez](#) - John Velez [207]
[Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Velez](#) - John Velez [37]
[1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception](#) - John W. Auchettl [130]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [139]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 9](#) - John Hayes [405]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report](#) - Bob Young [22]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Young](#) - Bob Young [20]
[Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Young](#) - Bob Young [46]
[Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Filer](#) - George A. Filer [37]
[Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [24]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [60]
[Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [41]
[U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [12]
[Re: Lakenheath - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [45]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Bourdais](#) - Gildas Bourdais [64]
[Re: Naud, Bouchmann & Le Paige - Mancusi](#) - Bruno Mancusi [31]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report](#) - John Velez [106]

[MIR Balloon Begins Worldwide Trek](#) - Scott Corrales [46]
[Re: Posting Protocol - Ledger](#) - ddddDon Ledger [19]
[Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [50]
[Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [51]
[The Watchdog E-Update - 03-01-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [18]
[Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Chalker](#) - Bill Chalker [128]
[Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [60]
[Re: PRA - Almost History A Book - Chalker](#) - Bill Chalker [126]
[Re: Air Force Buys Supercomputer to Identify UFOs](#) - SMiles Lewis [11]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [69]
[Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [39]
[Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [34]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report](#) - Bob Young [24]
[Re: Lakenheath - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [58]

Mar 3:

[Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [62]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Randle](#) - Kevin Randle [283]
[Re: T Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [165]
[Re: Protocols Plus - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [10]
[Secrecy News -- 03/02/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [97]
[The Earth As A Sphere?](#) - Matt Hurley [10]
[Re: Lakenheath - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [16]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [55]
[Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [12]
[Andy Roberts Suspension From UpDates](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [24]
[Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Velez](#) - John Velez [98]
[Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's 'Tunnel'](#) - Mac Tonnies [92]
[Bug in Big Balloon](#) - Wendy Christensen [21]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez](#) - John Velez [74]
[Canadian UFO Reports Up 2% Last Year](#) - Alfred Webre [53]
['UFO Clue' To Balloon Flight Flop?](#) - Diane Harrison - Director AUFORN [71]
[Labels And Communication](#) - Richard Hall [32]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez](#) - John Velez [41]
[Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [49]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [336]
[NASA Terminates Space Plane Project](#) - Steven L. Wilson, Sr [47]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez](#) - John Velez [125]
[Crackers Steal US Space System Codes](#) - Kurt Jonach [46]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report -](#) - Bill Chalker [123]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Kelly](#) - Christopher Kelly [44]
[Why Don't They Land On The White House Lawn?](#) - Kurt Jonach [103]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [20]
[Larry Hatch E-Mail Troubles](#) - Larry Hatch [23]
[Fireballs seen in Angol, Chile](#) - Scott Corrales [54]
[1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident](#) - Larry Hatch [37]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [72]
[Re: Lakenheath - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [98]
[Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [23]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [36]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [45]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young](#) - Bob Young [19]

[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young](#) - Bob Young [11]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's](#) - Bob Young [16]
[ACERN Article](#) - Roy J Hale [7]
[Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast](#) - David Bolton [35]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [67]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Young](#) - Bob Young [30]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [38]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [32]

Mar 4:

[Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton](#) - David Bolton [36]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [62]
[Re: -Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [30]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [35]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez](#) - John Velez [85]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Velez](#) - John Velez [84]
[Re: Crackers Steal US Space System Codes - Velez](#) - John Velez [23]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [190]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [82]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's](#) - Donald Ledger [33]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [34]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [63]
[Leakers \[was: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception\]](#) - David Rudiak [205]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [20]
[Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [28]
[Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [27]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [98]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Murray](#) - Marty Murray [23]
[Re: 1949 Camp Hood, TX Incident - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [56]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's](#) - Mac Tonnies [21]

Mar 5:

[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [22]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [31]
[Re: NASA Terminates Space Plane Project - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [29]
[Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [122]
[Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa](#) - Chris Aubeck [117]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez](#) - John Velez [66]
[Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [33]
[Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [32]
[Another MJ12 Source](#) - Bob Huff [23]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Meiners](#) - Jean Meiners [19]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [47]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [186]
[Man Who 'Vanished' Re-appears Near Home](#) - Kelly [42]
[Re: Joseph Smith - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [28]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's](#) - Mac Tonnies [23]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [68]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [38]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [137]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [58]

[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report](#) - Diane Harrison Director AUFORN [155]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [17]
[Re: Leakers - Young](#) - Bob Young [133]
[Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary](#) - Paul Anderson [286]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez](#) - John Velez [40]
[Re: Leakers - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [89]
[Re: Operations Of Air Defense Fighters - McCoy](#) - Gt McCoy [35]
[The Watchdog - 03-05-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [11]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [62]
[Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Parmantier](#) - François Parmantier [45]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [93]

Mar 6:

[Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Deschamps](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [90]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Young](#) - Bob Young [27]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [159]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [56]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [236]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [54]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [25]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [43]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton](#) - David Bolton [16]
[The Lakenheath Fiasco](#) - Richard Hall [31]
[Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez](#) - John Velez [51]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [76]
[String Of Pearls?](#) - Greg St. Pierre [9]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [47]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [21]
[Re: Leakers - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [12]
[Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary](#) - Dennis Stacy [30]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [106]
[UFO Website Redesign](#) - Mac Tonnies [10]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [69]
[Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel \[was: Cydonian\]](#) - Ted Toal [23]
[Re: Leakers - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [59]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [59]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [27]
[Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [85]
[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [21]
[Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada - Kelly](#) - Christopher Kelly [64]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [33]
[More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?](#) - David Furlotte [18]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [74]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [40]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [102]
[The Paradox Of Ufology](#) - Matt Hurley [10]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [74]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [56]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [18]
[Re: String Of Pearls?](#) - Roy J Hale [29]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [56]
[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke](#) - Dave Clarke [45]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [34]

[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [39]

Mar 7:

[Re: Leakers - Young](#) - Bpb Young [26]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [231]

[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Young](#) - Bob Young [26]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - The Paradox Of Ufology](#) - Richard Hall [22]

[Re: Leakers - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [54]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [73]

[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Evans](#) - Evans [35]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [26]

[Secrecy News -- 03/06/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [128]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [52]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [26]

[Re: Labels And Communication - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [19]

[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [31]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [29]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [26]

[Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - John Velez [28]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [33]

[Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [38]

[Cydonian Imperative: 3-6-01 - Unusual White Lines](#) - Mac Tonnies [113]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Furlotte](#) - David Furlotte [39]

[Re: AA Film Redux - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [226]

[Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl](#) - Scott Corrales [31]

[Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [42]

[Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [56]

[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [25]

[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [41]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [65]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young](#) - Bob Young [33]

[Re: Leakers - Young](#) - Bob Young [40]

[Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [21]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [17]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [72]

[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [21]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [27]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [108]

[Re: Leakers - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [34]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [62]

[Carter, Rose & UFOs?](#) - Serge Salvaille [33]

[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - Daniel D. Moroff [32]

[Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach](#) - Richard Hall [18]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Richard Hall](#) [12]

[UFOs in 1917 and 1904](#) - Chris Aubeck [26]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [81]

Mar 8:

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [83]

[Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Velez](#) - John Velez [63]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [26]

Mar 7:

[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - [ebk](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [54]

Mar 8:

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Young](#) - Bob Young [22]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [29]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [82]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [47]

[Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [45]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [47]

[Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [45]

[Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted](#) - Mac Tonnies [15]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [37]

[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [18]

[Re: Leakers](#) - Bruce Maccabee [164]

[Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [384]

[Re: AA Film Redux - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [95]

[U-Haul Graphics](#) - Jim Klotz [5]

[Flash Messages From Space](#) - John W. Auchettl [64]

[Article on New York 'Peanut' Video](#) - Bruce Maccabee [9]

[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - John Velez [77]

['Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article](#) - John Velez [30]

[Re: Labels And Communication - Jones](#) - Sean Jones [49]

[Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [43]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [42]

[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10](#) - John Hayes [568]

Mar 9:

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [98]

[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [42]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [33]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [193]

[About Whitley Strieber](#) - Chris Aubeck [39]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [26]

[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young](#) - Bob Young [64]

[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [77]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [46]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [67]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [31]

[Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [14]

[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [14]

[Secrecy News -- 03/08/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [95]

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [14]

[Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted - Young](#) - Bob Young [21]

[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Young](#) - Bob Young [21]

[The Watchdog \(e-update\) - 08-03-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [12]

[Richard Hall Article 'Conceptualizing UFOs'](#) - Jim Klotz [12]

[Re: Labels And Communication - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [30]

[PRG Update - March 9, 2001](#) - Steven G. Bassett [116]
[Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Fernandes](#) - Joaquim Fernandes [52]
[Re: Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach - Fernandes](#) - Joaquim Fernandes [29]
[Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Stratospheric Balloon](#) - Scott Corrales [52]
[Conisbrough, England 1966](#) - Larry Hatch [16]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted](#) - Mac Tonnies [20]
[Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [45]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [81]
[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [48]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [17]
[Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [52]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [84]
[Paradigms and Personal Experiences](#) - Matt Hurley [16]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [18]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [42]
[Re: Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Balloon - Young](#) - Bob Young [41]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [49]
[Wendelle C. Stevens?](#) - Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [5]

Mar 10:

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez](#) - John Velez [91]
[The Watchdog - 03-09-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [8]
[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - John Rimmer [17]
[Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10 - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [38]
[Dozens See UFO Over Tegucigalpa, Honduras](#) - Scott Corrales [69]
[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro Jsmortell@aol.com [67]
[Mars 'Worm'?](#) - Sean Liddle [20]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Cecchini](#) - Ron Cecchini [36]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [36]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [55]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [52]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [57]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Young](#) - Bob Young [28]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [37]
[Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [87]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [58]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [39]
[Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?](#) - Dave Clarke [23]
[Chris Carter Interview](#) - Sean Jones [8]
[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - Dave Bowden [24]

Mar 11:

[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [52]
[Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Ledger](#) - dledger@ns.sympatico.ca [9]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [45]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [41]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [13]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [164]
[Re: Labels And Communication - Jones](#) - Sean Jones [35]
[Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Jones](#) - Sean Jones [67]
[Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Lowe](#) - Adam Lowe [6]

[CCCRN News: 'Ice Circles' Update - 03-10-01](#) - Paul Anderson [54]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy](#) - Dennis Stacy [30]
[Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [78]
[Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - Filer](#) - George A. Filer [37]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Richard Hall" [36]
[Whitley Strieber's Cabin?](#) - Scott Carr [21]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [48]
[Re: Mars 'Worm' - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [41]
[Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?](#) - John Velez [46]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [81]
[Pelicans Redux \[was: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact\]](#) - James Easton [444]
[Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes'](#) - Mac Tonnies [60]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [72]
[American White Pelicans](#) - Jim Klotz [68]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [68]
[Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [60]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Georgina Bruni [15]
[JPL Explanation Of Mars' 'Tubes'](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [62]

Mar 12:

[The Watchdog - 03-12-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [16]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers](#) - William Sawers [43]
[An Interview with a Black Pelican](#) - Jim Mortellaro [37]
[Larry Warren On 'You Can'T Tell The People'](#) - Joe McGonagle [14]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [68]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [103]
[Magonia Supplement no.34](#) - John Rimmer [231]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Easton](#) - James Easton [105]
[Barwood On KTAR 620 AM](#) - Frances Emma Barwood [19]
[UFOs Over Ball Field, Fillmore California](#) - Dan Geib [16]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [39]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [32]
[Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [79]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [23]
[ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms 3.11.01](#) - Stephen MILES Lewis [169]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [110]
[Questions For Georgina Bruni](#) - Sean Tierney [395]
[Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers](#) - Chris Aubeck [77]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [31]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [49]

Mar 13:

[Secrecy News -- 03/12/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [110]
[Re: American White Pelicans - Easton](#) - James Easton [135]
[Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'](#) - Kevin Randle [21]
[Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [64]
[Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'](#) - Georgina Bruni [34]
[Re: UFO Flies Over Oxkutzcab, Yucatán](#) - Scott Corrales [24]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [15]
[Serious Research](#) - Richard Hall [39]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Dave Clarke [48]

[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Dave Clarke [23]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie)s [39]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [50]
[Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [11]
[Losthaven Updated](#) - Roy J Hale [14]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [101]
[Re: American White Pelicans - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [104]
[Re: Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes'](#) - Nick Balaskas [47]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [62]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez](#) - John Velez [68]
[THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive](#) - Rooyce J. Myers III [10]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [37]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [59]
[Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Sanchez-Ocejo](#) - Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [22]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [122]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [140]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [64]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [98]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [78]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie)s [19]
[Filer's Files #11 -- 2001](#) - George A. Filer [470]

Mar 14:

[Re: Serious Research - Kelly](#) - Christopher Kelly [83]
[The Watchdog - 03-13-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [18]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie)s [25]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [39]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Randle](#) - Kevin Randle [31]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie)s [26]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Richard Hall [65]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnie](#)s - Mac Tonnie)s [24]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez](#) - John Velez [39]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [83]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [124]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [78]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez](#) - John Velez [170]
[Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [210]
[Re: Serious Research - Jones](#) - Sean Jones [67]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [21]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [49]
[Re: American White Pelicans - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [53]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [88]
[More 'MJ-12 Documents'?](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [27]
[P-47/CANUFO: 1947 UFO Wave Canadian Media](#) - Ed Stewart [303]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers](#) - William Sawers [64]
[Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'](#) - Joe McGonagle [54]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton](#) - James Easton [620]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee](#) - Bob Young [51]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [79]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [24]
[Cydonian Imperative - 03-14-01](#) - Mac Tonnie)s [30]
[Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure](#) - Kurt Jonach [168]

[Re: erious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [193]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [32]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Dennis Stacy [36]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Liddle](#) - Sean Liddle [16]
[Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [36]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [68]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [25]
[Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure](#) - Roger Evans [58]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [225]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte](#) - David Furlotte [48]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez](#) - John Velez [87]
[AUFORN Brisbane Australia Public Meeting March](#) - Diane Harrison [27]
[Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The](#) - Richard Hall [39]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff](#) - Jim Deardorff [41]
[Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure](#) - Bob Young [20]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [25]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [71]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [52]
[Re: HE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [17]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01](#) - Robert Gates [22]
[CCCRN News: 'Fields of Dreams 2001' Crop Circle](#) - Paul Anderson [32]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [53]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [19]

Mar 15:

[Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Myers](#) - Royce J. Myers III [34]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [34]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Felder](#) - Bobbie Felder [33]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers](#) - William Sawers [48]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [130]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabeevvvv](#) - Bruce Maccabee [784]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [18]
[Mars - It's Stranger Than You Thought](#) - GT McCoy [4]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Young](#) - Bob Young [43]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [401]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [29]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [30]
['Alien Baloney'](#) - Kelly [189]
[Re: About Whitley Strieber - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [30]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [268]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [82]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11](#) - John Hayes [389]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [16]
[Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure](#) - Jim Mortellaro [45]

Mar 16:

[Re: Serious Research - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [57]
[Council Proposal](#) - Richard Hall [20]
[Secrecy News -- 03/15/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [102]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [66]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [89]

[Re: Serious Research - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [193]
[Dung Rains from the Skies](#) - Bob Young [7]
[Keith Basterfield Is Back!](#) - Jan Aldrich [16]
[Re: Serious Research - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [24]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [59]
[The Lost Haven](#) - Roy J Hale [10]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [28]

Mar 17:

[Re: 'Alien Baloney'](#) - John Velez [27]
[The Lost Haven Quiz Winner](#) - Roy J Hale [15]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers](#) - John Velez [44]
[John Carpenter Resigns](#) - Gary Hart [1]
[Re: Council Proposal - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [30]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [16]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [55]
[Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11](#) - Bill Hamilton [18]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton](#) - skywatcher22@space.com [22]
[Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [64]
[Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [11]
[Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'](#) - - Georgina Bruni [15]
[The Watchdog - 03-16-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [19]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [86]
[Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [32]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [44]
[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [37]
[Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [25]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [79]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [43]
[Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [35]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [153]
[Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [16]
[Cydonian Imperative: 3-17-01](#) - Mac Tonnie [82]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Velez](#) - John Velez [52]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [154]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [135]
[Re: Council Proposal - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [53]

Mar 18:

[U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on Best Case Standards](#) - Richard Hall [28]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [79]
[Re: Serious Research](#) - Sue Strickland [48]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Peterborough](#) - Kelly Peterborough [96]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Young](#) - Bob Young [19]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [25]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [22]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [21]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [18]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte](#) - David Furlotte [80]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [39]

[Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hayes](#) - John Hayes [31]
[Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [59]
[Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [42]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [83]
[Re: Council Proposal - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [73]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [47]
[Re: Serious Research - Kelly](#) - Christopher Kelly [47]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [58]
[AA Handwriting](#) - Roger Evans [27]
[Re: John Carpenter Resigns](#) - John Velez [23]
[Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [109]
[Re: Council Proposal - Velez](#) - John Velez [60]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [87]
[Velez - E-Mail Problems](#) - John Velez [11]
[Velez - E-Mail Problems](#) - John Velez [11]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [27]
[Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Young](#) - Bob Young [42]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Bassett](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [88]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [23]
[Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on](#) - Bob Young [22]
[Re: Council Proposal - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [46]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [113]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [81]
[Response to Larry Warren's Questions \(Part One\)](#) - Georgina Bruni [274]
[Response to Larry Warren's Questions \(Part Two\)](#) - Georgina Bruni [418]
[Re: AA Handwriting - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [49]

Mar 19:

[Re: Serious Research - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [25]
[Re: AA Handwriting - Tonnies](#) - Mac Tonnies [27]
[Re: John Carpenter's Resignation](#) - Jim Mortellaro [13]
[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Bowden](#) - Dave Bowden [29]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [27]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [54]
[Shedding Secrets](#) - Dennis Stacy [13]
[Gulf Breeze Books?](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [11]
[Re: John Carpenter Resigns - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [12]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [65]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [38]
[Re: Council Proposal - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [19]
[Re: Council Proposal - Randle](#) - Kevin Randle [28]
[Re: Council Proposal - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [105]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [89]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [134]
[Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [91]
[Re: Council Proposal - Young](#) - Bob Young [38]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [121]
[Re: AA Handwriting - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [53]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [37]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [87]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Young](#) - Bob Young [28]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez](#) - John Velez [204]

[Re: AA Handwriting - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [32]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers](#) - Royce J. Myers III [49]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [70]
[Re: Best Case Standards - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [130]
[Re: Serious Research - McGonagle](#) - Joe McGonagle [17]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [17]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [48]
[Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [32]
[Re: Gulf Breeze Books?](#) - Tom Benson [19]
[Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez](#) - John Velez [33]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [24]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [51]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 03/19/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [140]

Mar 20:

[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [181]
[Green Fireballs \[was: Serious Research\]](#) - Greg Salyards [78]
[Nazi Technology - New Book](#) - Jean-Luc Rivera [13]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [65]
[Re: Serious Research - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [15]
[Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [35]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall](#) - "Richard Hall" [66]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Wright](#) - Bruce Lanier Wright [13]
[Re: Council Proposal - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [80]
[Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [21]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [36]
[Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on](#) - Scott Corrales [30]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [35]
[Arnold's Fleet - A Question](#) - Wendy Christensen [18]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?](#) - Wendy Christensen [34]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [41]
[Spy Agency NIMA Examines Surface Of Mars!](#) - Nick Balaskas [19]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [251]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [61]
[Re: AA Handwriting - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [30]
[Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [98]
[Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez](#) - John Velez [64]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - McCartney](#) - Pat McCartney [54]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers](#) - Royce J. Myers III [38]
[Re: Serious Research - Easton](#) - James Easton [62]
[Arnold - What He Did Or Didn't See](#) - GT McCoy [99]
[Re: Green Fireballs - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [28]
[Re: Council Proposal - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [86]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [26]
[Re: Council Proposal - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [33]
[Re: AA Handwriting - Morris](#) - Neil Morris [32]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [29]
[Re: John Carpetner Resigns - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [28]
[Re: Council Proposal - Velez](#) - John Velez [30]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez](#) - John Velez [128]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [56]
[Re: Council Proposal - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [94]

[Re: Green Fireballs - Guenter](#) - Daniel Guenther [6]
[Weird World Hot Gossip - March 2001](#) - Georgina Bruni [123]

Mar 21:

[Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [240]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [90]
[Filer's Files #12 -- 2001](#) - George A. Filer [439]
[The Real X-Files - 03-20-01](#) - Georgina Bruni [26]
[Re: Serious Research - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [36]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [29]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [82]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Young](#) - Bob Young [38]
[Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [34]
[Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [50]
[Re: Serious Research - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [41]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [79]
[Re: Serious Research - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [34]
[MidAtlanticMUFONatFortfest](#) - Bruce Maccabee [150]
[Re: Serious Research - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [62]
[Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [53]
[Puerto Rico: UFO over Caguas](#) - Iornis1@juno.com [27]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [371]
[Secrecy News -- 03/21/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [116]
[Re: Filer's Files #12 & 'Dust Bunny Hunt' - Velez](#) - John Velez [106]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [52]
[New Effects Website](#) - Roger Evans [19]

Mar 22:

[Re: Serious Research - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [31]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [61]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [48]
[Re: Serious Research - Ledger](#) - Donald . Ledger [79]
[Re: Council Proposal - Young](#) - Bob Young [23]
[Selective Amnesia](#) - David Gullick [78]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [12]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [38]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [93]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Easton](#) - James Easton [116]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [62]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [29]
[Beyond Cydonia](#) - Kurt Jonach [60]
[Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars](#) - Kurt Jonach [371]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [18]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [15]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [73]
[Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA](#) - Bill Hamilton [73]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [54]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez](#) - John Velez [65]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder](#) - Bobbie Felder [31]
[Re: Serious Research - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [27]

Mar 23:

[Re: Serious Research - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [23]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 12](#) - John Hayes [349]
[Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA - Velez](#) - John Velez [201]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [162]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [44]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [89]
[Re: Serious Research - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca> [28]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger](#) - Donald Ledger [50]
[NFB's UFO?](#) - Don Ledger [9]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [27]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Young](#) - Bob Young [28]
[Re: Secrecy News -- 03/21/01 - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [51]
[Cydonian Imperative - 3-23-01](#) - Mac Tonnies [20]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [84]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [21]
[Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [25]
[Body Marks \[was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA\]](#) - Greg Sandow [20]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [65]
[The Watchdog - 03-23-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [46]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise](#) - Karoline Louise [41]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [65]

Mar 24:

[Re: Filer's Files #12 - Filer](#) - George A. Filer [127]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [42]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [57]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [57]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [68]
[Thor Heyerdahl's UFO?](#) - Manuel Borraz [24]
[Re: Serious Research - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [39]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [23]
[Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [19]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [75]
[Re: Council Proposal - Easton](#) - James Easton [72]
[C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [45]
[C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [65]
[Re: Body Marks - Velez](#) - John Velez [58]
[Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Rudiak](#) - David Rudiak [84]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Cuthbertson](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [17]
[Re: Filer's Files #12 - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [91]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez](#) - John Velez [90]
[Re: Body Marks - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [42]
[Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes?](#) - Scott Corrales [50]
[PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies](#) - John W. Auchettl [31]
[Re: Serious Research - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [49]
[Socorro 'Balloon' \[was: Council Proposal\]](#) - Don Ledger [39]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [20]
[Re: Body Marks - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [37]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [34]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [29]

[Re: Arnold's Fleet - Christensen](#) - Wendy Christensen [23]
[Re: PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies - Young](#) - Bob Young [10]
[Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [44]
[Re: Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes? - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [80]
[Re: C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [24]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices](#) - - Michel M. Deschamps [83]
[Re: Body Marks - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [77]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder](#) - Bobbie Felder [82]
[One Of Arnold's Fleet, Film By Stanford](#) - Bill Hamilton [20]
[Re: Body Marks - Cuthbertson](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [54]

Mar 25:

[Chupacabras Or What?](#) - Jim Mortellaro [23]
[Re: Serious Research - Easton](#) - James Easton [78]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Kelly](#) - Kelly [70]
[Re: Serious Research - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [25]
[Re: Socorro 'Balloon' - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [77]
[Re: Green Fireballs - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [17]
[Re: Body Marks - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [21]
[Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers](#) - William Sawers [47]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Lehmberg](#) - Alfred Lehmberg [79]
[Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices](#) - - Jim Mortellaro [143]
[Re: Body Marks - Anthony](#) - Gary Anthony [87]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre](#) - Alfred Webre [61]
[Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [115]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Velez](#) - John Velez [68]
[Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez](#) - John Velez [81]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez](#) - John Velez [237]
[Re: Body Marks - Velez](#) - John Velez [125]
[Re: Serious Research - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [12]
[Don's UFO Repair Shop](#) - Larry Hatch [10]
[UFOs And People?](#) - Jim Mortellaro [69]
[Mars Roots - Images For Earthly Comparison](#) - Kurt Jonach [112]
[GrafikFX Website](#) - Dave Bowden [5]
[Re: Body Marks - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [37]
[Fugo Sampler](#) - Jan Aldrich [49]

Mar 26:

[Greer's Disclosure Project - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [65]
[Dr. Leo And The New Age](#) - John Velez [83]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Fleming](#) - Lan Fleming [26]
[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Aldrich](#) - Jan Aldrich [25]
[Re: UFOs And People? - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [74]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [54]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [100]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [17]
[UFO Over Arica, Chile](#) - Scott Corrales [47]
[Re: Serious Research - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [21]
[Re: Body Marks - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [44]
[Re: Body Marks - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [53]
[Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas](#) - Nick Balaskas [39]

[Fugo Follow-Up](#) - Robert Gates [18]

[Re: Serious Research - Velez](#) - John Velez [45]

[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise](#) - Karoline Louise [128]

Mar 27:

[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [108]

[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [228]

[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [44]

[ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms: 3/23/01](#) - SMiles Lewis [171]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [27]

[Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart](#) - Gary Hart [89]

[Nick Pope's Weird World - April 2001](#) - Georgina Bruni [126]

[The Real X-Files - April 2001](#) - Georgina Bruni [143]

[Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart](#) - geehart@frontiernet.net [57]

[Icelandic UFO Experiences?](#) - David Hinson [8]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [51]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Myers](#) - Royce J. Myers III [25]

[Secrecy News -- 03/26/01](#) - Steven Aftergood [122]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre](#) - Alfred Webre [51]

[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [42]

[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [66]

[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [37]

[Exopolitics - UFO Magazine Article](#) - Alfred Webre [287]

[Re: Body Marks - Velez](#) - John Velez [52]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Lehmborg](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [223]

[Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - Goldstein](#) - Josh Goldstein [15]

[NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars](#) - Kurt Jonach [63]

[Re: Serious Research - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [52]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [38]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [73]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [90]

[Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni](#) - Georgina Bruni [46]

[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale](#) - Larry Hatch [25]

[Bolivian Air Force Jet Pursues UFO](#) - Scott Corrales [44]

[Further Details On UFO Pursuit By Bolivian Jet](#) - Scott Corrales [68]

[Re: Body Marks - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [59]

[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez](#) - John Velez [243]

[Re: Serious Research - Salvaille](#) - Serge Salvaille [168]

[UFO Materials Wanted For Local School](#) - Philip Mantle [40]

[Jacques Vallee?](#) - Thiago L. Ticchetti [6]

[Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Young](#) - Bob Young [40]

[Re: UFOs And People? - Maccabee](#) - Bruce Maccabee [52]

[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [61]

[Re: Serious Research - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [50]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Young](#) - Bob Young [22]

[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Don's UFO Repair Shop](#) - Bob Young [15]

[Re: NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars](#) - - Bob Young [13]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [54]

[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [26]

[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [110]

[Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Truncated](#) - George A. Filer [269]

Mar 28:

[Re: Serious Research - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [54]
[OT - The Omega Man](#) - Kelly [274]
[Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [23]
[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - McCoy](#) - GT McCoy [24]
[Re: UFOs And People? - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [120]
[Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland](#) - Sue Strickland [25]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [17]
[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [33]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise](#) - KarolineLouise@aol.com [192]
[Re: Icelandic UFO Experiences? - Aubeck](#) - Chris Aubeck [56]
[Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp](#) - Jim Mortellaro [43]

Mar 29:

[Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Corrales](#) - Scott Corrales [58]
[Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor](#) - Kelly [29]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [299]
[Re: Serious Research - Randles](#) - Jenny Randles [112]
[Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Young](#) - Bob Young [21]
[Re: Serious Research - Sandow](#) - Greg Sandow [25]
[Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Jones](#) - Sean Jones [28]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Brad Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [130]
[Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Part II](#) - George A. Filer [208]
[Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Re-send](#) - Kelly [45]
[ENN - Our Universe Not Alone, Say Scientists](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [69]
[AA Time Warp](#) - Roger Evans [38]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [113]
[Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base'](#) - Ralph O. Howard Jr. [27]
[Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Mantle](#) - Philip Mantle [29]
[Re: Serious Research - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [81]

Mar 30:

[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [30]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [30]
[Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young](#) - Bob Young [41]
[UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 13](#) - John Hayes [446]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young [23]
[Re: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Hamilton](#) - Bill Hamilton [20]
[Bolivian UFO Was MIR Balloon](#) - Scott Corrales [32]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [30]
[Re: UFO Update: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Velez](#) - John Velez [50]
[Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez](#) - John Velez [100]
[US Congress Joins Cloning Debate](#) - Sean Jones [56]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [140]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [60]
[Re: Serious Research - Louise](#) - Karoline Louise [39]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [86]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [50]
[Sergey Korolyov](#) - Paul Stonehill [25]
[Re: Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base'](#) - Mac Tonnies [22]

[Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Gates](#) - Robert Gates [34]
[Re: Serious Research - Sparks](#) - Brad Sparks [108]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Kaeser](#) - Steven Kaeser [49]
[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [45]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [52]

Mar 31:

[Re: iler's Files #13 -- 2001 - Cuthbertson](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [32]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Velez](#) - John Velez [42]
[Secrecy News -- 03/30/2001](#) - Steven Aftergood [133]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Tonnie](#) - Mac Tonnie [32]
[Re: US Congress Joins Cloning Debate - Tonnie](#) - Mac Tonnie [18]
[Debunkers' Guidebook](#) - Richard Hall [37]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Rimmer](#) - John Rimmer [46]
[Magonia Supplement 35](#) - John Rimmer [229]
[NASA Acquires 2001 HAL Computer](#) - Kurt Jonach [68]
[Re: Serious Research - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [59]
[Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale](#) - Roy J Hale [17]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Deschamps](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [51]
[Aurorae As IFOs](#) - Bob Young [24]
[False Memories](#) - Kevin Randle [5]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Hatch](#) - Larry Hatch [48]
[Re: Debunker's Guidebook - Ledger](#) - Don Ledger [98]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Hatch](#) - Don Ledger [52]
[Re: Serious Research - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [76]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark](#) - Jerome Clark [65]
[Re: False Memories - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [28]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Evans](#) - Roger Evans [61]
[Re: Mass Hysteria as a Myth](#) - Don Ledger [18]
[Re: Aurorae As IFOs - Hayes](#) - John Hayes [22]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Young](#) - Bob Young [33]
[Re: Debunker's Guidebook](#) - Bob Young [16]
[ETH Council](#) - Jenny Randles [44]
[The Moon Landing Hoax](#) - Bob Young [7]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [22]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman](#) - Ed Gehrman [70]
[Re: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Mortellaro](#) - Jim Mortellaro [81]
[Re: Serious Research - Young](#) - Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com> [35]
[Re: AA Time Warp - Hall](#) - Richard Hall [55]
[Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Hatch](#) - Don Ledger [81]
[The Watchdog - 03-31-01](#) - Royce J. Myers III [16]

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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

From: **Diane Harrison Director AUFORN** <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 08:45:14 -0500
Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

On Friday evening of 23 February 2001, at 10.45 pm at Collaroy NSW - a large, reddish object with a glowing red hemispherical base and a "dark, unlit, castle-like upper section" passed from west to east, then out to sea before disappearing several kilometers offshore

The object made an extremely loud noise ("like a hundred motorbikes") and was seen for about a quarter of an hour by several streets ("at least") of Collaroy residents, drawn outside by the loud noise. Several bouncers on the door at the local hotel had a very clear view of the object.

Witnesses reported that the object created a definite draft of air in the direction of travel.

An Australian Air Force source reported that four identical objects had been seen over Darwin (NT) earlier that Friday evening. Up to five Australian Air Force jets from Darwin had been scrambled in pursuit. The rotating objects seen at Darwin were reported as having a hemispherical base with a smaller cylindrical turret above.

At least one of the objects had flown alongside an Air Force jet, pacing it (the pilots had found this disconcerting). The object had 'jumped' instantaneously to a position behind the jet.

One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected without causing any apparent harm.

The objects had been followed southwards, but jets had to be diverted near Sydney to Richmond AFB to refuel.

(Estimates of the actual sizes of the objects, speeds, etc. are not available at this time)

The following Saturday morning, several AF retrieval and Hercules planes had overflown the Collaroy area, "as if looking for something."

Collaroy residents tried to contact the 1800 National UFO hotline during Saturday afternoon, but received a recorded message saying the service was temporarily unavailable.

On Sunday, Air Force and Navy planes had continued overflying the Collaroy area. One extremely large plane had overflown the area at very low altitude and low speed, with its cargo doors open.

PRA and Monash University (Melbourne) personnel are believed to have been discretely providing technical advice and support for the Defense investigation.

The position where the object vanished on Friday night (several

miles east of Collaroy) appears to be a favoured location for unusual phenomena. On several occasions during the mid-1990s, residents of Elanora Heights reported seeing a series of bright star-like objects appear at that location before they sped off either westwards, or northwards along the coast. On two different occasions, in the very early morning: an "explosion of light" had been seen and a thin, single ring of cloud had radiated outwards from that location, horizontal to the ground and several hundred metres up.

Elanora Heights residents had experienced an unusual and disorienting "wave", where the ground seemed to ripple to the northwest (but it was not the usual sort of earthquake and ground vibration). Two residents near a cliff reported that they had been temporarily 'projected' about 10 metres southeast so they could look down into their neighbour's back yard, which was not normally from the kitchen. An explosion was heard following the wave, from the southeast (seaward).

The incident is being investigated by INUFOR, UFOR(NSW) and UFOESA.

From: "Bill Chalker" <bill_c@bigpond.com>
To: "Diane Harrison Director AUFORN" <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Cc: <Aussiepost@listbot.com>
Subject: Re: Initial incident report - Collaroy incident
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:52:35 +1100
X-Priority: 3

Comment from Bill Chalker via OZ Network:

From: "Bill Chalker" <bill_c@bigpond.com>
To: "Diane Harrison Director AUFORN" <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Cc: <Aussiepost@listbot.com>
Subject: Re: Initial incident report - Collaroy incident
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:52:35 +1100

Hi,

I can confirm that Peter Khoury and I went out to Collaroy on Sunday and interviewed a number of locals. Details received in videoed interviews confirm the essential nature of the Collaroy incident, as described below in Bryan Dickeson's report:

One of the witnesses we spoke to confirmed an anecdote he had been told by a woman the following day, that approximates the Darwin anecdote Bryan describes. Darwin, an RAAF pursuit and firing were all mentioned. The anecdote was mentioned as being apparently linked to the Collaroy incident.

We briefly interviewed the local hotel manager and head of security there, but they did not confirm the incident, other than to volunteer that a large contingent of bikers did come into the area around 10 pm. This appears to be earlier than the incident involved. The witnesses who saw the alleged UFO were certain that the noise they heard was clearly related to be object they saw go overhead.

I visited Dee Why police on Sunday, but they could not confirm anything out of the ordinary.

I have sent an enquiry to the Department of Defence for comment.

I spoke with the editor of the Manly Daily. He was unaware of anyone contacting them about the incident and would not run a story to "flush" others out on principle. He would only run a story if locals contacted the paper.

Will advise any further relevant info.

Regards, Bill Chalker

Bill Chalkers request for information from the Royal Australian Air Force Canberra.

Hi everybody,

I sent the following enquiry off to the Department of Defence and got the following response, fairly promptly:

Wednesday, 28 February 2001 3:32 PM:

I am seeking any information about alleged "UFO" or "UAS" incidents that occurred on Friday night, February 23rd, 2001.

I have interviewed people in the Collaroy (northern Sydney beaches) area who observed and heard an unusual object at about 10.45 pm, ostensibly travelling west to east.

This object was claimed to have come down very low over the area and disappeared out to sea. Some locals have linked this to seemingly unusual aircraft and helicopter activity over the area, particularly on Saturday, February 24th.

Others have linked this activity to an alleged UFO event claimed to have involved RAAF aircraft from Darwin NT earlier in the evening of Friday, February 23rd, 2001. This activity allegedly involved 4 similar objects and up to 5 RAAF aircraft in "pursuit".

1. Could you please confirm whether the RAAF or Department of Defence has any knowledge of either the alleged Darwin NT and/or Collaroy NSW area events of Friday evening, February 23rd, 2001? Were any RAAF aircraft involved in any events of the nature described above?

2. Were Department of Defence aircraft, helicopters etc involved in activity off the Collaroy beach area on Friday February 23rd, Saturday February 24th and since then, and was this related to the events described above? If they were not related to such events could you please advise me if you are aware of any explanation for these alleged events and the activity since Saturday, February 24th, 2001 in the Collaroy area.

I will contact you further on this matter over the next day or so. Thank you,

Bill Chalker
UFO Investigation Centre (UFOIC)
02 9484 4680

The Royal Australian Air Force Canberra
official comment to Bill Chalker from:

Geoff Patchett
Wing Commander
Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force

SEC Unclassified RAAF Activities 23-25 March 2001

Wednesday, 28 February 2001 6:50 PM

Dear Bill,

In answer to your enquires regarding reports of unusual RAAF activity over the weekend of 23 -25 March 2001. I have confirmed that there was very limited and routine aircraft activity over that weekend. The only aircraft operating out of Darwin at that time were two F/A-18s conducting normal training flights. There was some transport aircraft activity out of Richmond Airbase but that was also routine tasking and did not involve any searching activity. A Caribou also transited to the Naval Station at Nowra on a routine flight. At mid day on 24th a F111 also transited from Brisbane to Nowra on a routine flight.

Geoff Patchett
Wing Commander
Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force

Will keep you posted on any further developments,
Regards,

Bill Chalker

Comment Diane:

I had a conversation with Bill regarding the incident and informed him I might be able to find out a little more from the RAAF in QLD and asked him if he would like me to do so.

Hence the report from me.

A formal request for information relating to the incident
In on the 23rd -25th February near Collaroy

From Diane Harrison, National Director of AUFORN
Time: 14:35p.m
Date: 28th 2 2001
To The Royal Australian Air Force Amberley QLD
Via Racheal King Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force Qld

Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 14:35:44 +1100
To: ambpublicrelations@defence.gov.au
From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Subject: Fwd: Initial incident report

Hi Racheal

Thank you for looking at this. Like I said I'm just a little surprised that this kind of information is said to have come from the Air force. I would be interested in what you can find out regarding this incident. Thank you again for talking the time to look at it.

Telephone call 28th 2 2001 to Diane Harrison from Racheal King
Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force Qld

The message left: Hi Diane just calling you back as we are having technical problem with our network. As for the information you seek, I've found there was nothing unusual happening in Darwin or Collaroy, I've been told that no F1-11 were scrambled as stated in the report. However I have been in-touch with Wing Commander Geoff Patchett Public Affairs Coordinator in Canberra. I informed him that I had your e-mail address, he informed me he would be sending another UFO network an Official Response and would do the same for you. If you require anything else please don't hesitate to call me. (End of call)

From: "Patchett, Geoff" <Geoff.Patchett@cbr.defence.gov.au>
To: "'tkbnetw@powerup.com.au'" <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Subject: SEC: Unclassified RAAF Activities 23-25 March 2001
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 18:53:03 +1100

Dear Diane,

In response to your comments regarding reports of unusual RAAF activity over the weekend of 23 -25 March 2001. I have confirmed that there was very limited and routine aircraft activity over that weekend. The only aircraft operating out of Darwin at that time were two F/A-18s conducting normal training flights. There was some transport aircraft activity out of Richmond Airbase but that was also routine tasking and did not involve any searching activity. A Caribou also transited to the Naval Station at Nowra on a routine flight. At mid day on 24th a F111 also transited from Brisbane to Nowra on a routine flight.

Geoff Patchett
Wing Commander
Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force
(02) 6265 5453

Comment Diane:

As you can see from the Commander response we are not much closer to finding out what happened in Collaroy. However I've heard that Bryan Dickenson, Bill Chalker and Peter Khoury are working on the case and I've been informed that they will keep us all up to date. Thank for the follow up Bill, Bryan, Peter

More to come

Regards Diane Harrison

National Director of The Australian UFO Research Network
Australian Skywatch Director

~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>
THE AUSTRALIAN UFO RESEARCH NETWORK
(A Non-Profit Organization)

E-Mail: tkbnetw@powerup.com.au
E-mail: ufologist@powerup.com.au
<http://www.powerup.com.au/~tkbnetw>

ADMINISTRATION:

PO Box 805
Springwood Qld 4127
Australia

~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>
Australian UFO Research Network Hotline Number
1800 77 22 88 Freecall

~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>
Disclaimer: A.UFO.R.N List Owners are not responsible
for the content or misuse of this list.
However, personal insults, flaming will not be tolerated.

~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>~~~~<>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [tkbnetw](#)

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:07:44 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 08:54:35 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 12:47:34 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Roger wrote:

>First off you are the biggest defender of Ray, despite his
>track record of deception and avoidance of responsibility
>regarding AA. I think 'exonerate' is a pretty good description.
>Second off I don't think you understand: Ray is not pushing
>your efforts in any way. He has made it clear that he does not
>want to be bothered with your investigations.

>Doesn't that, in itself, tell you something?

Roger,

Yes, It tells me that he cannot support me in any substantial way. It doesn't mean that he wouldn't if he could. My feeling, from the little that I know him and I admit I don't know him well, is that his hands are tied. >Snip

>I produced a very silly feature film
>called 'Forever Evil' with over 30 actors that ran 120 minutes
>back in 1987. It was shot on 16mm film, played on USA twice that
>I know of and is still available on VHS from VCI Home Video.

>120 minutes, Ed. That's two hours. And the total budget was only
>\$120,000. I am not saying that this film was any good; more to
>the point it was not. But it had mucho special make-up effects
>that were on par with anything seen in AA.

No, No, No! The only metallurgist to view the debris stated flatly that there was not a single method known to metallurgy that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!

And if a person could find a way to do it, then they would make far more \$\$\$\$ by making real products. Have you read the "Discussion the Debris" in Flatland?

The debris certainly was not on a par with anything you produced. Can you show or tell the List how the debris could be made? No. Why? Because you haven't viewed the AA footage with a critical eye. And that's just the debris. How about the creature? Do you think you could produce something on a "par" with it? You need to find a way to open the AA Cds. Then you won't make these mistaken judgments about the quality of the AA footage.

Ed

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:25:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 08:56:17 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: Gildas Bourdais <GBourdais@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 14:29:25 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Thank you for you offer, but frankly I have seen enough
>documents about the Fort Worth photos.

Gildas,

I too would like to see Bob Shell enter the discussion, but what really matters is for you to examine the evidence for yourself. Buy the CDs and ask Neil for the FW photo's CD. Read the "Flatland" articles. You won't be sorry.

Ed

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 16:18:00 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:00:03 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 00:42:12 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Bob wrote:

>As I recall Ray allegedly sold between 400,000 to 600,000 copies
>of the AA tape world wide, not to mention whatever FOX paid.
>When you run the numbers of just the video sales alone that
>equates out to 4-7 million dollars or thereabouts. Thats not a
>bad chunk of change for say a \$100 K investment. We are also
>told by AA supporters that the hoaxed tent footage also came
>from the cameraman as part of the 22 rolls of film.

I admit that Ray could have made millions but he says he didn't.
How much money he made is of absolutely no importance to me. I
don't know why it's so important to you, either. The only money
you should be worrying about is the \$35 you need to send me so
you can see for yourself how wrong you are about the quality of
the footage and your theorizing about how much it would cost to
produce. (see my reply to Roger)

About the hoaxed tent footage: Ray sent a roll of what he
considered damaged film to some technical friends to "see what
they could find". As it turned out, they couldn't get anything
from this old film.

So they decided to play a practical joke; they staged the tent
sequence and made a video of it.

They then told Ray that the video was taken from the film he'd
given them. Ray showed the video to the cameraman, and the
cameraman said he didn't remember filming anything like what was
being presented.

Ray became suspicious and canned the footage. Only a few folks
have seen this hoaxed tent footage. I have a copy and there is
absolutely no comparison between it and the other AA footage.

There is no detail; all you can see are shadowy figures doing
unimaginable things with some strange gooey substance.

There is a tent sequence in the AA footage but it's in the
debris portion. The debris is filmed inside a tent, but it has
nothing, I repeat, nothing to do with the hoaxed tent footage
which is not included in the AA CDs.

What the hoax does prove is that there actually was old 16mm
film and that Ray was trying to figure out what to do with it.

Ed

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Mackay

From: **Glennys Mackay** <glenmack@pacific.net.au>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 10:25:35 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:13:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Mackay

>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 13:16:10 -0000

>Hello to All,

>"UFO abductions have become especially common during 1989; so
>common that we believe we have now identified the mechanism of
>these events."

>In neither case do I come away any wiser about the possible
>howness or whyhness of the abduction phenomenon. Perhaps Mr.
>Chalker could provide a synopsis of the Bundjalung view of
>abductions as it stands. It could make very interesting reading.

>Chris Aubeck

Chris having just read your article, I would like to contribute some information regarding our Indigenous Race here in Australia.

I have spent a couple of months in Northern Territory, North/Western Queensland where I was privileged to stay with our indigenous people. This was in June 2000 and again in September of last year.

I sat and listened to their stories, a majority of stories were of the star people who come from the stars. They shared with me stories of the people that live among some of the tribes in remote areas.(Borroloola) I spent time in Arnhem Land (very remote area).

I spoke to women from Croker Island, which is a remote Island in the Arafura Sea, (off the coast of Arnhem Land). One lady described events that took place in December 1999 when her husband and brother-inlaw went out fishing in their dingy.

They were about 100 yards off the beach when a UFO came down over them, it started sucking up the water around the dingy.

From her description the two men almost walked on water trying to get away. They managed to get into the mangrove swamps nearby and covered themselves with mud. They stayed in the swamp till the craft left.

This took place about 11.30am. Since this happened the men refuse to go out fishing.

There have been recorded cases out near Dajarra (western Queensland. This is an Aboriginal settlement. I spent 3 days in this area talking to the elders.

A 7 year old girl was taken from the river bank one evening by a fury creature no taller than the child, the police investigated this case. The little girl was returned 7 days later to the same place. This took place over 20 years ago.

They tell me that these creatures sometimes come with the Star people. They're similar to the Yowie or Bigfoot, only much smaller.

These creatures come in the night and try to steal the women and children.

The men sit up all night around the fire with burning sticks to frighten these creatures away.

Not Far from Dajarra (146 kilometres) you have Boulia where the Min Min Lights are frequently seen. We had an experience of being followed by them in May 1999. Around 66 kilometres along the Development Road we were followed till we arrived at Middleton. I was taken there area by a friend who is Aboriginal, (without permission, white people are not allowed into these areas. These people are also very distrustful of city slickers. :)

We also saw a UFO in this area.

In some of these remote areas over the years many of the locals claim to have communication and regular sightings. :).

The older women in Arnham Land told me that sometimes the Star People take their children. The people talk about their visions and information they receive telepathically. The Aboriginal People (respectful name Murri's) are the most telepathic in the world. I think in the past the saying "Bush Telegraph" came from our indigenous people as they could communicate with other tribes thousands of miles away, and some of the full-blooded still do. Many of the sacred sights the elders sit and communicate with people who come from the stars.

About one hours drive from Alice Springs I visited a community besides the McDonald Range which is an Aboriginal settlement. (Over this range from Pine Gap.)

The lady I visited tells of regular sightings of craft that fly or hover over the area where she lives. They come from the direction of Pine Gap.

Where she lives is a restricted community only the Aboriginals live in this area - which is over the mountain range from the 'Joint American Installation'. Marilyn told me that they have regular sightings and have had trouble with UFOs hovering over the water tank and dam from which they take water.

Kind regards to all,

Glennys Mackay

MUFON Queensland
Brisbane Australia

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 18:53:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:15:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg

Another officious insult and attack on our basic verbal freedoms! Will this cloying Canadian literary tyranny never end?

Next, this fascist word czar will insist on relevancy and validity, or style -- think what it would mean! I quake at the implications.

Remember -- this is a man who uses a bathroom, and I don't mean that in a good way! Watch the North! Fear Canada!

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

~o~

EXPLORE Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.
<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME
<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/witches/237/lehmborg.html>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

From: Glennys Mackay <glenmack@pacific.net.au>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 10:47:07 +1000
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:46:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

Hello Errol,

A friend has forward this on to me, you may find this of interest.

I spent some time with this group of investigators North of Gympie, Queensland Australia, in a National park, camped in our motor home. In the early hours of the morning our 2 tonne Winnebago was lifted off its wheels.

At dawn we found footprints around 16inch long from heel to toe and over 4 feet apart. We were glad we did not go out and investigate when we got thrown out of bed.

From: Webmaster <yowiehunter@yowiehunters.com.au>
To: Glennys Mackay <glenmack@pacific.net.au>
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2001 9:42 AM
Subject: Re: UFO Update: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

Hi Glennys

This is where Richard and I spent the last 3 days.

Did a lot of trekking and found some great caves near a lagoon. I think we out in daylight sometimes.

Had a good trip and had a large rock thrown at us one night and a lot of movement in the bush around camp. This is the report we were investigating.

A report in last week!

Pig hunters in the Dalby area have had a few run ins with yowies in recent months.

Wally F and his offsidiers were out hunting with 14 dogs one night when the dogs bailed up a large Razorback. So they thought! As Wally got closer he could see that it was something much bigger. The dogs were all over the beast and about 4 dogs had latched on to it. The beast stood up and started hissing and growling and throwing the dogs off it's back! It was terrifying they said. We knew it was no boar as it reached behind it's back to pull a dog off which was firmly gripped on to the back of it's neck.

Dogs were thrown all around the bush. Many of them suffering some nasty injuries. One dog was picked up by the scruff of the neck and hind quarter and was thrown a good forty feet. The injuries were very bad ripping a large piece of flesh from the hind quarter and leaving very deep scratches as it ripped through the skin on the dogs neck.

I have spent all of my life in the bush hunting pigs with my Dad and now with my mates and have never seen anything like it before. said Wally.

Wally a Murri bloke aged 27 described the creature as about 6ft tall very broad shouldered with yellow eyes that were some 3 inches apart and shone like spotlights. It was very dark brown or black with thick matted Hair and ran off hunched over like.

Since the attack the blokes have had a few more encounters with these weird yellow eyed beasts one time a group of 3 of them tried to surround Wal and his mate as thay walked down a gully below their farmhouse. We were near a dam it was about 8.30pm and we had lost some keys earlier that day near there so we were sctaching around in the grass with our torchs looking for them. Wal heard a noise behind him and looked up to see a creature with these glowing yellow eyes. The thing picked up a small log about 8 inches in diametre and about a metre long and threw it at Wally.

The blokes were startled and gave up the search for the keys. Another creature appeared to be nearby in the bush near the dam they could see the eyes glowing as they swept the area with the dolphin torch. Then another noise in the bush coming down the side of the ridge towards the dam!

Another set of yellow eyes moving very fast heading towards them, It sounded really big you could hear it running and you could see that it was something like 9ft tall. The eyes were about 6-7 inches apart.

The guys took off and ran onto the road nearby then quickly up to the house.

Since that time Wally invited his brother Phil an ex-soldier to come out and see what he thought. Phil did not think it was for real but went along anyway.

The guys were all up at the house it was very late in the evening and then a noise was heard outside. Phil looked towards the window and saw a large set of yellow eyes peering in. It must have been about 8 or 9 ft tall he said to look in that window like that. It ran off into the darkness.

The family ended up leaving the farm and moving it was all a bit much when you have children around and they feared for their saftey.

Since then a new family has moved to the farmhouse and erected an eight strand barbed wire and electric fence around the house.

Guess old yellow eyes likes to visit regularly.

Phil Yowiehunter

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:48:35 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>ET via space travel is the simplest to explain truly
>unexplainable sightings which include observations of structured
>objects.

Bruce,

"Simple" if you can point to non-UFO, mainstream science data in support of same. But science itself has none to offer. To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in this country, as well as every other country in the world.

>Of course, if there are no such reports (all misidentifications, >hoaxes or delusions), then there is no point in making any ET >argument. (I note that Dennis still hasn't responded to my query >as to whether or not he accepts ANY sighting as unexplained and >truly unexplainable.)

Of course there are reports. I accept many of them as unexplained and unexplainable -- by their very nature. I accept my own sighting as inherently unexplainable, if for no other reason than that I will never be able to acquire all the relevant data regarding same. It will be forever and always unexplainable, yea, verily, and amen. At the same time, there is nothing inherent to the sighting itself that could ever be hauled into court (scientific or otherwise) in support of the ET hypothesis, other than as one hypothesis among many.

<snip>

>However, I can understand your inferred pleading: why hasn't a >saucer had an "Ubatuba problem" (explosion) over a city?

Thank you. Not all ufologists can.

<snip>

>The way I see it, the real problem is, is there any evidence of >Other Intelligences (OI) or Non-Human Intelligence (NHI) >involved, regardless of where it came from.

As evidenced by what?

<snip>

>Ponder this: is there any case which anyone here dares to >claim is unexplainable, period. If so, then we can argue over >whether or not it represents OI/NHI.

Yes, see above. So what? No, we can't -- unless you want to argue about everything else it might represent.

>This, of course, gets us back to ground zero... but what so many
>"newbies" don't understand is that after all these years
>we are still at ground zero at least as far as the scientific
>community, and to a large extent the public at large, is
>concerned

Arguably because no UFO evidence has ever broken through the theoretical threshold of containment and cover up. Think of it as a nice pillow to fall back on. When the evidence itself doesn't convince, then the Government must be to blame (sorta like the budget data).

Personally, having invested heavily in stocks based on ET technology recovered at Roswell (computer chips, fiber optics, Kevlar, etc.), I tend to fault Alan Greenspan for everything. I suspect he's the current head of MJ-12.

But I can't wait for the Missile Defense IPO.

Anticipated stock symbol: STWRS

Dennis

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Writings, Symbols and Emblems - Anthony

From: Gary Anthony <garyant@mithrand.karoo.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:15:50 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:50:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Writings, Symbols and Emblems - Anthony

>From: Diane Harrison - Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 06:57:05 +1100
>Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 18:24:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Writing, Symbols & Emblems? - Harrison

>>From: Gary Anthony <garyant@mithrand.karoo.co.uk>
>>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Writing, Symbols & Emblems?
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 00:19:39 -0000

>>Dear Colleagues

>>I am currently continuing to collect samples of alleged alien
>>writing, symbols and emblems with a view to compiling a
>>comprehensive database on alien languages; and in this endeavour
>>I have managed so far to acquire a number of different and
>>interesting examples and references from around the world.

>Hi Gary

>Here in Australia we have a Lady ufologist called Mary Rodwell
>who works with Abductee's and Contactee's and whilst working
>with them she has collected quite a number of drawings of
>symbols, ETs and writings.

>Here is Mary's e-mail if you would like to chat to her about them
>starline@iinet.net.au

>Also Mary and friends produced a Video called Expressions of ET
>Contact, a visual blue print, which was presented at the
>International UFO Congress, Film Festival in 1999 the video won
>two awards.

>It would be interesting to see if any of your collection is the
>same as Mary's. Ask Mary about Tracey Taylors drawing's there
>fantastic.

Hi Dianne,

Thanks for this info, already covered much of this ground and
correspond with Mary occasionally. I have also corresponded with
Tracey Taylor and have a copy of Mary's video. There are some
comparisons not just with Tracey's drawings but with others from
the video and others I have collected from elsewhere around the
world. (I also have Australasian Ufologist edition about
Tracey).

There is a case in Oz, I am trying to get further details of
which you perhaps may have heard of and can help with, I will
mail you privately about this as soon as I dig out my notes, if
I may? If not, then perhaps I can provide you with a little
reference of it?

Best Regards

Gary Anthony

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Lakenheath - Bruni

From: **Georgina Bruni** <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:43:29 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:56:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Bruni

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 17:10:00 -0000

>Being an 'uninformed journalist' has obviously done wonders for
>my career over this past decade. Perhaps if Georgina would like
>to come along to the Hilton Hotel in central London on March 13
>she might get to see how this 'uninformed journalist' managed to
>get his PR team shortlisted for the "Communications Team of the
>Year Award" - one of the most prestigious Public Relations
>Awards in this country!

I take it they won't be handing out any awards for modesty.

>Being 'uninformed' didn't stop me getting my expose of a multi-
>million pound scam which put condemned pet food onto dinner
>tables across Britain onto TV screens across the world

I'm impressed that you exposed a scam whereby recycled and
and decidedly dodgy fare was served up as if it was something
new and wholesome. But given some of your postings on this list,
there's something deeply ironic about that.

>Press Awards (Feature Writer of the Year, Yorkshire Press
>Awards 1993) aren't usually given out to 'uninformed' journalists,

Experienced investigative journalists don't need to sit for
awards, they are too busy working on big stories. All that you
mention is usually achieved in their junior years. When you grow
up you might become a real journalist. And don't forget that
real journalists don't need to brag about their achievements
because there is no need - because everybody knows who they are
and what they have done.

>I could go on but don't want to be accused of bragging

No comment

>It should be obvious to everyone that you are not interested in
>whether the Rendlesham story is credible or not. In fact it
>serves your purposes to perpetuate the mystery, not to solve it.
>If you solve it it takes away the prospect of more books,
>lecture tours and TV appearances. That's why you chose the News
>of the World, because all that matters is how many books you
>sell, not whether anyone takes what you're saying seriously!

Anybody who reads the book will surely know that I gave 3 years
of my life to investigate the case. In some instances even
exposing those who exaggerated their part.

>As for the News of the World "investigation" - the use of that
>word in this context is an insult to investigative journalism.
>The story they printed last November didn't display one iota of
>basic investigation - it was clearly directly re-written from a
>Press Release sent to the paper by your publisher. I very much
>doubt that the paper had even bothered to pick up a phone to ask
>a single question of a single source.

I put that to Gloria Stewart one of the journalists who covered the story. You might like to know that Ms Stewart won Journalist of the Year award when she was 26 years old. She later became a political journo in the Soviet Union during the Cold War and is now writing her memoirs. In fact, if it wasn't for her investigative talents exposing a certain moron, he would have been our prime minister. So, whatever you think, it was a qualified political journalist who did the story.

>It's the sort of piece my news editor used to call "easy copy."

Both Gloria Stewart and Lewis Panther read the whole book and questioned me several times. In fact the editorial director even called me. But things may be different in the provincial press.

>But of course, I wager not one of these scientists and
>investigative journalists would stand up and allow their names
>to be associated with your claims about time-travellers, would
>they? Anyone can quote 'unamed sources' who have made polite
>noises during cocktail parties to make themselves sound
>important. It doesn't impress me.

It might interest you to know that Mike Maloney, Chief of Photography for the Mirror Group, stood up in front of 100 guests at my book launch at the MOD and told everybody how credible I was. Even more amazing was that he told his own story of how he had been privileged to see a certain film of an alien autopsy twenty years ago. This is one of the most respected media people in the business.

I am hoping to quote some of the scientists but as everybody knows, it is not easy because they are afraid of losing their funding.

>Air Marshall Sir Timothy Garden KCB is the former assistant
>Chief of Defence Staff and Director of the Royal Institute of
>International Affairs. He is now visiting Professor at the
>Centre of Defence Studies, King's College, London, and has
>extensive knowledge of European Defence and Security Policy.

I'm surprised that given your award winning journalistic skills you haven't realised that you were simply being spun the party line.

>His views on UFOs and the alleged cover-up? Well to be polite,
>like most defence chiefs, he treats the whole thing as a joke.

I think the joke was on you.

>(your reaction to Jenny's Fortean Times piece - the only informed
>review your book has had so far - did not do you any favours),
>you might demonstrate a more mature approach to the debate.

Maybe you should check out the Magonia archive where your colleague Jenny Randles wrote a letter of protest regarding a review somebody had done on her book about Rendlesham "UFO Crash Landing?" at least I refrained from going that far!

In fact, maybe you ought to be more informed about a good many other things before making yourself look ridiculous.

And please don't bother me again with more of your achievements. This is a UFO List and I don't see anything so far that makes you an experienced researcher. Anybody can shout!

Have a nice day

Georgina Bruni

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Protocols Plus

From: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 20:46:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 10:02:02 -0500
Subject: Protocols Plus

List,

While I'm at it, let me take this opportunity to profusely thank ebk for the privilege, platform and spectacle he provides us all, whether it be:

Jerry Clark taking on Albion's Isle in its seeming entirety

The entire population of Albion's Isle taking on JC in turn

Jenny Randles spending way too much time responding to G. Budrais (or whoever), when she could be turning out a new article on floating "aliens" for The Anomalist 10, for which she will actually get paid

The Duke of Mendoza (Peter Pendragon) for almost anything (Here's hoping his horses aren't hoarse.)

John Rimmer, just because I like his mailing address (Look it up)

Hilary we-don't hear-enough-from-you Evans

Richard who-would've-thought-and-welcome-to-the-club Hall

Stanton have-you-bought-all-my-books-and-articles-yet Friedman

Bruce Maccabee because he plays piano

David Rudiak because he's always pissed-off about some thing or some one and has yet to recant Roswell, and by God never will

John the-ever-volatile Velez and our other abductees (I wish I had the answer)

Our foreign contributors -- from Spain, Italy, Sweden, France and so forth and so on... (yeah, like we need foreigners in the first place!)

And others too numerous to mention (seriously)

Why are we so supernally blessed with the best UFO List on the web?

Because of ebk.

Errol Bruce-Knapp

Or is that Eat Bulk Kelp?

I never could quite get those initials straight.

Anyway, everyone here knows what I mean.

Put another way: Huzza, huzza!

Dennis Stacy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:13:53 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 10:04:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Mortellaro

>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:37:42 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Hatch

>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 01:29:43 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

>>>From: Kelly Peterborough <kellymcg@attcanada.ca>
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 15:57:10 -0500
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Wife sees husband 'vanish'

><snip>

>>>In the meantime, Yabi's wife has also sought the assistance of
>>>bomohs to trace the whereabouts of her husband.

>>They give no clue what a "bomoh" is. Might that be some sort of
>>witch doctor or spiritual advisor? A bomoh could be a bloodhound
>>for all they tell you.

>Hi Larry,

>You got it right first time.

>A quick search on the 'net produced:

>A Bomoh is a Malay witchdoctor. Also known as pawang or dukun.
>They are still active today and work professionally.

>This was taken from Encyclopedia Mythica at

><http://www.pantheon.org/mythica/articles/b/bomoh.html>

>Note - The above is the complete entry for 'Bomoh'

>Best wishes,
>John Hayes

Gentlemen, Ladies, other bListers, Bomoh's and Errol;

I appreciate the serious nature of this report, potentially.
However I do have a request to make of anyone on this august
List.

Is it possible to either rent or otherwise pay for the services
of a Bomoh or other entity, with which to have my brother-in-law
disappear?

And his mother too, as long as we're at it.

Jim

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:38:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 10:31:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich

>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 21:56:15 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Goldstein

>>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons
>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 21:30:24 -0500

<snip>

>Hello Jan,

>The Japanese attempts to attack the US were pretty meager and
>somewhat pitiful, especially considering who they were up
>against. The attack on Pearl Harbor jump started us into the war
>and we certainly had the industrial power to overcome those
>losses and build an unprecedented armada to defeat Japan. A
>Japanese sub surfaced near Santa Barbara and fired a shell at a
>little oil drilling building. The Fugo balloons had no real
>psychological or material affect to make a difference in the
war.

I have to disagree, the attacks indeed weren't much, but the analysis to the potential had the military worried. The US was aware of the Japanese biological warfare research. They thought for awhile that some balloons did, or would soon, contain biological agents. (They had two leads for this, an intercepted messages to the Germans in which the Japanese bragged that they would soon launch biological and chemical attacks on the US homeland, and conversations of a Japanese general officer overheard by a Filipino servant in which he stated that the US would be attacked with chemical and biological agents in balloons.)

Balloon recovery personnel in this country were ordered to use protective gear when balloon bombs were encountered. Dr. Lincoln LaPaz, working for G-2 (can't recall the command right now.) said as early as 1947 that if the war had lasted another year, the expectation was that a biological attack would be launched on the US by balloons.

During the first round of declassification of US Fugo documents, references to possible biological attack by Japanese balloons remained classified even though such stories had reached the press. Also, one of the recovery units, the 555th Infantry Parachute Regiment's, ("The Triple Nickles") history was classified and not released for a long time. This was a black parachute outfit of company strength, it was never filled out to regiment size. Their mission was to recover Fugo balloons and fight forest fires caused by balloons or render other firefighting assistance to the US Forest Service. The 555th learned different parachute techniques and other tactics from the Forest Service, developed their own equipment. Some of the equipment and techniques, the 555th developed were used later by the Rangers. Because of racial prejudice and the withholding of 555th's history, the Triple Nickles' contributions were only

recently recognized publicly.

>Near the end of the war Japan started to build a few special
>submarines. These were designed with a hangar on the deck that
>would hold two planes. The special planes were single engined
>and named Aichi. The plan was for the sub to go to the west
>coast of the USA, surface, assemble the plane in 7 minutes and
>launch it to drop a bomb somewhere. They tried it once but the
>sub was sunk in the western Pacific ocean. The Americans shipped
>back an Aichi to the US. It was recently restored at the
>National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian.

Actually, the Japanese launched a seaplane from a submarine in Feb 1942. The pilot dropped a bomb which the Japanese hoped would start a forest fire in the Oregon woods. The Japanese idea about causing blazing West Coast forests was, of course, far fetched.

>They also
>published an excellent book covering the Fugo program. School
>age girls were enlisted to sew the balloons. To me, a great
>mystery is wondering what the heck that UFO was that caused the
>LA Air defense to start shooting at it.

A men's magazine, Saga, claimed that they interviewed a seaplane commander who lead the raid over Los Angeles. Consider the source.

Some of the firing was at a meteorological balloon launched by the Anti-Aircraft Regiment defending Los Angeles, but other sightings don't match this. This is a very complicated incident. It doesn't help that "war nerves" were raw here, and the authorities tried to play down the whole incident.

Further on war nerves, there was a story in Alabama during the Fugo "era" that Japanese were landing from balloons which started a panic. Law enforce took awhile to get this one under control.

>We had the Manhattan project and the 509th to deliver a huge
>wallop. When I worked at the National Air and Space Museum we
>had the Enola Gay in storage along with hundreds of other
>historic aircraft. This was back in the 1970s when I restored
>aircraft by day and made music at night. When I and a fellow
>technician used to take breaks we would often unlock a storage
>hangar, go inside, pick a historic plane and sit in it sharing a
>joint. We would get high and try to feel the vibes of the
>airplane, imagining we were the pilots on historical flights.
>One of those planes was the Enola Gay. This is dark humor, but I
>remember how weird it was to sit in the bombardier's position
>with my hand on the bombing button and getting a creepy feeling.

>The Germans were never anywhere near a bomb. We had >gotten a
>reactor to go critical and warm up the stadium bleacher seats
>above it.

Robertson, that is the Robertson of the 1953 Robertson CIA panel was sent in to assassinate Hiesenberg who was the mainstay of the German program. However, Robertson decided that the Germans were on the wrong track and did not carry out the killing.

However, on paper the Nazis were planning a mating between an atomic bomb and the Horton brothers proposed bomber which could reach the United States (again on paper). There is a lead that LTC Seashore of T-2, Wright Field was investigating this in 1947. Project Abstract, I believe was the name of Seashore's inquiry. "Abstract" is a tough nut to crack, not much information has surfaced yet.

The Japanese had two atomic bomb projects going during WW II.

>We then started moving towards a bomb. The Germans
>never got a reactor to go critical. If you'll remember, the
>allies had a special mission to destroy the Nazi heavy water
>facility, as portrayed in a couple of films. That pretty much
>knocked out any hope of an atomic bomb before the end of the
>war.

>The Soviets had Claus Fuchs and the Rosenbergs to thank for
>their early ability. Man, I remember during the anti-war
>demonstrations in the 1960s there were some misguided >communists

>parading around holding signs that the Rosenbergs were >innocent
>- yeah, right. The Russians took a B29 bomber that had crash
>landed in the USSR and copied it rivet to rivet to make their
>first prop superbomber.

Yes, the Soviet copied stuff that worked. However, anyone that thinks that there were not some great minds there, and some pioneers in rocket and jet engineering is wrong. In the 19th century a Russian scientist was talking about "consumable rockets," that is parts of rockets would be used as fuel during the flight. GIRD was the Soviet counterpart to Wern von Braun German rocket scientists, GIRD scientists and engineers had built rocket planes, jets, and artillery rounds which were rockets to increase the range, just before WWII. Thank God, Stalin, sent them all off to prison. If they had continued the Soviets would have been even farther ahead in rocketry and aircraft design. As it was, the GIRD people were released during the war, but the bloom was off the rose. After the war, the Soviets used the German technicians catch up.

Okay, what is the relevance to UFOs?

The whole Cold War mentality is! Early after Arnold it was suggested that UFOs were a biological agent delivery system. Stories in Iowa newspapers, tongue in cheek, of course, said that people watched UFOs dropping insects which attacked crops.

I have Top Secret messages from the 1947 period in which Japanese scientists and administrators are trying to negotiate immunity, before discussing Japanese bio warfare research.

US documents discussing the ghost rockets in Scandinavia, mention the idea of consumable rockets. (See my article in the CUFOS Winter 1998, IUR, "Investigating the Ghost Rockets." Also, a file of significant ghost rocket documents has recently been published by FUFOR many of these were also Top Secret. Finally, you may view images of some significant ghost rocket documents on the Project 1947 website.)

Significant developments, rockets, jets, long range aircraft, etc., by the Germans fell into the hands of the Soviets, in fact entire factories were dismantled and moved with all technicians to the USSR. Many such developments were only on paper, but intelligence had to look for possible breakthroughs. Some Japanese biological research conducted on the Asian main land fell into the Soviet hands. Most everything about bio warfare in US hands was classified Top Secret, so any connection drawn about UFOs as a delivery vehicle is probably still classified. LaPaz alludes to this as an important consideration. He also thinks until quite late that the Soviets or the US are playing with advanced weapons, especially in the SW US.

In 1947 it was even considered that the Soviets might be using a Zeppelin, carrying aircraft to launch on scouting missions against the US. Seems like some lighter-than-air ship advocates in the Navy might have been touting on this one a little bit to push their case for lta's, but a 1948 Air Force Association magazine has a drawing of such an airship launching jets and rockets. This was the 1940s, the sky was still the limit. Intelligence took many far-fetched things into account.

Jan Aldrich

Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331, USA
(860) 546-9135

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 1](#)

The Watchdog E-Update - 02-28-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:49:33 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 10:42:19 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog E-Update - 02-28-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't trip on your open mind."
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

*****Your ad here*****

~GARY LOWERY: IN HIS OWN WORDS

UFOWATCHDOG.COM interviews Gary Lowery. This is a most unusual abduction case. Will it be the smoking gun of abductions, is it a hoax, or will it simply fade away like so many other cases?

NEWS

~ Mystifying Space Shuttle Shadow Explained
~ UFO Researchers Welcomed by Chilean Air Force
~ New Evidence Strengthens Claim of Ancient Life On Mars

*****Your ad here*****

OF INTEREST

UFOWATCHDOG.COM's investigative expose of Sean David Morton hasn't kept him from making his claims, many of which are false. Morton is scheduled to appear on Art Bell's Coast to Coast AM radio program this coming Friday. Bell has been sent UFOWATCHDOG.COM's investigation into Morton.

One of Morton's false claims was that he was Star Trek Creator Gene Roddenberry "protégé" and that he helped develop Star Trek: The Next Generation and worked on one of the popular Star Trek movies. Roddenberry's official biographer, David Alexander refutes this claim and has also contacted Bell about it more than once. Feel free to e-mail Bell and ask him about Morton's background.

*****Your ad here*****

If you have received this message and are not a current subscriber but would like to subscribe to "THE WATCHDOG" e-updates, please send an e-mail with "subscribe" in the subject box. Address all e-mail to ufowatchdog@earthlink.net

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:10:54 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 07:53:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:16:32 -0000

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 12:16:08 -0600

>>>From: Andy Roberts <AndyRoberts@ancientassociates.fsnet.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 10:21:29 -0000

>>I am told that you and your colleagues are
>>actively refusing to share information with other Lakenheath
>>experts.

>Hi Jerry,

>I'm sorry to hear that you are paying attention to hearsay
>evidence - it was this sort of thing which allowed the myth to
>grow in the first place.

>Rather than listening to Brad Sparks you should be asking
>pertinent questions like why he and Thayer suppressed the
>contradictory evidence of the RAF Fighter Controller in their
>account of 1980 - a question Sparks has pointedly failed to
>address on this List (see the post from Joe McGonagle, and my
>reply).

I certainly did address your false allegation and refuted it.
It's a matter of record.

>As for us "actively refusing" to co-operate with other
>"Lakenheath experts", don't make me laugh.

>The only individual you can possibly be referring to is Brad
>Sparks, so why don't you make it clear what you mean. Sparks, by
>his own admission, has spent 20 years recycling second and third
>hand information rather than investigating anything first
>hand.

Information from your RAF radar controller and the USAF radar
controller Perkins was not second or third hand but first hand.
But apparently you think I have to personally make the contact.
If so then we'll apply this rule to everything you use that has
been gathered by Randles, Fuller and Roberts -- we'll call it
"second and third hand."

>Now he realises that someone else has broken the rules of
>this rather cosy gentlemen's club and actually traced some
>first-hand testimony and documents, he wants to be in on the act
>- when it suits him.

Typical that you attribute a natural interest in the case and

desire for information to some evil or wrong.

I approached you in a friendly collegial fashion and you responded with insult, abuse, accusation and condescension.

>What qualifies someone as a "Lakenheath expert" other than
>self-proclamation?

Same could be said in return.

>Private correspondence I had with Sparks made it quite clear
>that he could not offer any new information to the
>investigation which we did not already possess.

You "possessed" it because I freely shared it on UFO UpDates and other lists but you and your associates hoard information. How convenient that I freely shared my new info and you would not?

>This was
>explained to Sparks, despite him making a groundless suggestion
>that we had already made "serious errors" in our investigation -
>something he could not possibly have known as he had no
>knowledge of what we had discovered!

As you well know bits and pieces of your "investigation" have been dribbled out and I had privately pointed out serious errors based on this that you and your colleagues have never refuted with facts -- only bald denials. But you and your colleagues desire to suppress criticism of your numerous advance previews and wish to either gloat over your great victory against the forces of ignorance and stupidity that you quite obviously deem UFOlogy to be or you seek applause for your self-evaluated superiority. This childish attitude is tiresome. Let's stick to the facts of the case at hand.

>Given such an attitude - why on earth should we waste time
>corresponding with someone who knows nothing, and jumps to such
>a conclusion without evidence?

Here you again make an insulting and false assertion. You call others "bullying" later on but what is this here?

>Our investigation has been conducted following journalistic
>procedure - talking to first-hand sources and obtaining
>contemporary documents. To this end we have been dealing
>directly with RAF aircrew, retired Squadron Leaders and the
>Ministry of Defence who have been very helpful. We also have
>enlisted the help of two radar experts, with almost a century of
>technical experience between them to act as advisors.

This would be just tremendous if Andy Roberts hadn't been announcing for months now with unconcealed zeal how this trashes ufology's precious classic case. You, Fuller, Randles, keep saying you aren't finished, aren't ready to draw conclusions about the case, everyone should wait till you're done, etc. A few paragraphs below you indicate that your "conclusions" have not even "been formulated" yet, supposedly. If so then what Roberts has done is announce the conclusion in advance of the evidence -- jumping to conclusions.

It is also reasonable to ask if emotional personal attacks and outbursts is indicative of bias in the investigation. What people on this List can see is that your UFOIN group keeps announcing the impending destruction of the Lakenheath case without any facts to sufficiently back up such a conclusion, and it leads to the impression that you are doing everything in your power to support your pre-announced conclusion.

>Our approach as been simple - unless someone has some new
>information, rather than just tired old information and
>speculation to offer, then why should we pay any attention to
>it?

At this point, all we've been served up is "tired old information and speculation" from your side. Even the stuff about the "gunlockt" capability, or alleged lack thereof, of the Venom NF3's airborne radar, goes back to Philip Klass in his classic book UFOs Explained in 1974 or some 27 years ago. The selected Venom crews' denials of a "cat and mouse chase" now goes back 5 years to 1996 -- does adding one new duplicative

denial constitute really new info? In law this would be called "cumulative." So what do you have that is really "new"?

>>Indeed, if that's your view (and it certainly seems to be your >>view, though I would like to be wrong), one can only conclude, >>sadly, that you don't understand how the scientific process >>works.

>You talk about "how the scientific process works", but see my >comments above. No scientist involved in a research project >would halt in the middle of his writing up to post his >unfinished notes to an e-mail list before his conclusions have >been formulated.

They do this all the time -- share information with others working in the same field in the middle of a project well before completion. Nowadays entire scientific papers are published long in advance of official journal publication in draft form on the Los Alamos Labs' website (for a very popular example) for instant access as well as to establish priority. Email lists are constantly used to share scholarly findings well in advance of drawing conclusions.

>The correct process is to publish and then allow peer review, >which is what we intend to follow.

See above. Normally "peer review" is done before publication in order to help screen out errors.

>No amount of bullying and groundless insinuation will change our >intention to do just that, in our own time.

The actual source of "bullying" is a matter of record.

I would suggest that you and your associates maintain cordial relations even with those you've positioned as your opponents. The amount of unpleasantness and incivility on this List is really unnecessary. If I have contributed in any way to this please accept my apologies.

Regards,

Brad Sparks

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 20:47:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 07:59:27 -0500
Subject: Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

Welcome to the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network
(formerly CPR-Canada)

CCCRN NEWS
The E-News Service of the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

March 1, 2001

(Note: we did feel the earthquake here this morning, but fortunately no reports of major damage or injuries in the Vancouver area. Most of the damage was in the Seattle, WA area just south of us - 6.8 according to most recent news reports).

CCCRN News is the e-news service of the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, providing periodic e-mail updates with the latest news and reports on the crop circle phenomenon in Canada and around the world, as well as other information on CCCRN-related projects and events. CCCRN News is available free by subscription (see below).

WELCOME TO THE CANADIAN CROP CIRCLE RESEARCH NETWORK
(FORMERLY CIRCLES PHENOMENON RESEARCH CANADA)

As of March 1, 2001, Circles Phenomenon Research Canada, formerly an affiliate of CPR International, has become the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, a now-independent, non-profit organization which investigates the crop circle phenomenon in Canada.

Along with this change, there are several other news items at this time, which are outlined together in this update instead of separate e-mails:

- * New Web Site for CCCRN (formerly CPR-Canada)
- * CCCRN News (Formerly CPR-Canada News) Now with ListBot
- * CCCRN Web Site Joins the Crop Circle Web Ring
- * Internet Radio Interview: Eyada.com ('The Morning Show with Lionel')
- March 1, 2001
- * 'Fields of Dreams 2001' Lecture: Barclay Manor House, Vancouver, BC
- March 19, 2001
- * Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary Report 2000
- * Millennium Research: BOLs in England Crop Circles 2000

NEW WEB SITE FOR CCCRN

The former CPR-Canada web site is now at a new address (as of March 1, 2001):

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

Please update your links and bookmarks accordingly. The web site itself is also in the process of being revamped.

CCCRN NEWS (FORMERLY CPR-CANADA NEWS) NOW WITH LISTBOT

As part of these changes, the former CPR-Canada News is now CCCRN News. The mailing service has also been changed, from Yahoo! Groups to ListBot, after having some technical problems with Yahoo! Groups. ListBot offers more services and features, and is also better for managing multiple mailing lists. You can also now subscribe either with the e-mail address (see end of this update) or on the CCCRN web site, using the convenient subscription box (just type in your e-mail address and click accordingly to either subscribe or unsubscribe). That's it! With ListBot (with the current setup) the present mailing list can be transferred by invitation only, not manually. If you wish to remain on the mailing list, you will need to update your subscription as outlined above, a very simple procedure. This is your invitation to join the new CCCRN News mailing list. This process should also help to clean out the list, deleting old no longer working addresses, etc. (ListBot also automatically deletes old addresses which bounce). Subsequent mailings after this update will be sent to the new list (on ListBot), so please update your subscription so as not to miss any updates (there is also an archive of updates available on the ListBot web site, see below or on the web site for the link).

CCCRN WEB SITE JOINS THE CROP CIRCLE WEB RING

CCCRN has joined the Crop Circle Web Ring, another excellent resource from Paul Vigay in the UK:

<http://www.vigay.com/cgi-bin/webring?ring=cropcircle>

INTERNET RADIO INTERVIEW: EYADA.COM ('THE MORNING SHOW WITH LIONEL') - MARCH 1, 2001

Interview with CCCRN director Paul Anderson on the 2000 Canadian crop circles.

eYada.com (New York)

<http://www.eyada.com>

'The Morning Show with Lionel'

Thursday, March 1, 2001

Live, 11:00 am ET / 8:00 am PT

Either RealPlayer (<http://www.real.com>) or Windows Media Player (<http://www.microsoft.com/windows/mediaplayer/en/download/>) is required to listen to the audio stream as this an internet-only broadcast..

Also, Wireless Flash, another internet news service which covered the 1999 Canadian crop circles, recently did a follow-up earlier this month on the 2000 circles:

<http://www.flashnews.com>

'FIELDS OF DREAMS 2001' LECTURE: BARCLAY MANOR HOUSE, VANCOUVER, BC - MARCH 19, 2001

In this next 'Fields of Dreams' presentation, Paul Anderson will provide an overview of the 2000 crop circle season, from Canada and around the globe, with special reports on the Canadian crop circles of 2000 in another busy and most interesting year, and pre-season ideas on what may happen in 2001.

Barclay Manor House / West End Community Centre

1447 Barclay Street, Vancouver, BC

7:30 - 9:30 pm

Free admission (call 604.257.8333 to pre-register; please book ahead as seating is limited)

For further information:

604.731.8522 (CCCRN)

604.257.8349 (Barclay Manor House / West End Community Centre)

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada> (CCCRN))

CIRCLE PHENOMENA IN CANADA SUMMARY REPORT 2000

The 2000 summary report will be out in the next few days. A text copy will be sent to the mailing list, with a graphics version on the web site. The summary may be reprinted for print media, web sites, etc. provided credits are given where indicated (including various sources for photos, diagrams, etc.). A print version will also be available soon, with additional graphics, maps and newsclippings.

MILLENNIUM RESEARCH: BOLs IN ENGLAND CROP CIRCLES 2000

A link has been added to the MR report on the BOLs ('balls of light) phenomenon in England crop circles in 2000:

<http://cropcircleconnector.com/Millennium/PsychicPhotographyReport2000.html>

To subscribe to CCCRN News, send your e-mail address to:
cccrnnews-subscribe@listbot.com

To unsubscribe from CCCRN News, send your e-mail address to:
cccrnnews-unsubscribe@listbot.com

You can also subscribe or unsubscribe from the CCCRN web site:
<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada/emailupdates.html>

CCCRN News Archive:
<http://www.listbot.com/archive/cccrnnews>

For further information, submissions or inquiries, forward all correspondence to:

CANADIAN CROP CIRCLE RESEARCH NETWORK

Main Office
Suite 202 - 325 East 14th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5T 2M9
Canada
Tel / Fax (Office): 604.731.8522
Tel (Cell): 604.727.1454
E-Mail: psa@direct.ca
Web: <http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

Reporting Hotline:
604.731.8522

© Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, 2001

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Writing, Symbols and Emblems - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:39:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:07:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Writing, Symbols and Emblems - Velez

>From: Gary Anthony <garyant@mithrand.karoo.co.uk>
>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Writing, Symbols and Emblems
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:01:42 -0000

>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 13:55:06 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 14:44:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Writing, Symbols & Emblems? - Velez

>>>From: Gary Anthony <garyant@mithrand.karoo.co.uk>
>>>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Writing, Symbols & Emblems?
>>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 00:19:39 -0000

>>>Dear Colleagues

>>>I am currently continuing to collect samples of alleged alien
>>>writing, symbols and emblems with a view to compiling a
>>>comprehensive database on alien languages; and in this endeavour
>>>I have managed so far to acquire a number of different and
>>>interesting examples and references from around the world.

>>Hi Gary, Hi All, Gary why don't you contact Stuart Apelle at
>>Cornell University here in New York. Four years ago I submitted
>>some 'writing samples' to Budd who in turn forwarded them (and
>>several other samples) to Mr. Apelle for study and analysis. A
>>report was 'supposed' to have appeared in the Journal of UFO
>>Studies. As we all know, no such report ever materialized. I
>>believe JUFOS is no longer being published. In all fairness to
>>Stuart Apelle there were \$ problems with the publication of the
>>Journal etc.etc.etc. The bottom line is, Mr. Apelle is sitting
>>on a cache of these writing samples and speaking as one of the
>>contributors to the study I'm pissed that (for whatever reasons)
>>it was never conducted.

Hello Gary, hi All,

You wrote:

>Hi John, I contacted Stuart Apelle about a year ago and he told
>me:

>'Although a linguistic analysis may indeed be interesting, I see
>that as a second step. The first step, I believe is to determine
>if the symbols reported by abductees differ in any way from
>symbols that might be generated by a control population asked to
>imagine symbols observed under circumstances similar to those
>reported by abductees.'

>I agree 100% though was a bit confused why Prof' Apelle would
>take this up, as it is in the realm of both psycho-linguistics
>and linguistics to determine experimentation.

I agree with Apelle that a 'control' (base-line) needs to be
set-up. It would be important (and revealing) if
non-experiencers were to spontaneously produce something similar
to what the abductees have submitted. Maybe 'something' in the
way our brains are wired would cause someone to produce the kind

of shapes and structures seen in the "alien" samples when asked to 'imagine themselves in a similar situation.' But you are also correct in that procedural priorities should be set-up/determined by the linguistics people. It is after all -their- domain. Stuart is a psychologist not a linguist or philologist. (That I'm aware of.)

>This is indeed a
>valid and necessary part of what must seem like a long process,

It has nothing to do with feeding a need for immediate gratification Gary. It's already been -three/four- years since I was asked to participate. I submitted my own material via Budd and I know that Stuart was in possession of it shortly afterward. As far as I know, it's all just been collecting dust somewhere in Stuart's office. We have not seen or heard hide nor hair of it since.

>it would also be interesting to experiment with things like
>what people doodle or what 'linguistics experts' _imagine_ an
>alien language may represent and how this differs from other
>cross section samples.

See my first response.

>A senior linguistics colleague of mine has also
>corresponded with Stuart and exchanged ideas in this area. As
>far as I know, Stuart had set up some experimentation along
>these lines with 100 subjects, but he had not yet subjected his
>data to a statistical analysis. Indeed, if a paper were
>published along these lines it would be a necessary addition to
>the topic, as it would add to the essence of what we may
>consider prima facie examples of alleged alien semiotics to be?
>Stuart thinks linguistics analyses are valid as do Mack and
>others and yet very few people in the 'ufology' business are
>properly archiving or describing the samples in a 'scientific'
>manner.

An 'old saw' between myself and Budd for years. I went as far as 'hustling' a computer for him so that all his twenty plus years of notes and data could be catalogued and entered into a database. I left him and IF almost 2 years ago now so I have no idea if it was ever started or completed. It's a shame. It appears to be 'par for the course' with many who are in possession of critical or important materials/information. Budd's not a "scientist" (and has never claimed to be one) so I cannot in good conscience hold him responsible to maintain strict scientific methodology. It is, or will be necessary at some point in time to properly catalog all that material and possibly publish a series of white papers as it is processed/digested.

>There are two Universities willing to conduct all of this
>research and both may conduct certain preliminary
>experimentation into various related aspects of alleged alien
>communications and symbolism a scientific paper/s combining the
>expertise of the fields of psycho-linguistics, linguistics and
>cryptography would be propitious to this cause. I am working on
>this already John, with two experts, but we still require a lot
>more input and co-operation. Understandably, some people are
>uncomfortable or do not feel that their samples of alien
>semiotics require scrutiny or validation even though I have
>access to some of the best linguists in the world, who have also
>interjected relevant commentary and suggestions and there are
>certainly a lot of tools the 'scientific discipline' of
>linguistics can bring to bear on this topic.

If that is the case I want to help in any way that I can. If you can give me a written assurance that -none- of the material that I contribute will appear in print or any other media, it will allow me to keep my word to Budd, (not to 'publish' all the symbols and writing samples) and to make a contribution to your academic efforts. To lend myself in any way I can to any -serious- studies or investigations is why I'm here.

>Tried Budd Hopkin's with a couple of brief mail requests, trying
>to initiate a correspondence, don't know if he has been busy or
>whether I may have dissuaded him with my 'British-ness' (not
>intended, ironically I think I was one of the first Brits to
>have a copy of 'Intruders' signed when colleagues of mine
>organised the first big UK conferences).

You can thank Peter Brookesmith for that! <LMAO!>

When Peter was in town (NY) a couple of years ago researching his book, "Alien Abductions" he managed to rub Budd's fur the wrong way 'somehow' so maybe Budd has developed an aversion to British accents these days. <LOL>And yes, I can vouch for the fact that Budd is a very busy man. The demands on he and his time are enormous. Try again. You may wish to contact Greg Sandow (who always has Budd's ear) and possibly arrange for him to speak to Budd on your behalf. It's just another approach to try to get his attention.

>The only big cheese
>'state-side' who has contacted me, has been David Jacob's with a
>succinct, poignant and surprising mail. I have however, had
>lot's of help and assistance with abductees/experiencers and
>researchers in America -- particularly people like Leo Sprinkle,
>Dana Redfield, Katharina Wilson, Debbie Kauble et al... Who
>initially gave me a great start and some brilliant suggestions.

I don't know Dana but Kat and Debbie are long time friends of mine and both wonderful people for you to have as resources. David is, and always has been, more 'accessible' than Budd. I'll get to meet Leo Sprinkle for the first time in two Saturdays (fortnight away) on 'Strange Days... Indeed' (EBK's radio/Web program.) I hope that UpDates Listers will tune in. I look forward to meeting and talking with him. Whether by accident or design, in Kat and Debbie you've rounded up some good people. Let me know if I can be of any service. Debbie, David, Budd, and Katarina will vouch for me.

>Since then, quite a few people that Budd Hopkin's has worked
>with have contacted me and sent samples. I have also been
>really surprised by the amount of reference there is out there
>on this topic, I have unearthed articles I never thought
>existed, some from way back.

>and since my 'missus' has just had our
>twin boys my time is even more limited.

Many congrats Gary! Cigars all around. Cubans I hope! ;)

>Publishing is secondary and having read many
>ufological tomes I am inclined to leave well alone and find some
>useful ways of making the information widely and freely
>available.

God Bless the Internet. A webpage or website is the way to go Gary. I can be of assistance there to. It's what I do for a living. :) Whenever you reach that stage let me know.

>There's a niggling curiosity to see where this focus
>leads?

No greater than my own I can assure you.

>>Mucho viento, poco trabajo! (Lot's of wind, little work.) ;)

>Point well taken! I was very frustrated when I started out with
>this work and have been waiting for at least 16 years to see
>someone do it or see what it may amount to?

Been six for me. The needle on my frustration meter broke about five years ago. That 'nerve' is no longer capable of transmitting 'pain' signals to my brain. At some point I just became numb to it all and I've decided to plod on regardless. I figure if I stick around long enough my "Prince" will come.
<LOL>

>>Go to my website Gary. Right on the AIC banner you'll find three
>>examples of what you're looking for. I have incorporated two
>>"writing" samples (individual letters/words/ whatever) and one
>>of the "symbols" that are associated with "them." You are
>>welcome to those for your collection. I cannot provide you more
>>because I promised Budd I would not make it all a matter of
>>'public record.' Those writing samples are one of the few tools
>>he has to help identify legit/ possible abduction cases. They
>>are still somewhat useful because they have not been splattered
>>all over the media like the images of Greys have for instance.
>>-Everybody- knows what a 'Grey' looks like, -few- have ever seen

>>the writing samples.

>Thanks for this John. I will indeed take a look at AIC Banner
>and if I may, accurately reproduce same?

As I said earlier Gary; as long as it's strictly archival and not for publication, you are most welcome to add them to your database. I will provide you with a couple more privately as long as you are willing to comply with my proviso that none of it (whatever I may contribute) finds its way into print. I gave Budd my word that it wouldn't. (with the exception of the couple I have used on the website which he knows I've used before. Keeping my word means everything to me.

>There is a matter that
>I may ask you privately about -- not as a disclosure, but which
>I think you may or may not be able to confirm anyway, by way of
>covering ground.

You have my e-mail address Gary. I am at your disposal.

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:46:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:09:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Velez

>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 13:16:10 -0000

>Hello to All,

>Since I began my research in these matters I have tried to
>collect information on Native American traditions regarding
>UFOs. This seems like an easy task at first sight, as a search
>for material on the internet produces amazing numbers of
>documents and links. However, a percentage of what is available
>is evidently utter nonsense invented to fool unwary UFO
>believers.

<snip>

>Lorraine
>Mafi-Williams, a spokeswoman for the Bundjalung tribe, told
>Chalker that:

>"We believe in UFO, but here... we have the aboriginal
>concept and belief, and we know about abductions and why."

>These words remind me of Vladimir Azhazha's surprising
>statement in Vallee's UFO Chronicles of the Soviet Union
>(1992):

>"UFO abductions have become especially common during 1989; so
>common that we believe we have now identified the mechanism of
>these events."

>In neither case do I come away any wiser about the possible
>howness or whyness of the abduction phenomenon. Perhaps Mr.
>Chalker could provide a synopsis of the Bundjalung view of
>abductions as it stands. It could make very interesting reading.

Hi Chris, hi All,

I've known the "how" for years, I'm just dying to know "why!" I
hope you get Bill Chauker's attention. I'm more curious than
you are. ;)

Regards,

John Velez, A 'Vic'

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception

From: John W. Auchettl <Prauf@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 05:10:14 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:12:17 -0500
Subject: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception

TITLE: F-86D UFO Interception
SOURCE: Duncan Curtis
DATA: May 20th, 1957
Kent - England
The 406th Fighter Interceptor Wing (FIW)
AIRCRAFT: USAF North American F-86D Sabres
CREWS: Dave Roberson - Flight Leader 406th FIW
Milt Torres's - 406th FIW

CASE REPORT:

"It was a typical English night in Kent. The 406th FIW had committed to Met [Metropolitan] Sector (RAF) to have F-86Ds stand alert as an operational requirement. The date was May 20, 1957, and our squadrons were considered combat qualified when they committed us to the operational requirement. My recollection seems to indicate that this function was rotated about England between the various RAF and USAF units. This particular night the 514th Fighter Interceptor Squadron [FIS] had the alert duty. Two F-86Ds were on 5-minute alert at the end of the runway at RAF Station Manston awaiting the signal to scramble. The hour was late as memory serves me, and the weather was IFR. Looking back at my log book, a total of 30 minutes of night weather was logged on a 1-hour and 15 minute flight. The details such as exactly what hour the scramble occurred or what we were doing just prior to scramble totally escapes me, however, the auxiliary power units (APU) were 'on', and the power was transmitted to the aircraft. We were ready for an immediate scramble and eager for flight time."

"I can remember the call to scramble quite clearly, however, I cannot remember specifics such as the actual vector to turn after take off. We were airborne well within the 5 minutes allotted to us, and basically scrambled to about Flight Level 310. Our vector took us out over the North Sea just east of East Anglia. Normally, Dave Roberson, the other member of the set of two fighters would be lead ship. I can only suggest that I was leading due to an in-place turn of some sort. I remember in quite specific terms talking as lead to the GCI [Ground Controlled Intercept] site. I was advised of the situation quite clearly. The initial briefing indicated that the ground was observing for a considerable time, a blip that was orbiting the East Anglia area. There was very little movement and from my conversation with the GCI all the normal procedures of checking with all the controlling agencies revealed that this was an unidentified flying object with very unusual flight patterns. In the initial briefing, it was suggested to us that the 'bogey' actually was motionless for long intervals."

"The instructions came to go 'gate' [select afterburner] to expedite the intercept, and to proceed to an Initial Point at about 32,000 feet. By this time, my radar was on, and I was looking prematurely for the bogey. The instructions came to report any visual observations, to which I replied "I'm in the soup and it's impossible to see anything!" The weather was

probably high alto stratus, but between being over the North Sea and in the weather, no frame of reference was available, i.e no stars, no lights, no silhouettes - in short nothing. GCI continued the vectoring and the dialogue describing the strange antics of the UFO."

"The exact turns and maneuvers they gave me were all predicated to reach some theoretical point for a lead collision course type rocket release. I can remember reaching the level-off and requesting to come out of afterburner only to be told to stay in afterburner. It wasn't very much later that I noticed my indicated Mach number was about .92. This is about as fast as the F-86D could go straight and level."

"Then the order came to fire a full salvo of rockets at the UFO. I was only a Lieutenant and very much aware of the gravity of the situation. To be quite candid, I almost shit my pants! AT any rate, I had my hands full trying to fly, search for bogeys and now selecting a hot load on the switches. I asked for authentication of the order to fire, and I received it. This further complicated my difficulty as the matrix of letters and numbers to find the correct authenticatio was on a piece of printed paper about 5 by 8 inches, with the print not much bigger than normal type. It was totally black, and the lights were down for night flying. I used my flashlight, still trying to fly and watch my radar. To put it quite candidly I felt very much like a one-legged man in an ass-kicking contest."

"The authentication was valid, and I selected 24 rockets to salvo. I wasn't paying too much attention to Dave, but I clearly remember him giving a 'Roger' to all the transmissions. I can only suppose he was as busy as I was. The final turn was given, and the instructions were given to look 30 degrees to port for my bogey. I did not have a hard time at all. There it was exactly where I was told it would be, at 30 degrees and at 15 miles. The blip was burning a hole in the radar with its incredible intensity. It was similar to a blip I had received from B-52s, and seemed to be a magnet of light. These things I remember clearly. I ran the range gate marker over the blip, and the jizzle band faded as the marker superimposed over the blip. I had a lock on that had the proportions of a flying aircraft carrier. By that, I mean the return on the radar was so strong that it could not be overlooked by the fire control system on the F-86D. I use in comparison other fighters and airliners. The airliner is easy to get a lock on while the fighter, not being a good return, is very difficult, and, on that type of aircraft, a lock-on was only possible under 10 miles. The larger the airplane, the easier the lock on. This blip almost locked itself. I cannot explainto the lay person exactly what I mean, save to say that it was the best target I could ever remember locking on to. I had locked on in just a few seconds, and I locked on exactly 15 miles [range], which was the maximum for a lock on. I called to the GCI. 'Judy', which signified that I would take all further steering information from my radar computer [rather than the GCI site]".

READ THE FULL CASE STORY

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Launchpad/8608/406th.html>

FIGHTER INTERCEPTOR AT BENTWATERS:

An F-86A of 91st FIS, pictured in the UK. 91st FIS was based at RAF Bentwaters from September 1951. This F-86A was written off in a flying accident on 4th December 1952.

IMAGE 4

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Launchpad/8608/sgn.html>

Interesting case, but its veracity needs to be confirmed.

John W. Auchettl
Director PRA Research

THANKS TO:

- [1]. World's oldest continuously
operating Military airbase formed in 1913.
RAAF - Central Flying School,
Point Cook, Victoria, Australia

<http://www.raafmuseum.com.au/>

- [2]. Duncan Curtis
DunxC@aol.com
Sabre Site

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Launchpad/8608/index.html>

PRA WEB:

<http://members.aol.com/praufo/PRA1/Pra1.htm>

Phenomena Research Australia [PRA]
P.O. Box 523, Mulgrave, Victoria, Australia, 3170
Australian & Asia UFO
1961-2001 - 40 YEARS OF RESEARCH SERVICE

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:33:47 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:18:25 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles

>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:02:18 -0000

>>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 00:20:35 -0600

>Of course, there have been reports of "samples" of whatever is
>being observed, as well as landing traces, etc. Somehow all said
>cases seem to get messed up or covered up or whatever. I am
>reminded of the metal particles supposedly found in the Zamora
>case. Or the chemical changes in soil in the DELphos Kansas
>ring, or reports of "angel hair," Trans-en-Provence changes in
>chlorophyll (suggesting some weird radiation), and, of course,
>optical (photos) and radar data.

Hi,

I think the problem is that physical evidence cases tend not to prove (or even particularly to support) the ETH.

This may be an inherent problem. After all the universe is made up of finite elements and physical properties are probably the same on the mythical planet Zog as they are on earth. The current argument over Martian microbes shows the difficulty as they are very earth like, creating the inevitable dispute as to whether they are post fall contamination. So how would we even recognise ET evidence?

UFO physical evidence rarely even hints at an unearthly origin and that's the big problem. The recent Australian hair strand DNA case is an illustration where an impressive looking piece of data infers a bizarre but more or less terrestrial origin for the sample rather than anything clearly beyond earth.

We once had a case in the UK where a witness claimed an alien zapped his flashlight with a beam. It melted. The lamp was tested and the outcome was that something creating effects akin to a blowtorch had burnt it. But who can answer whether that means an earthly blowtorch did it (as part of a hoax) or whether ETs ray guns follow similar physical principles causing blowtorch like consequences?

You have to ask which is the more credible option in context of the case, but you can never rule out the less credible possibility.

>There hasn't been "absolute proof" because what has been
>available as been "argued away" or, perhaps, grabbed by "official
>agencies."

I doubt that very much. There's no UK agency geared up to spirit away physical evidence and in a country far more densely populated than the US no UFO event is going to happen a long way from people. There's a fair chance even a rapid response team could never get to most UFO incidents first - and at least not every time as there will be far too much probability of witnesses close by.

I just don't find it persuasive that every piece of clearly non terrestrial evidence happens to get 'abducted' by the powers that be. No agency is that efficient.

>Ponder this: is there any case which anyone here dares to
>claim is unexplainable, period. If so, then we can argue over
>whether or not it represents OI/NHI.

I've been asked this often and all my experience says that to suggest any single case as definitive is courting disaster. I have seen way too many promising cases erode with time to do that. There are strong cases and less strong cases but not one ever that I think we could reasonably argue was without question inexplicable.

It comes down to weight of numbers - that if there are enough strong cases with a reasonable likelihood of staying unresolved we can have high confidence that there are unexplained phenomena at work. But its a value judgement - not a certainty. And also it is not my experience that these cases tend not to be definitively ET even so. Yes there are good cases implying physical reality, unusual energy fields, perhaps even suggestive of something new to science at work. But what cases positively cry out - this must be alien in origin? I don't see any of these.

The closest I have ever come is with the Ilkley alien affair in 1989 - where an abductee filmed the alien that he says spacenapped him during a period of missing time. As you know - especially Bruce as he tried to do enhancement work on the photo - what we have here is utterly frustrating. But probative - no way.

Firstly, this is a case that surely is either a hoax or definitive, because this is no misperception or fugue state or hallucination. Either the witness photographed a four feet six tall entity during an abduction or he in some way made it up. Its not even feasible that 'he' was hoaxed. Its as close to an either/or as I think you can get, because there just don't seem alternatives to these two options.

My gut feeling has always been that he had to have made this up. The case just doesn't sit right and there are nagging problems with it. But I know that might be at least partly by inherent caution.

Peter Hough and myself tried hard to figure out what was the motive for a hoax (we long supposed the most probable was some kind of experiment upon Ufologists to gauge reaction) and (Peter especially) spent a lot of time trying to defrock this case. All to no avail.

The witness stands by his story 12 years on. He has never made capital or appeared in public debating it as he shuns publicity (but has met several investigators and always been cooperative with us in doing so). The photo has been analysed numerous times (eg by Kodak) and its a real photo of 'something; four foot six tall up a hillside. But there's no way to say that this something is an alien (rather than a maniken or a child in a suit). The witness has been interviewed by a clinical psychologist, who is convinced. But that doesn't mean he isn't a good liar. What little physical evidence there is (a reversed polarity compass) has been tested by physicists and whilst strange it is possible to create this for yourself if you know how. The witness professes an MIB encounter afterwards, but all the checks we have made to verify it really happening have failed. His wife backs him up but its the two of them against no hard evidence.

So where do we stand? A case that we cannot prove was a hoax, where if it was a hoax the motivation was more complex than a lust to make money or get publicity (although as we know UFO

hoaxes can indeed have complex motives and get out of hand rapidly backing the witness into a corner after they start as an innocent jest) (see 'The UFOs that Never Were' - for instance).

In the end you have a story that acts like a mandala to meditate over. Which way you interpret it is more likely to depend on your beliefs. If you think there are no aliens you will soon see difficulties (there are some internal inconsistencies - although nothing obviously fatal to possible reality so far as I can see). You will then assume it is a hoax that just hasn't been exposed yet and whose motivation is non standard.

But if instead you believe in aliens you will likely regard this as a powerful case because the data more or less holds together and no skeptic has ever cracked it (or indeed - ironically but for Peter and myself as first hand investigators into it - has ever really tried).

But despite a wealth of data - probably more than you are ever going to get for a UFO case - this is still only describable as being indeterminate. It isn't anything like proof of the ETH and by all expectations it should be.

Based on that I wonder what case ever could become so.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 9

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 12:02:02 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:24:10 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 9

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan@aol.com>
=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 6, Number 9
March 1, 2001
Editor: Joseph Trainor

<http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

EL DIABLITO STRIKES AGAIN IN PITRUFQUEN, ARGENTINA

"As occurs in fairy tales and myths, a strange being has been appearing repeatedly at night in the town of Pitrufquen, Argentina.

"The creature involved could be a diablito (Spanish for Imp--J.T.) which according to the testimony of some local children has manifested itself in a patch of a vacant lot located in the city's Calle Manuel Rodriguez (street). The children attested that the mysterious entity, which only appears at night, 'is small, more like no taller than 60 centimeters (20 inches), and he's been appearing since September (2000) in the same spot.'

Pitrufquen is located about 400 kilometers (250 miles) west of Buenos Aires, the national capital."

"They believe that the entity lives in a sort of cave not far from the backyard of the children's home."

"'We would go and see him every night, but first we thought it was a guagua (a newborn baby--S.C.) living in a house close to where we live.. Then we realized that the baby was always crying, and we thought that this is how we knew El Diablito was approaching,' explained the youngsters."

(Editor's Comment: The "crying baby" sound is associated with many types of paranormal phenomena, everything from poltergeists to phantom panthers. It may be like a duck call or a moose call, a device which the phenomenon uses to lure humans closer.)

"'Sometimes we would shine a flashlight on him at night. The light would shock him and make him crouch. That's when we could see things on the side of his head--like (unusual) ears. He'd squeal and then would go away, and that's when we started throwing stones at him. He would follow us, but we always managed to get away,' they stressed."

"The children explained that after this incident they never again went near the place. 'El Diablito scared us because he could do anything. Besides, he's real strong because he lifted a car that was near the cave, and he beat up the dogs,' they said."

"The youngsters added that, 'El Diablito got into the hospital

and to pester the people there. That's why lots of people came (to the lot) to see him--firefighters and Carabineros (Argentinian state police--J.T.) and detectives showed up to keep an eye on him and to find out what was going on.'"

(Editor's Comment: El Diablito at the hospital: "Don't think of me as an Imp. Think of me as your vertically-challenged, HMO-designated primary care physician.")

"Selmira Munoz, the children's aunt, corroborated their version of the events. 'Whenever my nephew visited that place, they all came across a little crouching man wearing a sort of blanket over his back. The other neighbors can also say the same, since many of them have seen it. Fortunately, the entity hasn't come all the way to our house, and that's why the children have no trouble sleeping. But if they bother it, it reacts violently,' she stated."

"Selmira Mynoz also noted that there were suggestions that that the alleged Imp had been captured. 'The hospital officials said that it had been caught and sent to Temuco to perform experiments on it.'"

"Hernan San Martin, another witness to the mysterious entity's presence, recalled that 'one day I was drinking tea with my wife. I heard the children throwing stones at something. We went out for a look, and my wife told me she saw a little man walking around. I went outside to check what was going on and found a sort of cave in which it seemed to hide. That's when my wife told me it was a little man with wizened features , hairy pig-like ears and shining eyes.'"

"San Martin recalled that after the incident he wasn't all that convinced by the children's story. 'However, my wife and I thought we could feel it approaching the house in the dark. I made an effort to catch a glimpse of him, but I couldn't because he's very astute.'

"As time went by, he noticed that a few of his hens and chickens were slowly dying.. 'The likeliest explanation is that the critter killed them. What I find strangest of all is that it only drank the blood. All of these events led us to find out more about it. People told us that it was an imp raised in the countryside and will never live in the city. They further told us that it obeys a master and is loyal to him.'"

(Editor's Comment: Note the similarities between this Imp and the reports of Chupacabras coming out of Chile, Nicaragua and Mexico.)

"Hernan San Martin finally tried in spite of its aggressive tendencies, has not hurt the children un so far. 'It appears to have only wanted to play with them. , but it behaves violently towards animal since it hurts our cats and dogs don't want to go near it because it frightens them.'" (See the newspaper Diario Austral de Temuco for February for February 18, 2001, "Local residents terrified of 'Imp.'" Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales, autor de los libros, Chupacabras and Other Mysteries y Forbidden Mexico y tambien Gloria Coluchi para ese articulo de diario.)

ANTOFAGASTA SAUCER "JUST A BALLOON," EDITOR SAYS

The "giant silver saucer" seen by two jetliners and hundreds of people in the cities of Calama and Antofagasta in northern Chile on Friday morning, February 16, 2001, was just a French research balloon, according to a noted South American ufologist.

Luis Eduardo Pacheco, editor of Informe Alfa (Spanish for Alpha Report --J.T.), an e-magazine published in Argentina, said the UFO sighting in Chile "was generated by the flyby of a special kind of stratospheric balloon called the Montgolfier InfraRed (MIR)."

"This type of balloon has an aluminized Mylar envelope which reflects sunlight like a mirror, making it possible for the balloon to be seen up to a distance of 100 kilometers (60 miles)," Pacheco explained, "The UFO sighted by the two airliners and many people of Antofagasta and Calama on February 16 was the second MIR balloon, launched from the city of Bauru

in the state of Sao Paulo in Brazil on February 15, 2001, which followed an east-to-west route more or less in a straight line along" Latitude 20 degrees South.

"An earlier balloon was launched on February 13 and will be reaching Africa in a few days," he added.

"The last balloon was launched on February 21, 2001 and is following the same route across South America and out over the Pacific Ocean. We have written to several researchers in Australia and Africa, warning them against false UFO reports resulting from the sighting if the MIR balloon." (Muchas gracias a Luis Eduardo Pacheco para esa informacion.)

(Editor's Note: The original Antofagasta story can be found in UFO Roundup, Volume 6, Number 8 for February 22, 2001, "Two jetliners spot giant silver saucer in Chile," page 1.)

MYSTERY BOOM AND TREMOR RATTLE NORTH YORKSHIRE

"A mystery tremor shook Scarborough and surrounding towns and villages " on Wednesday, February 21, 2001 ."

"The tremor hit at 11:30 a.m. and was felt as far north as Whitby and as far south as Filey."

"But as the Evening News went to press, there was no explanation what they were."

"Theories include a possible sonic boom or an earth tremor. John Porter, 52, who lives at Knipe Point, said the glass in his double-glazing (window) and roof were left shaking for two or three seconds."

"He said, 'It could have been an earth tremor. We have had them in England occasionally. We heard a low-pitched rumbling and the windows and roof started shaking.'"

"'I did not see or hear anything overhead. There was no sign of a plane or anything out to sea.'"

"Scarborough Council's group engineer Doug Bedford said, 'We felt it as well but we don't know what it is. The windows in the office shook.'"

"Mr. Bedford did not think it was an earth tremor, more something in the air."

"'I think it could have been an air pressure wave, like a building falling down,' he said."

"Scarborough Police Inspector Nigel Slater said that the boom was also felt at the police station but he had 'no idea what it could be.'"

"Michael Hill of Eastway, Eastfield, N. Yorks. also heard and felt the tremor. He said, 'I couldn't believe it. The whole house shook. I thought we were having an earthquake.'"

"Mike Green, watch manager for Humber Coastguards, based at Bridlington, said, 'It seems to me that it would be a sonic boom because of the area where it had been heard, possibly someone low-flying over the North York Moors.'"

"Peter Marks, Chairman of Eastfield Tenants and Residents Association, said, 'I heard a dull rumble, what sounded like an explosion and seconds later the windows began to wobble. It seemed quite a way away.'" (See the Scarborough Evening News for February 22, 2001. Many thanks to Gerry Lovell for forwarding this newspaper article.)

(Editor's Note: Scarborough was the site of a UFO incident a couple of weeks ago. For details, see UFO Roundup, Volume 6, Number 6 for February 8, 2001, "Three UFOs fly over Scarborough, Yorkshire," page 3.)

FIVE YELLOW UFOs FLY OVER GRIMSBY, LINCS.

On Monday, February 19, 2001, at about 9 p.m., James Ruffles

was outdoors in Grimsby, Lincolnshire, UK when he spotted an unusual light in the north.

"A bright yellow object was approaching from the north," he reported, "There were five yellow bright lights heading into the woods. They were flying very fast. They whipped across the sky. When they got near the woods, they slowed down considerably and descended into the trees, and I lost sight of them."

"I phoned the RAF and asked if they had been doing anything in the area and they said no."

James described the UFOs as "yellow, oval in shape, and moving very, very fast." (Email Form Report)

LARGE COLOR-CHANGING UFO SEEN IN VILLAVERLA, ITALY

On Thursday, February 15, 2001, a man in Villaverla, Viterbo province, Italy "noticed in the sky around 10 p.m. a very large object like a star continually changing colors from azure blue to yellowish red. The object made circular movements through the sky as if it were spinning out of control and on the verge of disaster," the witness said. But as it got closer to the ground, the object levelled off and began flying in a zigzag motion, leaving a reddish blue luminous trail behind it."

This case is being investigated by Italian ufologist Carlo Trimboli. (Grazie a Alfredo Lissoni di Centro Ufologico Nazionale d'Italia per questo rapporto.)

METALLIC SPHERE UFO SIGHTED IN BRAZIL

On Tuesday, January 23, 2001, a "mysterious object was seen" crossing the sky over the town of Baixada Fluminense in Brazil.

"The large spherical metallic object performed aerial maneuvers over the town and was seen by hundreds of witnesses. The object then hovered directly over one house. The frightened residents telephoned the Policia Militar. The object then departed at high speed."

"Witnesses who did not see the object heard an explosio in the sky that was very loud."

The Policia Militar reportedly sent a bomb-disposal team to Baixada Fluminense along with a contingent of troops to investigate the incident. (Muito obrigado a Visitantes Cosmicas do Brasil por eso caso.)

MYSTERY LIGHT CHASES A CAR ON A HIGHWAY IN QUEENSLAND

On Saturday, February 17, 2001, at 11 p.m., Glen B. was driving his car on the Newell Highway just north of Moree, a town about 150 kilometers (90 miles) south-southwest of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia when he noticed a strange glow in his rear-view mirror.

"Travelling north on the Newell Highway" near More "a single bright light approached me from behind until it appeared to be about three metres (10 feet) back and to the right and the rear of my car. The light was approximately 1.5 metres (5 feet) off the ground."

"The light appeared bright when far back initially but, once closer, its apparent intensity reduced. It did not illuminate the inside of the car nor did it project a beam as a headlight would be expected to do."

"My initial thought was a motorcycle. But the light showed none of the jitters that a motorcycle light displays from undulations in the road. The light appeared about 30 to 40 centimetres (12 to 16 inches) in diameter and displayed a pink tinge to the side."

"During the course of about 90 minutes," Glen added, "the light disappeared, reappeared but at no stage overtook or approached ahead of my car. The light did, however, on a number of occasions, disappear and reappear perhaps 100 to 200 metres (330

to 550 feet) off to the side of the road but keeping perfect pace with the car. Although at night I know it is bush, fields, etc. off to the side of the highway, here in outback Australia, the light continued to pace the car."

"Only once did the light appear to stop and this was when it was perhaps 100 metres off to the right and pacing the car in a field. The light suddenly stopped and in a flat place. I could see that immediately in front of the light was a small tree/bush. However, I kept driving and the light disappeared behind, stationary behind the tree."

"The light appeared and disappeared intermittently for about 150 kilometers (90 miles) . The light appeared to interact with another vehicle only once. The light was behind my car when a truck (lorry in UK--J.T.) approached a number of kilometers behind, slowly closing to overtake my car. Within a few seconds, the light disappeared. But when the truck was within 100 metres" of his car, "the light reappeared behind and to the right of the truck. The light alternately appeared to the left and right of the truck, but each time it seemed to be passing behind the truck when it did this. Never in front. The truck suddenly braked and I pulled away" and "the light disappeared."

"When the light was pressing me a number of times just behind, I took my foot off the accelerator. No matter how quick a person's reflexes are, at 120 kilometers per hour (72 miles per hour) it will take time to react. and for the light to surge ahead. At no time did this happen. The light maintained perfect distance with respect to my car. The light paced the car exactly and smoothly. There was no sound emitted by the light." (Email Form Report)

(Editor's Comment: Glen's encounter sounds less like a UFO and more like an encounter with Australia's elusive Min-Min Light.)

WEST VIRGINIA IS FOR...BLACK HELICOPTERS!?

Luminous UFOs hovering over isolated natural gas week, mysterious noises underground, black helicopters flying up and down mountain valleys--these are just some of the strange doings these days in the "coal counties" of southern West Virginia.

You start in Beckley (population 18,000), a city 60 miles (100 kilometers) south of Charleston, the state capital. Then you head due south on U.S. Route 18 to Princeton (population 2,000). Then you head northeast along the old Seneca Trail to Lewisburg (population 3,600) and White Sulphur Springs (population 2,700). Then you head due west straight back to Beckley.

And there you have it--the Hinton Triangle.

According to William Ross, author of Armageddon or New Age, the Hinton Triangle has been the site of some strange occurrences since 1996.

Take Whitesville, W.V., for example. Ross wrote, "Many miner communities have only the retired miners. The mines are shut down. The local (Whitesville) state police barracks were only trailers when thousands of (coal) miners used to live here. Now that they've left for North Carolina for jobs, we now have Auschwitzes (secret prison camps--J.T.) all over the place. For example, up in Whitesville, the once-trailer is now a 10-acre school transferred to the state police What do you need a mini-prison for when over 90 percent of the population has left?"

In the 1970s, Ross noted, "The miners used to just close and leave. Now 20-foot (6-meter) chainlink fences surround the roads to keep you off the whole mountain. This is going on all over the place in all of the southern coal counties of West Virginia."

Trucks go in and out, but they sure aren't hauling coal."

"Behind me is the old (Union) Carbide mine (that) closed 25 years ago. People in the community here have been hearing machinery noises 'down under' and explosions that shook the

earth. They sure aren't mining coal. All of the (dairy) farms from Over Top in about a 73-mile area are being bought up by the (USA) federal government."

Within the Hinton Triangle, he added, "At certain locations, small-engine aircraft do drops,, black helicopters land, etc. They have sensors in the trees, and four-wheelers (all-terrain vehicles--J.T.) chase after you."

Black helicopters have been sighted frequently in Shady Springs, W.V., located 8 miles (11 kilometers) south of Beckley

In Princeton, the seat of Mercer County, black helicopters have been seen flying at night, and "when you walk in the (nearby) woods, you come across open clearings used as (black helicopter) landing zones (KXs)."

Another frequent black helicopter haunt is the Green Brier Valley.

(Editor's Note: The valley is best known as the birthplace of Traveller, the horse that belonged to Confederate general Robert E. Lee.)

"UFO-type aircraft are seen refueling at natural gas wells in the woods," Ross wrote, "And MJTF (Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force--J.T.) trains in part of the forest" northeast of Princeton.

The most curious feature of the Hinton Triangle is the sighting of "disappearing trucks," he added, "Trucks are seen at night, driving around a hill, and...ZAP! No more truck. The 75-mile area is surrounded by radio towers from Ripley to Ravenswood to Sissonville to Arbuckle."

Ross noted a strange incident that took place at the Winfield Locks and Dam, just down the mountain from Arbuckle on the Kanawha River. Here some civilians were intrigued by the huge warehouses on the property. Finding an open window, they went inside and were stunned to find dozens of large military armored vehicles in storage. These included Russian-built T-80 and T-72 tanks, BMP-40 armored personnel carriers and ZIL-131 and Kamaz 5320 heavy-duty military trucks. All of the vehicles were painted white and had the black letters UN on their turrets or sidewalls.

"The huge white warehouses were housing Russian and East German tanks. Army tanks--big ones! They went in five years ago. They never had this kind of thing in the state even during the Cold War." According to Ross, "There is an underground base in Shady Springs with tunnels reaching into Pipestem State Park."

The strangest report comes from Hinton, W.V. itself. Here, Ross claimed, "There is an old M.I.B. (Men in Black--J.T.) underground base which has a bunch of old black cars--in mint condition." Classic cars in storage there include a 1948 Packard, a 1953 DeSoto, a 1956 Thunderbird and vintage Cadillacs dating from 1950 through 1962.

(Editor's Comment: The General Services Administration (GSA) customarily auctions off old federal government cars every year. Why are these old and potentially very valuable automobiles being kept in underground storage? This facility sounds like a car collector's dream.) In the west end of the state, Ross reported another unusual incident in Parkersburg, W.V. (population 7,400.) Here some people saw "white plastic-coated, snap-together aluminized 'tiger cages' " laid flat and loaded onto wooden pallets on the Ohio River docks.

(Editor's Note: Tiger cages made of wire and bamboo were used to confine American P.O.W.s in Vietnam during the war. Also, Parkersburg played a role in Illuminati history. Just north of the community, in the middle of the Ohio River, is Blennerhasset Island. Today there are only ruins there, but it was once a fortress-mansion built by the notorious Illuminati diabolist Harman Blennerhasset. From 1794 until 1806, the mansion was the headquarters of the Illuminati in the USA. For more on the Conspiracy of 1806, see any biography of Thomas Jefferson or Aaron Burr.)

Another MIB underground depot is located in Red Sulphur

Springs, W.V., he added, not far from the extensive Laurel Creek Cave system. (Many thanks to Rev. Billy Dee for forwarding the pamphlet. Thanks also to West Virginia--A Guide to the Mountain State, Conservation Commission of West Virginia, 1941, pages 380 to 405.)

From the UFO Files...

1995: INVADED BY A BLACK HELICOPTER

"During April of 1995, during an official visit in the U.S. by the Japanese emperor," Akihito, "a clerk observed a black helicopter landing across the street from the Corner Store in Ruckersville, Green County, Virginia. The chopper deployed several black-uniformed armed troops who fanned out running. and formed a defensive perimeter. They were in a defensive position for approximately 30 minutes., then upon a whistled command (a non-U.S. tactical signaling approach, suggesting that these may have been foreign troops--J.K.) they remounted the chopper and egressed the area. Employment and deployment happened very fast, and the (store) clerk was startled and very scared." (See Black Helicopters II: The Endgame Strategy by Jim Keith, IllumiNet Press, Lilburn, Georgia, 1997, page 20.)

Well, that's it for this week. Join us next time as we review more UFO and paranormal news from around the planet Earth, brought to you by "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you next week!

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2001 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their websites or in newsgroups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan@aol.com> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

http://ufoinfo.com/forms/form_sighting.htm

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>

UFOINFO: <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives of the UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences,
UFO + PSI Magazine also available, plus archives of
Filer's Files and Oz Files.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:00 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:28:53 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
>Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

Diane, Bryan, List:

Compliments on an informative collection on info. Too often what we see is only fragmentary and pretty useless to make a judgement

>On Friday evening of 23 February 2001, at 10.45 pm at Collaroy
>NSW - a large, reddish object with a glowing red hemispherical
>base and a "dark, unlit, castle-like upper section" passed from
>west to east, then out to sea before disappearing several
>kilometers offshore

Could you provide more information about the "hemispherical" object? What was the orientation of the hemisphere, in other words, was the rounded part of the hemisphere facing down or up? I wonder if this might have been a parachute?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:01 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:30:38 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Young

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:07:44 -0800

>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 12:47:34 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>No, No, No! The only metallurgist to view the debris stated
>flatly that there was not a single method known to metallurgy
>that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!

Ed,

Can you provide the name of the metallurgist and info about
where the List could view his written report as to how he
determined, through metallurgy that is, that something he
saw in a movie could not have been produced by any known
process.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:46:06 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs - Young

>From: Glennys Mackay <glenmack@pacific.net.au>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 10:25:35 +1000

>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Tribal Beliefs and UFOs
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 13:16:10 -0000

<snip>

>I have spent a couple of months in Northern Territory,
>North/Western Queensland where I was privileged to stay with our
>indigenous people. This was in June 2000 and again in September
>of last year.

>I sat and listened to their stories, a majority of stories were
>of the star people who come from the stars.

<snip>

>They tell me that these creatures sometimes come with the Star people.
>They're similar to the Yowie or Bigfoot, only much smaller.

>These creatures come in the night and try to steal the women and
>children.

>The men sit up all night around the fire with burning sticks to
>frighten these creatures away.

<snip>

>The older women in Arnham Land told me that sometimes the Star
>People take their children.

Hi Glennys, Chris, List:

A nearly world-wide myth from many people sees the constellation Orion as a hunter or hero. He is often portrayed searching for, or chasing the Pleiades cluster, portrayed as seven women, seven sisters, etc. This story has also been noted among some aboriginal people in Australia. It is believed to have predated Europeans there. Thus, it could be more than 40,000 years old.

>The people talk about their visions
>and information they receive telepathically. The Aboriginal
>People (respectful name Murri's) are the most telepathic in the
>world. I think in the past the saying "Bush Telegraph" came from
>our indigenous people as they could communicate with other
>tribes thousands of miles away, and some of the full-blooded
>still do.

What proof can you offer for direct, "telepathic" (not cultural) communications over thousands of miles?

Without such proof, this could be more a comment of aboriginal beliefs (and perhaps yours) than fact.

Just a couple observations.

Clear skies

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Filer

From: **George A. Filer** <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:46:23 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:41:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Filer

>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 15:43:17 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001

<snip>

>>One area on Mars where there are strong indications of
>>intelligent life is the area known as Cydonia. The famous face
>>on Mars is in the Cydonia area and can possibly be explained
>>away as a trick of nature,

>I don't think it's as much a "trickery of Nature" as it is of
>the Human Mind. I think the tubular structures that appear to
>contain a large 'metallic looking' sphere, (that Arthur C. Clarke
>has recently raised public questions about,) are much more
>compelling scientifically than the so called Face. Which I
>think is more a 'trick of Mind' than Nature.

Perhaps because I'm looking for life, I see it. I certainly
could be wrong, but nature seems to operate in certain ways, and
I know of no place any where like Cydonia.

I have been trying to obtain data on the size of the tunnel like
structures on Mars? Do you happen to know their size? Even a
good estimate?

>* George, you're a MUFON director, have you heard -anything-
>at all about the headquarters investigation into the John
>Carpenter (sale of abductee files) business? I'm both curious
>and trying to do a follow up. It's been awhile since we've
>heard anything new about their "internal investigation."

Sorry I really don't know anything about John Carpenter's
situation. Since no one other than the editor and the director
is paid by MUFON, its tough to criticize people who have done
major work and look for some kind of remuneration.

'NIDS frequently asks me for info, but never pays me.

Apparently, all the other abductee researchers like John Mack,
Jacobs, get paid by various orgainizations. I'm unaware if some
kind of confidential trust was broken. I guess that what they
are looking at.

Regards,

George Filer

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Stacy

From: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 12:03:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:07:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Stacy

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:38:24 -0500

<snip>

>Robertson, that is the Robertson of the 1953 Robertson CIA panel
>was sent in to assassinate Heisenberg who was the mainstay of
>the German program. However, Robertson decided that the Germans
>were on the wrong track and did not carry out the killing.

<snip>

Jan,

The agent sent to assassinate Heisenberg was actually some semi-famous baseball player whose name escapes me at the moment. Moe Somebody. Read it in his obituary in the NY Times recently. Heisenberg was speaking at a conference in, I think, Switzerland at the time. Moe (?) had a pistol in his pocket, but after listening to Heisenberg's lecture decided that the latter didn't have a clue.

Robertson may have been Moe's (?) handler, I don't know. Anyway, this Moe guy led a pretty fascinating life. Don't know if there's a full length bio of him or not. If so, I may have read the above in a book review and that's what I'm thinking of instead of his obit.

Dennis

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 11:34:35 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:09:36 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:07:44 -0800
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 12:47:34 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, I had written:

>>I produced a very silly feature film
>>called 'Forever Evil' with over 30 actors that ran 120 minutes
>>back in 1987. It was shot on 16mm film, played on USA twice that
>>I know of and is still available on VHS from VCI Home Video.

>>120 minutes, Ed. That's two hours. And the total budget was only
>>\$120,000. I am not saying that this film was any good; more to
>>the point it was not. But it had mucho special make-up effects
>>that were on par with anything seen in AA.

Ed replied:

>No, No, No! The only metallurgist to view the debris stated
>flatly that there was not a single method known to metallurgy
>that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!

>And if a person could find a way to do it, then they would make
>far more \$\$\$\$ by making real products. Have you read the
>"Discussion the Debris" in Flatland?

>The debris certainly was not on a par with anything you
>produced. Can you show or tell the List how the debris could be
>made? No. Why? Because you haven't viewed the AA footage with a
>critical eye. And that's just the debris. How about the
>creature? Do you think you could produce something on a "par"
>with it? You need to find a way to open the AA Cds. Then you
>won't make these mistaken judgments about the quality of the AA
>footage.

Hello, Ed.

Have you touched the alien to know that it's real and not rubber?

No.

Have you touched the debris to know that it's even metal and not
plastic or fiberglass or papermache or any number of materials
that would work as a fake?

No.

The obvious problem with your approach to this is that you
readily accept the alien and the debris as real, then work
backwards to find a solution that fits your pre-ordained
outcome. Because of this, you avoid obvious questions like, "How
do we know that the debris is even metal, to begin with?"
Instead, you trot out the opinion of a metalurgist to support a

claim about the debris when his opinion wouldn't apply if the debris isn't made of metal, at all! To that end, you are safe, because he can safely say, "There was not a single method known to metallurgy that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!" This would be especially true if the debris wasn't made of metal. But then, in your mind, if it isn't made of metal, that only means that it's made of some super light weight alien substance that only seems like plastic or such.

Circular reasoning.

Regarding my viewing of your CDs, I have made it clear that I am not going to load unwanted software onto computers that I use every day for my livelihood. But, again, I will look at any high quality videotape, like BetaSP, and can digitize from that. But, basically, I am quickly losing interest in this whole thing.

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 17:44:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:12:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast - Clarke

>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 20:22:33 -0500
>From: Todd Lemire <tlemire@home.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast

>>From: David Bolton <David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 11:21:32 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast

>>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>>Subject: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast
>>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 18:24:52 -0000
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>I seem to recall that on past occasions where sonic booms have
>>occurred there have been claims that the BGS can also pick up
>>thier effects - and hence differentiate between them and true
>>earth tremours. Are they now claiming that they can't?

Hi there Todd, David, list...

I've been in communication with Glenn Ford at the British Geological Survey (BGS) re. the sonic boom, and got the following conclusion:

On the basis of the evidence we have at the moment we do feel the likely origin of the incident was sonic.

1. No ground seismic signals were detected by any BGS seismographs.
2. It would have to be a fairly significant earthquake (or manmade explosion) in UK terms to cause the observed reports and would therefore definitely be detected by the BGS seismic network. Approximately 90% of the earthquakes we detect in the UK are so small nobody feels them.
3. No felt reports have been received from anywhere inland, all coastal towns.
4. MOD have confirmed aircraft in the area at the time, but have not stated if they had gone supersonic or stated if it was the RAF, USAF or Navy. You must draw your own conclusions from this.
5. Almost identical historic cases available to compare, were we have had confirmation of supersonic flight. Most recent 20 January 2000, town of Elgin and other villages in area of NE Scotland shook up by RAF tornado.

Hope this helps.

Best,

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 13:32:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:15:25 -0500
Subject: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!

Errol and list,

While waiting for my bus to go to work on Wednesday, at around 1:50 p.m., in Sudbury, Ontario, a U-Haul truck went by and on its side, I noticed a scene depicting Area 51 with a stealth fighter-type aircraft lifting off its surface, and the word 'Tonopah' (if I remember correctly) written vertically near the back end. Ever neat!

I'd seen the 'Roswell' one on the Internet before, but not this one.

Never thought I'd see that around here....this far up north! It was cool. Wish I had a picture.

Michel

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Lakenheath - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 18:40:13 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:19:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Clarke

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:43:29 -0000

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 17:10:00 -0000

Hi Georgina,

>In fact, maybe you ought to be more informed about a good many
>other things before making yourself look ridiculous.

I think its a matter of opinion who looks ridiculous.

If my lowly, unimportant provincial achievements in journalism demonstrate anything, then they at least show that I have a life outside of ufology, an essential ingredient towards the kind of critical judgement which appears distinctly lacking in some quarters.

>And please don't bother me again with more of your achievements.
>This is a UFO List and I don't see anything so far that makes
>you an experienced researcher. Anybody can shout!

Does the same rule apply to your good self?

For instance are we going to endure further episodes of your self-congratulatory postings advertising your book and associated merchandise?

Is that what this UFO List is for?

I'm making no claims about being an "experienced researcher", I will leave that for others to decide, based upon my record in ufology of which many long-serving subscribers to this List - on both sides of the ideological fence - will recognise.

Ufology consists of more than Rendlesham Forest, and it's a pity that your ufological knowledge seems to begin and end with that case, and that case alone.

Hardly a very balanced view for someone promoting themselves in the way you have been.

This exchange began with me raising some constructive criticisms of your book. I repeat again, despite those criticisms I enjoyed it and think it is a contribution to the literature on the case if not ufoLogy.

But it's become increasingly obvious that you are not prepared to engage in any kind of critical debate unless its with some back-slapping sycophant. Well I'll sign off here and give you space to sing to the Ufological Choir, as Ed Stewart describes it.

Re: Lakenheath - Clarke

Have a nice day to you too.

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Bourdais

From: Gildas Bourdais <GBourdais@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 13:42:00 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:22:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Bourdais

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 11:31:25 -0000

>>From: GBourdais@aol.com
>>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 14:29:22 EST
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 00:20:52 -0000

>>>>From: Gildas Bourdais <GBourdais@aol.com>
>>>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 18:19:41 EST
>>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>>>Date: Sun, 18 Feb 2001 12:11:52 -0600

>>>>>Yes, and I do not think that a mere transcript of the pilot's
>>>>>testimonies will suffice. Video or at least audio recording will
>>>>>have to be produced before independent parties. I suggest for
>>>>>instance, among British ufologists, Timothy Good, Nicholas
>>>>>Redfern and Omar Fowler.

>>Hello

>>I am not joking at all.

>>I repeat my question: will you present the full recordings to
>>independent parties, yes or not ?

>>If you don't, a doubt will remain.

>>If you do and they accept your proofs, be assured that I will
>>accept them too, as will most probably everyone.

>>Including the COMETA members whom you put in doubt a week after
>>the publication of their report because they did not know your
>>new testimonies.

>>When you act that way, don't be surprised if people ask for
>>solid proof.

>Hi,

>Act what way?

>All I did was point out that the COMETA team needed to
>reconsider their stance on Lakenheath - as mentioned by their
>report - because they depended upon the older version claiming
>that the air crew visually saw a UFO that played cat and mouse
>with their plane. This is what UFO history says happened in this

>case - but its not what the air crew themselves report.

>So what was wrong with suggesting that COMETA update their
>information on this case to take account of what the witnesses
>themselves say happened? Only you are turning it into some kind
>of anti COMETA witch hunt. I'm not.

Hello Jenny,

That's exactly how your friend Perry Petrakis understood it,
since he published your message as a centre piece if his long
and violent diatribe against the COMETA Report, in his magazine
"Phénomèna" of september 1999.

Now, about your pilot's testimony, here's a very simple thing to
do:

When you finally decide to release it, make it available to
everyone, unabridged, against payment of the costs for
duplicating and shipping. If you don't want to do that yourself,
I am sure that other people who have the know-how will be glad
to do it, at a commercial price.

You could propose that to Quest Publications, for instance.

Looks very simple to me.

Gildas Bourdais

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Naud, Bouchmann & Le Paige - Mancusi

From: Bruno Mancusi <swissufo@swissufo.ch>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 20:05:33 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:25:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Naud, Bouchmann & Le Paige - Mancusi

>From: Bruno Mancusi <swissufo@swissufo.ch>
>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 09:32:17 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Naud, Bouchmann & Le Paige

>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Naud, Bouchmann & Le Paige
>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 14:45:42 -0000

Chris Aubeck wrote:

>>1) Does Naud mention his source for the 1796 Russian case? In my
>>edition there is no bibliographic reference, though I think I
>>know where he got it (or who invented it, perhaps).

Which I responded:

>No, there is no source. In view of the fact that it is described
>just after the famous Alençon case (1790, France) I have checked
>its source (not given by Naud): Alberto Fenoglio, "Antichi
>visitatori dal cielo", 'Clypeus' #10, 1966, pp. 13-14, but it's
>not here (it's better because Fenoglio has invented many stories
>like the German Sonderbüro and the Alençon landing...). I will
>forward a copy of this mail to Boris Shurinov, perhaps he know
>something.

Here is the answer from Shurinov (I took the opportunity to ask
him what an "ataman" is because the abductee Pushkin is
described as an "Ataman Cossack"):

Dear Bruno,

The 1796 Russian case has nothing to do with Russia. Ataman
means Cossack chieftain or (gang-) leader.

Regards,

Boris

Regards,

Bruno

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:33:35 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
>Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

>On Friday evening of 23 February 2001, at 10.45 pm at Collaroy
>NSW - a large, reddish object with a glowing red hemispherical
>base and a "dark, unlit, castle-like upper section" passed from
>west to east, then out to sea before disappearing several
>kilometers offshore

>The object made an extremely loud noise ("like a hundred
>motorbikes") and was seen for about a quarter of an hour by
>several streets ("at least") of Collaroy residents, drawn
>outside by the loud noise. Several bouncers on the door at the
>local hotel had a very clear view of the object.

>Witnesses reported that the object created a definite draft of
>air in the direction of travel.

>An Australian Air Force source reported that four identical
>objects had been seen over Darwin (NT) earlier that Friday
>evening. Up to five Australian Air Force jets from Darwin had
>been scrambled in pursuit. The rotating objects seen at Darwin
>were reported as having a hemispherical base with a smaller
>cylindrical turret above.

>At least one of the objects had flown alongside an Air Force
>jet, pacing it (the pilots had found this disconcerting). The
>object had 'jumped' instantaneously to a position behind the
>jet.

Hello Diane, Bill, All,

>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>without causing any apparent harm.

Fired upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
an order?

If true,...'who' would have given the order for such an action?

The guy that pulled the trigger should be transferred to the
Navy so that he/she can be properly keel-hauled. The one who
issued the order to fire should be sent to the darkside of the
moon alone and permanently. At least there, he'll only be able
to harm himself. Absolute, unmitigated insanity.

I didn't know Australia had "John Wayne" style cowboys too.

"Welcome to Earth Motherf****r, bang, bang, bang!"

Perfect representatives of our race. -MORONS!-

And then,....

>_____

>Bill Chalkers request for information from the
>Royal Australian Air Force Canberra.

>Hi everybody,

>I sent the following enquiry off to the Department of Defence
>and got the following response, fairly promptly:

>Wednesday, 28 February 2001 3:32 PM:

>I am seeking any information about alleged "UFO" or "UAS"
>incidents that occurred on Friday night, February 23rd, 2001.

>I have interviewed people in the Collaroy (northern Sydney
>beaches) area who observed and heard an unusual object at about
>10.45 pm, ostensibly travelling west to east.

>This object was claimed to have come down very low over the area
>and disappeared out to sea. Some locals have linked this to
>seemingly unusual aircraft and helicopter activity over the
>area, particularly on Saturday, February 24th.

>Others have linked this activity to an alleged UFO event claimed
>to have involved RAAF aircraft from Darwin NT earlier in the
>evening of Friday, February 23rd, 2001. This activity allegedly
>involved 4 similar objects and up to 5 RAAF aircraft in
>"pursuit".

>1. Could you please confirm whether the RAAF or Department of
>Defence has any knowledge of either the alleged Darwin NT and/or
>Collaroy NSW area events of Friday evening, February 23rd, 2001?
>Were any RAAF aircraft involved in any events of the nature
>described above?

>2. Were Department of Defence aircraft, helicopters etc involved
>in activity off the Collaroy beach area on Friday February 23rd,
>Saturday February 24th and since then, and was this related to
>the events described above? If they were not related to such
>events could you please advise me if you are aware of any
>explanation for these alleged events and the activity since
>Saturday, February 24th, 2001 in the Collaroy area.

>I will contact you further on this matter over the next day or
>so. Thank you,

>Bill Chalker
>UFO Investigation Centre (UFOIC)
>02 9484 4680

Bill, why didn't you ask about the reported weapons fire? If a military craft fired upon another aircraft (whether known or unknown) within sight of civilians, didn't you think it was as pertinent a question as your other ones? Maybe you were trying to be 'political' in hopes of getting info. I don't pretend to know the situation. I'm just surprised that the single most outrageous detail (military aircraft firing live ammunition at a "UFO") wasn't worthy of an inquiry.

If I believed in guns (or the use of guns) I would use one on the idiot (the animal) that pulled the trigger, and the MORON that gave him the order. Please keep us informed. I hope the whole case turns out to be BS and just the result of week-end drinking and Harley Hogs. I'd much rather that, than that this story of the military 'Firing' on a UFO turns out to have any substance.

John Velez

Completely outraged

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

MIR Balloon Begins Worldwide Trek

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 14:56:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:37:53 -0500
Subject: MIR Balloon Begins Worldwide Trek

Dear Friends,

Luis E. Pacheco, one of IHU's Argentinean coordinators, has sent us the following information regarding a huge, silvery balloon that will almost certainly give rise to UFO reports in every single country it traverses. Read on!

Scott Corrales

IHU

=====

SOURCE: Informe Alfa (Argentina) www.informealfa.com.ar
DATE: March 1, 2001

THE FIRST MIR BALLOON LAUNCHED FROM BAURU BEGINS WORLDWIDE TREK

As announced by the Institute of Meteorological Research in Bauru through its website, the first of the MIR balloons corresponding to the year 2001 stage of the joint research program between said institute and France's CNES, was launched on February 13 from the location in question and has entered the Atlantic Ocean's airspace again inbound from Africa. In the next few hours, it could reach the coast of Brazil coming in from the east.

Owing to excellent flight performance, scientists have decided to make their device go around the world one more time, thus postponing the command to release the instruments gondola, which had originally been envisioned for the end of the initial circumnavigation of the Earth.

According to IPMET forecasts, the MIR balloon shall move along its east-west trajectory over northern Sao Paulo state or over southern Minas Gerais, further cautioning that if the balloon is seen during daylight hours, it will resemble a bright star in the sky.

The two remaining balloons launched on 2/15 and 2/21 of this year are over Zimbabwe and northeastern Australia, respectively. The latter balloon is following the same trajectory as its predecessors, although detouring several hundred kilometers to the north.

It is worth noting the likelihood that the MIR launched on 2/15 could have been responsible for the mass sighting on 2/16 as it passed over northern Chile. For this reason, it would be appreciated if researchers from Sao Paulo and Minas Gerais were advised of possible misidentifications with UFOs.

While the flights have had an excellent performance, the absolute record for MIR balloons is held by the mission launched from Pretoria (South Africa) which went around the world three consecutive times in 69 days.

More information and maps can be found at:

<http://www.ipmet.unesp.br>

#####

Translation (C) 2001. S.Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Luis E. Pacheco

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Posting Protocol - Ledger

From: ddddDon Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 17:48:32 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:41:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Posting Protocol - Ledger

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Posting Protocol
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 18:53:27 -0600

>Another officious insult and attack on our basic verbal
>freedoms! Will this cloying Canadian literary tyranny never end?

>Next, this fascist word czar will insist on relevancy and
>validity, or style -- think what it would mean! I quake at the
>implications.

>Remember -- this is a man who uses a bathroom, and I don't
>mean that in a good way! Watch the North! Fear Canada!

You betcha-Yankeeman. We have a secret weapon up here called a cold front which we send down there periodically. Course we suffer with it too - but we're immune and we withhold it during the summer months. For a mere 25 percent of your gross national product - we can be reasoned with.

Inquiries should be directed through the literary tyrant himself the EBKster.

ddddDon Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:26:50 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 11:25:09 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch

>From: Manuel Borraz <maboay@teleline.es>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394
>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 00:10:01 +0100

>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 15:19:41 -0000
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: UFOs in 1882 & 1394

>>Hello again,

>>Can anyone answer these questions?

>>1) An enormous UFO was seen by numerous European witnesses on
>>November 17th 1882. It travelled westwards at an approximate
>>altitude of 130 miles and was spotted by several eminent
>>scientists. These included Dr. E. Walter Maunder, an astronomer
>>at Greenwich, the English spectroscopist J. Rand Capron, and
>>Dutch astronomers Audemans and Zeeman. Greenwich published an
>>official report which stated that the object had a well-defined
>>body and was "disc-like in appearance." Unlike an ordinary
>>meteor, it said, the behaviour of the disc had seemed "orderly
>>and controlled."

>>Does anyone know the location of an on-line article reproducing
>>a whole translation of the original report? Whether the object
>>was a natural or an artificial body is not what interests me,
>>but rather the fact that it was apparently disc-shaped.

><snip>

>Hi Chris,

>I found a few lines about it in the books of W. R. Corliss
>("Handbook of Unusual Natural Phenomena", "Lightning, Auroras,
>Nocturnal Lights, and related Luminous Phenomena").

>Note that:

>- It probably was a rare auroral phenomenon (in fact, it took
>place "while the aurora was fitfully blazing in the north,
>north-east, and north-western sky"; hence the somewhat
>misleading term "auroral meteor" that was used by many
>scientists at the time).

>- It was mainly described as a torpedo-shaped cloud of whitish
>light.

Hello Manuel!

Oh heck, there goes half my data for 1882. I had only two cases listed, a slow year. The 17NOV1882 event was mentioned in Jacques Vallee's book Anatomy of a Phenomenon, pg.244 in my paperback copy.

I had it as a disk shape seen by eminent astronomer Maunder; himself notable for the Maunder Minimum in the sunspot cycles of

yore. The same effect was also seen in Brussels. With such a wide audience, this begs for an astronomical or atmospheric effect. I think the aurora then blazing away is sufficient to put this one to rest for most of us.

Best wishes and thanks!

- Larry Hatch

= = = = =

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:26:50 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 21:53:55 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394 - Hatch

>From: Manuel Borraz <maboay@teleline.es>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: UFOs in 1882 & 1394
>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 00:10:01 +0100

>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 15:19:41 -0000
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: UFOs in 1882 & 1394

>>Hello again,

>>Can anyone answer these questions?

>>1) An enormous UFO was seen by numerous European witnesses on
>>November 17th 1882. It travelled westwards at an approximate
>>altitude of 130 miles and was spotted by several eminent
>>scientists. These included Dr. E. Walter Maunder, an astronomer
>>at Greenwich, the English spectroscopist J. Rand Capron, and
>>Dutch astronomers Audemans and Zeeman. Greenwich published an
>>official report which stated that the object had a well-defined
>>body and was "disc-like in appearance." Unlike an ordinary
>>meteor, it said, the behaviour of the disc had seemed "orderly
>>and controlled."

>>Does anyone know the location of an on-line article reproducing
>>a whole translation of the original report? Whether the object
>>was a natural or an artificial body is not what interests me,
>>but rather the fact that it was apparently disc-shaped.

><snip>

>Hi Chris,

>I found a few lines about it in the books of W. R. Corliss
>("Handbook of Unusual Natural Phenomena", "Lightning, Auroras,
>Nocturnal Lights, and related Luminous Phenomena").

>Note that:

>- It probably was a rare auroral phenomenon (in fact, it took
>place "while the aurora was fitfully blazing in the north,
>north-east, and north-western sky"; hence the somewhat
>misleading term "auroral meteor" that was used by many
>scientists at the time).

>- It was mainly described as a torpedo-shaped cloud of whitish
>light.

>Manuel

Hello Manuel!

Oh heck, there goes half my data for 1882. I had only two cases listed, a slow year. The 17NOV1882 event was mentioned in Jacques Vallee's book Anatomy of a Phenomenon, pg.244 in my paperback copy.

I had it as a disk shape seen by eminent astronomer Maunder; himself notable for the Maunder Minimum in the sunspot cycles of yore. The same effect was also seen in Brussels. With such a wide audience, this begs for an astronomical or atmospheric effect. I think the aurora then blazing away is sufficient to put this one to rest for most of us.

Best wishes and thanks!

- Larry Hatch

= = = = =

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

The Watchdog E-Update - 03-01-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 21:44:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 21:56:44 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog E-Update - 03-01-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM

"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"

GARY LOWERY INTERVIEW

Updated with a comments page and a link to a Jeff Rense radio interview with Lowery.

Because you absolutely demanded it...

UFO Dirtbag of the Month for March 2001
SEAN DAVID MORTON

The response to the investigation into Sean David Morton has been incredible! Thanks for your comments and because you demanded it Morton will continue on as UFO Dirtbag of the Month for March 2001. Many have asked that the article on Morton be posted to the website permanently and it will be. Keep your eyes open for UFOWATCHDOG.COM's investigation into Ed Dames...

Don't forget that Morton is scheduled to make an appearance on Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell this coming Friday - March 2, 2001. Feel free to e-mail Bell and ask him about Morton's claims.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Chalker

From: **Bill Chalker** <bill_c@bigpond.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 13:59:02 +1100
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 21:58:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Chalker

>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Feb 2001 15:58:03 -0000
>Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Feb 2001 07:35:38 -0500
>Subject: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

>I have been researching African folklore in connection with
>CE-IIIs and CE-IVs, and have come upon a wealth of new and old
>material. However, I have been having some difficulty validating
>many of South African philosopher/healer/guru Credo Mutwa's
>claims.

>I can verify a few of his stories about African belief but many
>of them seem (seem, but I am not accusing him of anything just
>yet) of his own invention. What Mack mentions in 'Passport to the
>Cosmos' is just the tip of an iceberg that stands quite Way Out.

>I'm not even sure what kind of help I need at the moment,
>whether to correspond with an expert in the field of African
>mythology or just to see if anyone has any solid reason to
>proclaim him a fraud (at least as far as UFOs are concerned).

>I hope someone out there can help me along the right path and
>out of David Icke's involvement in Mutwa's case. I just keep
>turning up Icke, Reptile Creatures, videos for sale and
>references to how wonderful Credo Mutwa is in the twin worlds(?)
>of Spirituality and International Politics.

>Chris Aubeck

Hi Chris & the List,

I feel it would be unfair and inappropriate to judge Credo Mutwa
on David Icke's presentation of and influence on him.

His story and "otherworldly" claims are not just artifacts of
Icke's "reptilian" agenda. They have a long lineage of which
Icke's is a recent aberration. Watching Icke's Mutwa interview
is fascinating, but care must be taken in judging where Icke's
influence ends and pure Mutwa comes in.

Such difficulties exist in all oral material that filters to us
from indigenous cultures. Professional anthropologists are at
least a bit more experienced in trying to limit "western"
effects, or at least documenting such influences when they do
occur, inadvertently or deliberately.

Some "oral material" is very difficult to judge because often
the source, like Credo Mutwa, is willingly reaching out to
create a bridge between different cultures. Such attempts often
lead to a degree of diffusion of world views, either
deliberately or inadvertently. These should not lessen the
credibility of such sources, rather it means we should be
mindful of such influences and try to recognise them when they
appear.

I have seen this mechanism at work in a number of people, such
as Credo Mutwa, and Australian aboriginal "abductee" Lorraine
Maffi Williams. Both are fascinating people and should not be

reduced in stature by uninformed criticisms, coming from people who are ill informed about the odyssey's such people have been on. Neither are without their flaws and problems, and neither would the high minded critics be, if they had had the same "life experiences" of people like Credo Mutwa and Lorraine Maffi Williams to deal with. As people like Credo and Lorraine go through their "journey" of course they will "filter" the ideas of others and maybe their world view will be diluted somewhat from the original and unique indigenous world views they have presented. Both people have tried to create "bridges" between cultures and therefore it is inevitable they may reap the flak of both their own cultures and those "superior" cultures looking in.

Credo Mutwa represents a particularly intriguing case study of the emergence of an "alien" story from an indigenous source. Credo has been talking about "aliens" for longer than a lot of people on this list have been interested in the topic. We either have the situation where his story grows with each retelling fuelled by the obsessions and interests of those who seek him out. Or its a traditional and somewhat expected gradual unfolding, mediated by tribal "taboos" and a perception that people of the "western world" sometimes hold views that are consistent with Credo's. Perhaps its like the onion as layers are slowly peeled back to reveal layer after layer of an extraordinary mythic view. At present I err on the side of the latter given my awareness of how Credo Mutwa's story has slowly unfolded. I'm open to others who may be better informed than me that there might be other perspectives that are more suitable.

My introduction to Credo Mutwa was via Lyall Watson's "Lightning Bird", his book on the extraordinary life of Adrian Boshier (1982). That book describes some of Boshier's dealings with Credo Mutwa, that impressed Boshier, with Credo's credibility. Brian Crowley wrote briefly about his association with Credo in his book "The Face on Mars" (1986) co-written with James Hurtak, who has also had a strange and bizarre involvement in this field. Crowley expands on Credo's "Martian" Zulu connection in his followup book "Return to Mars" (1989) co-written with Anthony Pollock. Some of Credo's beliefs or myths that address the theme of UFOs and aliens are included. One painting, dated 1983, includes Credo's depictions of some of the "aliens" in African lore, such as the "muhondoruka", the "mutende-ya-ngenge" (which later is described as the "mantindane" - the "greys"?) and "mvonjina". Crowley's book does not describe encounters with such creatures, instead again focusing on the Martian - Zulu connection. Credo himself describes UFO encounters, entity encounters and abductions in his "biograghy"/"shaman lore" book edited by mythologist Dr. Stephen Larsen "Song of the Stars - the Lore of a Zulu Shaman" (1996). Credo credits Crowley as being instrumental in the process that had himself opening up to his own "visionary" shamanic experiences. Crowley has written a book "The Zulu Bone Oracle" which I assume is about Credo? With regard to Larsen's book it should be noted that the bulk of the work occurred between 1989 and 1990, with editing in 1991. It was finally published in 1996. Larsen first met Credo in Japan during 1985, where Credo was a guest speaker at the International transpersonal conference. Already by then Credo was well travelled and respected as a custodian of Zulu knowledge. Credo Mutwa had long before (1967 to be exact) published his epic repository of Zulu cultural knowledge - "Indaba My Children". Later came "Let not my Country die." (1986) During 1994 John Mack steps into the Credo picture with his visit to Africa with Dominique Callimanopulos. He videoed an interview with Credo talking about his abduction experience. The best general accounts of Credo's "extraterrestrial perspective" & experiences comes from the Larsen edited book (1996) and John Mack's "Passport to the Cosmos" (1999). Stephen Larsen & John Mack are well acquainted particularly through their transpersonal interests. Credo's personal abduction experiences are detailed in the Larsen/Mutwa book, Mack's book and more recently in Icke's taped video interview ("The Reptilian agenda") and an interview partially facilitated by Icke in The Spectrum newspaper, by its editor Rick Martin (unfortunately now not available on the web - originally present as a 37 page transcript). Both Icke's video interview and Martin's phone interview occurred in 1999, and are worth seeking out, with appropriate caveats.

Trust this helps in your attempts to reconcile the issue of

Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Chalker

"credibility and Credo Mutwa".

Regards,

Bill Chalker

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 22:25:18 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:03:27 -0500
Subject: Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Mortellaro

People who are normal are not tuned into the abduction phenom. How's that for an understatement and a half?

They would very much like to be kind and sympathetic, and sometimes they do, inspiring within their bosoms, a strikingly brave and stallwart effort at not smirking into their sleeves. One can nearly see the tongue, moving ever so slowly into the cheek, where it may be pressed firmly between the molars, somewhat like a female breast in the plates of the mammogram. It would appear that biting the tongue firmly planted in the cheek takes away any tendency to smirk and sneer.

I can relate to that effort, however my way of avoiding the smirky sneer is to think about my brother in law. Or the IRS (may the bastards choke on my bile).

What can anyone expect? There is not one dot of evidence that I or anyone else for that matter, has been abducted. Not one stinking shred of HARD evidence. And for all I know, it may all be in my mind. I don't think so. But it may. And in a previous post, I tried hard to point to the possibility of this phenom taking place on a spiritual level. It seems that at least one of you got carried away with that on. Fine. But all it was, was an attempt at another explanation for the phenom.

I have a good friend, a kind and gentle soul, sensitive and, well, just a peach of a man, who put it in words that I, the great Gesundt, could not emulate. Listen.

"The problem everyone has with this subject is they hate it when an otherwise credible person reports an experience they don't believe. The sad fact is, none of our experiences are believable... none! There is no compelling scientific evidence for ufo's or abduction! None of these physical trace studies would make it out of the smallest, most needy university graduate school in the country. They all have huge methodological problems. Still, we know what happened to us."

And for the record, this List should know that as a perceived abductee, I hate the little bastards for what they've done to me. I am a gentle man who cannot even shoot a rabbit or a woodcock for lunch. Can't hurt or kill anymore. I have this special love for anything which lives. Even you.

But when it comes to those whom I expect have done to me what they have likely done to me, especially me as an innocent child who was extremely modest and clean minded, with a good and very healthy respect for my body even as a three year old, I could, I believe sadly, hurt the little mothers.

In answer to another post by Mr. Velez, I ask this question, "Did anyone here say they enjoyed the violation of body and mind?" Wasn't me, John.

In a recent post, John Velez wrote:

>The implications in your

>statements are; that we are all so incredibly un-evolved and
>spiritually bankrupt that as a race, we need an "intervention"
>from ET in order to make any meaningful progress spiritually.

No, those were your thoughts. I never said or even implied that. However I must admit to agreeing with you on one count, I do believe that the human being has everything it needs to progress spiritually. I also believe that we are in the process of learning to appreciate that fact and discover the powers within. But damned if I don't agree that we've even come close to succeeding.

In conclusion, I hate what they've done to me. Maybe even more than you do. I'm Sicilian.

Jimmy, The Doc, Mortellaro

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: PRA - Almost History A Book - Chalker

From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 15:01:02 +1100
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:08:48 -0500
Subject: Re: PRA - Almost History A Book - Chalker

>From: John W. Auchettl <Praufu@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 12:08:56 EST
><updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: PRA - Almost History A Book

>PRA SITE OF THE WEEK
>OLD AUSTRALIAN UFO MAGAZINE COVER
>Copy of the front cover of one of Australia's oldest UFO
>magazines. Feb 1955. In PDF file. Zoom in to read.

John,

Thank you for posting this link to Australia's historical past.
A few points of clarification are however in order. See within
the quoted message:

><http://members.nbci.com/praufo/prapeople/oldmag1955.htm>

(from this link)

>The front cover (below) is only one of 11 individual
>publications (magazine) on Australian and World UFO reports that
>were produced up to the end of 1954 (Feb 1955). This was the
>last in that set. These early magazine sets come from Victoria
>(qty 7) >and New South Wales - NSW (qty 4).

This is not quite correct. Jarrold and the New South Wales
(NSW) based organisation AFSB, produced at least 6 issues of the
Australian Flying Saucer Magazine, not 4 as you indicate. The
issues I am aware of and have copies of are the premiere issue -
May 1953, August, 1953, November, 1953, March, 1954, August,
1954, and the final revised format issue of February, 1955.

As to your indication that there were 7 Victorian magazines that
were produced up to the end of 1954/55, I would certainly think
there would be a number of us who would be curious to know what
those were. The Victorian UFO Research Society (VFSRS now
VUFORS) did not form until 1957. Perhaps your are referring to
the Australian Flying Saucer Investigation Committee (AFSIC)
based in Victoria, which formed in February 1953, but seemed to
have broken up by 1955. In 1954 they produced a detailed report
on the 1953/54 wave in Australia, which was quoted from by the
media, particularly the "Argus", however I have not seen a copy
of the original report. If you have the report, I'm sure there
would be lots of researchers who would like to see it, myself
included. I am not aware of any magazines that the AFSIC might
have produced, but perhaps you can enlighten us and make any of
these historical issues more widely available.

>This cover comes from the third edition of Australian Flying
Saucer Bureau (AFSB) publication called the "Australian Flying
>Saucer Magazine". AFSB was a New South Wales UFO organisation
that was founded in July 1952. It is also important to note
>that 1952 was the start date of the UK group the British Flying
Saucer Bureau (BFSB). In May 1953, AFSB published their first
>magazine. But all this work ended soon after this impressive,
No3, February 1955 edition came out.

>There have been some heated discussions about this magazine as

to its authenticity. The central cause for the disputes hinge
>around the data in the magazine and the date of publication. To
add to the confusion the magazine editor and president of the
>Australian Flying Saucer Bureau (AFSB) a Edgar R. Jarrold
suddenly resigned (1955), without any public explanation he
>vanished from the UFO map within weeks.

There should be no question to the authenticity of the February
1955 edition of the Australian Flying Saucer Magazine (It was
not number 3 as you suggest). That issue was clearly produced by
Jarrold and perhaps helped by the likes of Andrew Tomas. Even in
correspondence in late 1954 between Jarrold and the pioneer New
Zealand UFO researcher, Harold Fulton, Jarrold was commenting on
content that appeared in the February, 1955, issue. The
correspondence does reveal an intermittent and seeming
escalating level of frustration and difficulties that Jarrold was
experiencing. He largely liked a "one man" show, and it was this
weakness, more that any other implied exotic paranoia that
caused the disintegration of Jarrold's public flying saucer
career. Your implication of sudden resignation and magazine
issue and disappearance of the UFO map is not really credible.
His personal life was under strain and his obsession with
flying saucers was starting to create intolerable pressures.

>Edgar Jarrold is best remembered for being one of a group of
>(world) researchers, who became association with the original
>"Men in Black" encounters. These encounters are fascinating and
>well recorded.

This suggests that these "MIB" encounters were credible. They
were not. The so called MIB in Jarrold's case was an eccentric
local researcher, Gordon Deller, whose occult saucer beliefs in
"Etherians", even down to going in trance challenging, seemed to
convince Jarrold, but not the apparently more pragmatic Fulton.
Fulton was diplomatic, but the implication seems to be he
thought Deller was a "nut". Jarrold however seemed hung up on
the apocalyptic dimensions of Deller's credo. Gary Barkers
version of the MIB events in his "They knew too much about
flying saucers" is big on yarn telling and short on letting
facts spoil a good story. Much of it was in a word - "bullshit".
Barker in fact knew that Deller was Jarrold's "MIB" but chose to
beat the story up into something it wasn't. Clearly if Jarrold's
"encounters are fascinating and well recorded" we seem to be
talking about entirely different sagas. Perhaps you could
clarify if you feel there is substance to Jarrold's "MIB" saga.

I have written about Jarrold in detail in Jerry Clark's
encyclopedias and more recently in "The Jarrold File" in The
Australian Ufologist" Vol 4. No.1, 2000, pgs 18-23.

>In two later interview with Jarrold, his explanation for his
>disappearance (due to politics and stress), were never
>satisfactory clarified - However, he never returned.

Jarrold was "spruking forth" on "Martians may land here" in
1956, in an article in People magazine (July, 1955). The date is
well after the February 55 magazine date. It is clear that by
then his organised ufology campaign was in rapid decline. But he
never entirely disappeared. For example he resurfaced in the
early 1970s to titillate ufologists of the era in a run of
prolific correspondence.

>In one of the interviews Jarrold he said: "I don't like the
>subject, it scares me to death Brian (1), and since I have
>started asking question, I have had endless trouble from all
>types of people... I do not know what I have done wrong, but it
>is something very >important to someone&"(1). Mr. Brian Boyle -
>Aeronautical & Meteorological Phenomena Rsearch (AMPR est 1949 -
>PRA) & >Royal Aeronautical Society Australasian - Victorian (RAS
>est 1953).

It was be nice if you could date Brian Boyle's interview and
expand on it. However it may prove nothing other than the fact
that if you thought UFOs are strange, many of the people that
populate the field of their study and interest, are far stranger
still.

>The Feb 1955 edition is the most public and referenced magazine
>from the AFSB selection and the most interesting of the AFSB
>set.

>J. W. Auchettl - PRA - Director

The earlier issues in the AFSB set are also of particular interest. The whole set is a great view into early Australian and world ufology and "flying saucery".

Regards,

Bill Chalker

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Air Force Buys Supercomputer to Identify UFOs

From: **SMiles Lewis** <smiles@elfis.net>
Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 23:27:07 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:09:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Air Force Buys Supercomputer to Identify UFOs

-The IBM / Air Force Supercomputer to Identify UFOs

You might remember back in November the news report about the Air Force supercomputer to identify ufos.

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/nov/m23-006.shtml>

Apparently there is an Austin, Texas connection.

Powerful Technology Keeping a Lookout in Space

http://www.kvue.com/click/293057_click_here.html

Watch the story in Real Video

<http://www.kvue.com/realvideoclips/click.rm>

02/21/2001
KVUE News Staff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 00:58:22 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:12:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 12:19:16 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:54:46 -0600
>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 14:16:27 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>Previously, John wrote:

>>>NASA makes me feel like I'm trapped in a bad B&W 'cine noir'
>>>50's flick. What's up with that! This 2001 not 1951. Tell me
>>>that those dolts don't have any working 'color' imaging cameras
>>>on that craft because I have a bridge in Brooklyn that I'd like
>>>to sell you. ;)

>Lan replied:

>>The MGS low-resolution (approx. 200 meter) camera does have
>>color capability - sort of. It has a red filter and a blue
>>filter, so red and blue images can be combined into a color
>>image.

>>The problem with this is, aside from the low resolution,
>>that nothing like the true color of a scene can be reproduced to
>>any degree of certainty with only red and blue.

>Hi, Lan, John.

>I understand that you are talking about the specific low-rez camera of
>the MGS. However, you give the impression that using color filters in
>conjunction with a black and white camera will yield lower resolution
>pictures than a color camera and this is not the case. Black and white
>video cameras and scanners are inherently higher in resolution than
>their color counterparts. In fact, one of the best images you can get on
>video (next to a scanner) is to use a modern, high resolution black and
>white CCD camera and make three passes; red, blue and green and then
>combine them in Photoshop for use on TV productions. I do this for color
>artwork and graphics that are too big for my scanner and the resolution
>and color definition is far superior to that of any 3-chip color camera.
>Of course, the subject matter must not be moving, but the results are
>superior.

Hello Roger, Lan, John and others:

I think there may be another issue here, that of "bandwidth" (I
hate the term) or file size.

Take any picture, say 1000 by 1000 pixels. That's a million
pixels. In black and white (lets say 16 shades of grey from
black up to white) we have 16 million bits of info, or 2

megabytes.

All that has to be sent back to Earth. To avoid noise, a relatively slow redundant channel might be used. In short, we have an information bottleneck.

Now, put this into color. How about the nice 4096 colors your computer screen likely can handle? Well, that's 4096 x a million bits..

You don't have many choices. You can shrink the picture, say 100 by 100 pixels and look at a single small rock. You can send fewer pictures .. But, you cannot have your cake and eat it too.

On top of all this, there are the many many regions which have not been imaged at all, as opposed to lets say Cydonia, which now has multiple images.

Personally, I'm very glad they cast their net wide enough to capture images which as much as prove the recent or present existence of liquid water, obvious former river channels etc.

I think that is exciting.

The scientists are charged with getting the best science out of a large but not unlimited bandwidth, over the useful lifetime of the MGS probe. Maybe we should put ourselves in their shoes as a sort of thought experiment.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 01:16:44 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:41:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Hatch

>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:37:42 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Hatch

>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 01:29:43 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

>>>From: Kelly Peterborough <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 15:57:10 -0500
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Wife sees husband 'vanish'

><snip>

>>>In the meantime, Yabi's wife has also sought the assistance of
>>>bomohs to trace the whereabouts of her husband.

>>They give no clue what a "bomoh" is. Might that be some sort of
>>witch doctor or spiritual advisor? A bomoh could be a bloodhound
>>for all they tell you.

>Hi Larry,

>You got it right first time.

>A quick search on the 'net produced:

>A Bomoh is a Malay witchdoctor. Also known as pawang or dukun.
>They are still active today and work professionally.

>This was taken from Encyclopedia Mythica at

><http://www.pantheon.org/mythica/articles/b/bomoh.html>

>Note - The above is the complete entry for 'Bomoh'

>Best wishes,
>John Hayes

>webmaster@ufoinfo.com

>UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>

>Official Archives for UFO Roundup, UK UFO Network Bulletin,
>AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI
>Magazine plus archives of Filer's Files and Oz Files.

Hello and thanks John!

That answers my question, a Bomoh is indeed a witch doctor. In any case, this puts the disappearing-husband matter in a better perspective, if you catch my drift.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:23:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:48:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Aldrich

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 12:03:31 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Stacy

>>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:38:24 -0500

<snip>

>>Robertson, that is the Robertson of the 1953 Robertson CIA panel
>>was sent in to assassinate Hiesenberg who was the mainstay of
>>the German program. However, Robertson decided that the Germans
>>were on the wrong track and did not carry out the killing.

<snip>

>Jan,

>The agent sent to assassinate Heisenberg was actually some
>semi-famous baseball player whose name escapes me at the moment.
>Moe Somebody. Read it in his obituary in the NY Times recently.
>Heisenberg was speaking at a conference in, I think, Switzerland
>at the time. Moe (?) had a pistol in his pocket, but after
>listening to Heisenberg's lecture decided that the latter didn't
>have a clue.

>Robertson may have been Moe's (?) handler, I don't know. Anyway,
>this Moe guy led a pretty fascinating life. Don't know if
>there's a full length bio of him or not. If so, I may have read
>the above in a book review and that's what I'm thinking of
>instead of his obit.

>Dennis

Dennis,

The book you are referring to is "The Catcher Was a Spy." The
author elludes me now as my memory has been abducted.
Robertson, as I remember, was in on this and made the decision
not to proceed.

Jan

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:37:44 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:52:01 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>>without causing any apparent harm.

>_Fired_ upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
>one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
>OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
>repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
>genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
>an order?

Hi John, Diane, Bill, anybody:

What kind of genius equips his interceptors with "bullets",
nowadays. Snoopy or the Red Baron? And was it a Sopwith Camel?
"OZ Air Force", indeed. This story, or at least this exciting
detail, is fiction.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 2](#)

Re: Lakenheath - Bruni

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 15:41:34 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:55:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Bruni

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 18:40:13 -0000

Dave

First of all I would like to point out to the List how you change things to suit your thinking. In a previous post (Thu, 22 Feb 2001)

You quote the following:

>You really gave the game away in your last posting when you
> said "who ever told you there is no money to be made from UFOs".

Well, I was sure I never wrote that and if I did it was surely a typing error. So I checked the archive and here is what I wrote:

>One is obliged to do lecture tours if ones book is popular and
>who ever told you there is money to made in ufology?

So you adding the word "NO" to change my quote was a very nasty thing to do.

And if there is anybody who has made a comfortable living out of studying ufology, please give me your secret.

>For instance are we going to endure further episodes of your
>self-congratulatory postings advertising your book and
>associated merchandise?

>Is that what this UFO List is for?

I have never advertised any merchandise on this List, other than point out where my book is available on line. For the last four months I been very generous with my material, copying pictures and files and the Halt tape and sending them free to people who asked. But this has become very expensive so I recently put together a folder with numerous files and have had the Halt tape made into a CD with an introduction, the full clear track (not the one everybody has) and the major parts of interest featured in separate tracks plus the transcript. It's been a lot of work and thanks to Darren Danks, who has designed the CD cover and CD itself, it has turned out to be a very exciting contribution and everybody who's interested in the case should have this package, which is not expensive. In fact, I could well do without the extra work but had to draw the line somewhere. So, anybody who wants details of this can contact me direct.

You can accuse me of advertising but I would not have mentioned it here because I put them together not to make money (which is a joke when you consider the time and effort and costs) but because there is an interest and of course people would like to receive this information, it helps with research and the CD might turn out to be a collectors item.

My 3 years of research has already cost me dearly.

>Ufology consists of more than Rendlesham Forest, and it's a
>pity that your ufological knowledge seems to begin and end with
>that case, and that case alone.

This is just more of your insults. I don't need to explain my research, which of course has not just revolved around UFOs. And I have never called myself a ufologist.

Why on earth do you have to be so bitter and nasty when debating on this List. You act as if you are a 75 year old professor with years of experience, when all you have really done (and we've already had reams of information in earlier posts on your PhD) is study fairies.

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:04:04 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 07:47:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons - Salvaille

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 12:03:31 -0600

>>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Atomic Bombs and Fugo Balloons
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:38:24 -0500

<snip>

>>Robertson, that is the Robertson of the 1953 Robertson CIA panel
>>was sent in to assassinate Hiesenberg who was the mainstay of
>>the German program. However, Robertson decided that the Germans
>>were on the wrong track and did not carry out the killing.

<snip>

>The agent sent to assassinate Heisenberg was actually some
>semi-famous baseball player whose name escapes me at the moment.
>Moe Somebody. Read it in his obituary in the NY Times recently.
>Heisenberg was speaking at a conference in, I think, Switzerland
>at the time. Moe (?) had a pistol in his pocket, but after
>listening to Heisenberg's lecture decided that the latter didn't
>have a clue.

>Robertson may have been Moe's (?) handler, I don't know. Anyway,
>this Moe guy led a pretty fascinating life. Don't know if
>there's a full length bio of him or not. If so, I may have read
>the above in a book review and that's what I'm thinking of
>instead of his obit.

<snip>

Hello Dennis, Jan and List.

Moe Berg: 1902-1972, spoke 12 languages, was "an alumnus of
three universities, lawyer, mathematician, linguist".

<http://www.usajewish.com/scripts/usaj/paper/Article.asp?ArticleID=873>

From the USA Jewish of July 17, 2000, quoting the L.A. Times

<Start quotes>

MO' BETTER MOE BERG

A Baseball Shrine for Those Who Made a Difference

Moe Berg was a weak-hitting catcher who spoke 12 languages and
who once went to check out a German atomic scientist named
Werner Heisenberg during a 1944 lecture in Zurich. Berg, posing
as a graduate student, carried in his pocket a pistol and a
suicide pill. Berg's mission, and he chose to accept it, was to
assassinate Heisenberg if Berg determined the Germans were close
to exploding an atomic weapon during World War II.

Berg, a Jew, decided the Germans weren't that close, so
Heisenberg and Berg lived on.

Today Berg, along with pitcher Bill Lee and Pam Postema, who tried for 13 years to become major league baseball's first female umpire, will be inducted into the Baseball Reliquary Shrine of the Eternals in a ceremony at the Pasadena library.

<End quotes>

At:

http://www.sportsline.com/u/baseball/bol/ballplayers/B/Berg_Moe.html

"Among the most scholarly professional athletes ever, Berg was an alumnus of three universities, lawyer, mathematician, linguist, and poor hitter, eliciting the comment: 'He can speak 12 languages but can't hit in any of them.' His ability to handle young pitchers and his reputation as a bullpen mystic kept him in the majors [...] He declined the Medal of Merit for his wartime service and never wrote his memoirs after being angered by an assigned co-author who confused him with "Moe" of the Three Stooges."

Life, what a trip.

Serge

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Randle

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:10:07 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 07:51:39 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Randle

>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 23:19:17 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Feb 2001 11:21:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Feb 2001 15:10:38 +0000
>>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

<snip>

>>>I've quite deliberately tried to stay out of this area, I've met
>>>Bond personally and heard his side of things, I've read what the
>>>other side has to say, I believe an admission is on record that
>>>the tapes _have_ been edited,

>>Neil, all -

>>This is an example of spin. After I interviewed Dr. Johnson in
>>1989, and after I had published an article in the INTERNATIONAL
>>UFO REPORTER, Dr. Johnson spoke to Jerry Clark, saying that many

>Kevin,

>The above comment _was_ uncalled for on my part and as such I
>apologise.

That is most gracious of you. Thank you.

<snip>

>Even _without_ any direct contact with Bond, I believe I would
>still have arrived at the opinions I hold today.

Dr. Johnson's testimony is of little importance. The pictures
are his real contribution.

>>Since you,
>>Neil, are siding with him, I will make you the one time good
>>offer of copying all this material for you so that you can hear
>>him say the things he denies he said, listen to him claim credit
>>for writing the July 9 article, and see how I have tried to get

>Siding?, that gives the wrong impression, I _have_ tried to stay
>impartial, and it's not my place to wade into differences that I
>have had no personal involvement with.

Yes, siding, but only because of the comment about "editing."
Other than that, it seems that your efforts have been those of
the objective researcher and not the partisan.

>But should you choose to completely set aside Bond's testimony

>_altogether_, which is an exercise I've gone through, what does
>it actually alter in the scheme of things, not a lot really.

Clearly Dr. Johnson was in General Ramey's office. Clearly he took six photographs (and his telling me that he took two, later that he really took four, and finally identifying he took all six is of little real importance).

>It doesn't change the fact the photo's were taken, and what's
>more it doesn't alter their _content_.

Agreed.

<snip>

>>>Further, we are now finding that
>>>some of his most disputed information ie the "press conference"
>>>_is_ receiving independent confirmation from an individual who
>>>_was_ there reporting the news in FW at the time.

>>If you have reporters in General Ramey's office, and they are
>>asking him questions, then you have a press conference whether
>>it is officially called or not.

>>We are in an argument over
>>semantics here that has little real importance in understanding
>>what happened that night.

>I guess this boils down really to an argument over scale, I
>wouldn't say a possible couple of reporters arriving unannounced
>out at FWAAF would constitute "press conference".

Semantics, and really unimportant. Reporters were there and talked to Ramey and I think we all agree with that.

<snip>

>>>I think it's also hard to pin down just what Gen DuBose could or
>>>could not recall, I have Jamie Shandera's interview transcript
>>>where DuBose claims _no_ pictures were ever taken at all, that
>>>is until he is shown the JBJ images of himself. Jesse's story
>>>too is obviously a partial memory, we know firmly JBJ took
>>>pictures of Marcel, Ramey and Dubose in the _one_ session I
>>>think we are all agreed on that. Yet Marcel gives us the quote
>>>that he was only involved in the _one_ photograph, the one he
>>>claims where he is shown holding some of the actual debris from
>>>Roswell and I believe he then goes on to mention some other
>>>"staged" photographs might have been taken later "but he was not
>>>involved with those".

>>But, as I have tried to point out, Bill Moore has provided us
>>with three versions of that quote. The first is from his book
>>which you quote here. Second, Moore sent a letter around, again
>>using the Marcel quote, but this time it said, "...Ramey allowed
>>the press to take two pictures of this stuff. I was in one and
>>he and Col. DuBose were in the other.

>>Then in the article, "Three Hours that Shook the Press," the
>>quote is again altered to say, according to Moore and Shandera,
>>"In his interview with Moore, Maj. Marcel maintained that the
>>debris in the two photos of him..."

>>Then, finally, in "Enough is Too Much," Moore returns to the
>>original quote that mentions but a single photograph of Marcel,
>>and none of Ramey and DuBose.

>>This, I think, would negate the quote attributed to Marcel
>>because the man who conducted the interview has altered it to
>>suit him and the situation as it developed... which means as
>>more pictures were discovered, Moore altered the quote to cover
>>each new discovery.

>Kevin, I think we must accept peoples recollections of event
>from such a long time ago will be coloured by both the passage
>of time _and_ what they themselves discover of the events in the
>present. Marcel's story changed it seems the more interviews he
>gave, it's hard not to believe that in between these interviews
>more and more of the story he was involved in would be
>"refreshed?" and we possibly end up with a feedback loop of
>acquired information augmenting the original memory.

Certainly, memories fade, change and mutate over time. But that is not what happened here. I'm talking about the same quote, from the same interview, being provided in three different forms. Jesse Marcel's memory didn't change, the reporting of the quote changed to reflect the number of photographs that have been taken.

>I put it forward that this is what has happened in Bond's case,
>together with many of the other Roswell witnesses, I don't think
>it's deliberate, it's just the way we seem to work as humans.

I agree that there hasn't been a conscious effort on the part of Dr. Johnson to alter his memories. He's been assisted in this. The point is that the original tales he told are radically different than those he tells to day. This is not the normal mutation of memory, but a complete alteration of what it once was.

<snip>

>>So here is information that has been printed in both the IUR and
>>the CUFOS Roswell special, and has been corroborated by Johnny
>>Mann when asked by others, but which has been ignored. We have a
>>witness who tells us that Marcel said the pictures in General
>>Ramey's office were staged. We have Dr. Johnson telling us, in
>>his original interviews, said that the setting had been staged.
>>He didn't believe, in those original interviews, that he had
>>seen anything special. Now, of course, he has changed his story.

>><snip>

>Yet we have the direct counter to that from Shandera's DuBose
>interview where DuBose say's "yes that's the stuff they brought
>from Roswell" when shown quite likely the very same photo's, and
>he additionally states that no substitution of debris ever
>took place.

>Like I said before, you can select testimony from Roswell to
>support any stance, pro or anty, and believe me, I hold a very
>pro position.

>>>This is very incomplete accounting of Dubose's many interviews
>>>on the matter, and obviously comes from the highly suspect
>>>Shandera "interviews" with Dubose. Even though Shandera produced
>>>lengthy "transcripts", he has also been unable to produce the
>>>tape recordings that would have been needed to produce such
>>>detailed "transcripts." He is also unable to reproduce even
>>>notes of the conversation.

>>>On the other hand, there are a number of recorded interviews
>>>with Dubose which completely contradict your assertion and RPITs
>>>that Dubose wasn't aware of the photographs and claimed the
>>>stuff in the photos was from Roswell.

>>Copies of those interviews, and corroboration by others is also
>>available. The video taped interview was conducted in August
>>1990 and is in the FUFOR archives. I also have copies of it.

><snip>

>>>I agree DuBose said the above and I can live with your assertion
>>>Shandera might be a little shakey in his methods, but there
>>>again there's nothing to say he didn't make that quote to
>>>Shandera.

>>More importantly, there is nothing to say that he did.

>>>I think DuBose tended to please everybody.

>>No, he attempted to tell the truth, as best he could remember
>>it when not being pushed by someone with an agenda. Billy
>>Cox, of FLORIDA TODAY reported on these facts a number
>>of years ago, as did Don Ecker of UFO Magazine (USA).

>In the end DuBose either said it or he didn't, and I can accept
>he actually said both statements, and therefore contradicted
>himself in the process. Does it nullify all his testimony?, or
>just indicate he had very poor recall of the events. Being
>shown the photograph's by Shandara doesn't mean to say he

>_positively_ ID'd the debris either, but merely it might
>have_looked_ like what he could recall after 40 odd years.

My point here was that we reject the Shandera interpretation of the testimony because we have no reason to accept it as valid and Shandera has offered nothing to prove that DuBose actually said those things without prompting by him.

Why do I say that? Billy Cox of 'Florida Today' reported on November 24, 1991 that he had interviewed DuBose. The tone of that interview agrees with what I have reported in the past, and disagrees with what Shandera claims. Additionally, in a letter dated September 30, 1991, Cox wrote:

"I was aware of the recent controversy generated by the interview he(DuBose) had with Jaime Shandera, during which he stated that the display debris at Fort Worth was genuine UFO wreckage and not a weather balloon, as he had previously stated. But I chose not to complicate matters by asking him to illuminate what he had told Shandera; instead, I simply asked him, without pressure, to recall events as he remembered them... he seemed especially adamant about his role in the Roswell case. While he stated that he didn't think the debris was extra-terrestrial in nature (though he had no facts to support his opinion), he was insistent that the material that Ramey displayed for the press was in fact a weather balloon, and that he had personally transferred the real stuff in a lead-lined mail pouch to a courier going to Washington... I can only conclude that the Shandera interview was the end result of the confusion that might occur when someone attempts to press a narrow point of view upon a 90 year old man..."

Don Ecker also had a similar experience. Shandera had attempted to arranged for Ecker to interview DuBose. Ecker called DuBose and talked to him, again getting my version (or rather the version that DuBose told Don Schmitt and Stan Friedman on video tape). When Ecker reported that to Shandera, Shandera said to wait. Shandera then called DuBose, talked to him and then called Ecker back, saying, "Now call him." DuBose then offered the new version. Of course, left alone to speak naturally, DuBose said that the debris was a weather balloon brought in for the purpose of showing reporters wreckage.

So, my point again, is that we ignore the Shandera version because there is good reason to reject it. We have Shandera's spin, wanting it to be one thing, and attempting to enforce that one thing, when it is really something else.

<snip>

>>>The same way Marcel recalled a posse of news photogs taking his
>>>picture when the historical record shows we only have Bond
>>>Johnson's 6 pictures only 2 of which are of Marcel.

>>>The human memory.

>>Or human interpretation. I see nothing in Marcel's statements to
>>suggest a "posse of news photogs." Maybe it was just radio
>>reporters. This posse of photogs is your invention, or Dr.
>>Johnson's invention and not supported by the facts as they have
>>been established.

>Not my invention Kevin, but I believe the public perception of
>the event. Granted in your books you relate it just as reporters
>arriving later. But I've seen presentations by notable
>researchers where this _has_ been "spun" into the realm of a
>media feeding frenzy.

And now it is my turn to apologize. Suggesting it was your invention was not right... though invention it is. There is a scene in the 'Roswell' movie where there are a number of photographers pushing forward to photograph the debris. That scene is, of course, inaccurate.

>>We have a great deal of information that has been spun here. We
>>have evidence to support my claims including the audio tapes
>>and letters. If Dr. Johnson wants to believe today that he was
>>the only reporter there, ever,

>The fact Bond's story has changed over time I accept and don't

>have a problem with, it hasn't had an impact on the research
>I've personally been engaged in. As I've said, set aside Bond's
>testimony totally and what difference does it make to what we
>_know_ of events that night?. Most of the information we have to
>work with comes from sources _other_ than Bond.

>Bond Johnson's _unique_ contribution to the Roswell story is not
>his verbal testimony interesting though it is, but the legacy of
>the photographs he took that afternoon.

And I would agree with this. His contribution of the
photographs, along with the printed newspaper stories and other
documentation is of great importance. His testimony has gotten
progressively more interesting, but it is in direct conflict
with what he said originally. There is no way for both versions
to be correct, and my problem is that I catch the blame for his
alteration of the facts.

>>that he saw the real debris, and
>>Ramey didn't know what it was when he was there, I don't care.

>I could "selectively" quote DuBose at this point, but I won't, I
>could selectively quote Marcel but I won't, what I will do
>though is repeat that quote from Maj Kirton who _is_ giving a
>statement from Gen Ramey to Reuters, this, some time before
>5.30pm that afternoon.

And if you did "selectively" quote either DuBose or Marcel, I
would be forced to explain why there is justification in
rejecting those quotes. The reason is simple. They are the
interpretations of those reporting them and not what the men
said themselves.

>>When you begin to suggest that I have altered the information,
>>that I have inaccurately reported information that is backed up
>>by audio tape and other evidence, then I take a stand. Like it
>>or not, Dr. Johnson told me one thing and told others something
>>else. His spin is not going to change the facts, on tape. Listen
>>to them if you want, but don't suggest, even as carefully as you
>>have here that I might have altered things because I edited a
>>tape for time to assist Dr. Johnson in understanding that he
>>actually said the things he denies saying.

>I agree the comment was uncalled for, again accept my apology.

Certainly, you are most gracious.

>And I would be happy to review your material, the Uni address
>below will find me.

I realize that this debate is "off topic" for you, and I simply
want you to hear Dr. Johnson say, himself, the very things that
he denies, to learn that I did not call him cold, that I have
not altered the tapes, and that I tried to straighten this whole
thing out. I appreciate it that you will take you time to do so.
The tapes and other documents will be sent on the next few days.

My best

KRandle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: T Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 07:56:38 -0500
Subject: Re: T Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>ET via space travel is the simplest to explain truly
>>unexplainable sightings which include observations of structured
>>objects.

>Bruce,

>"Simple" if you can point to non-UFO, mainstream science data in
>support of same. But science itself has none to offer.

You don't understand (or I don't understand... someone here doesn't understand)... Mainstream science says , "Space Travel, yes!" It is not a conceptually difficult extrapolation beyond what we already can do to image taking long trips in space... So it might takes years, decades, millenia to get somewhere. The argument against is not based on physics but sociology or "what people would or wouldn't want to do." The arguments about the physics of space travel have already been presented here ad nauseum... in 10/100/1000/ 10000/100000/1000000, etc. years we will be able to do X, where X is "fast space travel" or space travel in which the travelers age hardly at all , etc. So please don't say "science has non to offer" regarding ET/space travel. (And note developments as recent as the last few weeks in which more planets are found and evidence of organic molecules in spaces, life on Mars, etc... indicating tha there probably is life "out there.")

>To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>his country, as well as every other country in the world.

What you are doing is putting the cart before the horse... or trying to... by saying science has no support for ET type space travel and therefore ufologists resort to UFO data to prove ET space travel is possible. Actually, one can argue for space travel without resort to UFO sightings... and numerous conventional but forward thinking scientists have already done that. (One "forward thinking" individual is Robert Forward... who has argued for zero point energy as a source of "fuel" for space travel... if I recall correctly.)

As for the "resort to one of the three" arguments you mention: actually, I resort to all three arguments ... not to explain space travel, but to explain why the available UFO evidence is effectively ignored by mainstream science. I add another:

4) Self-Cover Up: the implications of True UFO sightings... ET craft or whatever... are so overwhelming as to make people try to ignore it... wish it away (I wish UFOs would go away)... because it (a) represents a loss of status for mankind in the universe, or (b) introduces (another) uncertainty into our lives or (c) makes us feel uncomfortable or (d) makes us angry or (e) has no direct impact on the lives of most of us or (f) a combination of the preceding a - e.

Years ago Hynek stayed at my house... I think in 1980 at the time of the Smithsonian UFO debate. I asked him how he managed to live a "normal" life knowing what he did about UFOs and he said something like, "I live every day as if this weren't real."

Even Hynek bought into the "self cover up"... but with more sophistication than the average self-cover-upper (average person).

"If it isn't kicking me in the rear, don't bother me about it" is the attitude of most people and scientists add another reason for ignoring: "It can't be, therefore it isn't" (Hynek, in his book The UFO Experience)

>>Of course, if there are no such reports (all misidentifications, >>hoaxes or delusions), then there is no point in making any ET >>argument. (I note that Dennis still hasn't responded to my query >>as to whether or not he accepts ANY sighting as unexplained and >>truly unexplainable.)

Now we get to the starting point for this whole discussion:

>Of course there are reports. I accept many of them as >unexplained and unexplainable -- by their very nature.

Aha! Then we have a reason to discuss the ET hypothesis and any others with Dennis... without feeling that he is merely humoring us. (Lots of scientists are willing to discuss the ET hypothesis as a potentiality without any grounding in reality... i.e., as if there were no UFO sightings.)

>I accept >my own sighting as inherently unexplainable, if for no other >reason than that I will never be able to acquire all the >relevant data regarding same. It will be forever and always >unexplainable, yea, verily, and amen. At the same time, there is >nothing inherent to the sighting itself that could ever be >hauled into court (scientific or otherwise) in support of the ET >hypothesis, other than as one hypothesis among many.

Fine. You had a sighting. I do not know the description of your sighting, but I do see that you place it into the Insufficient Information category... is this because there really is insufficient information or because you just don't want to take the "next step" and propose what it was? You indicate that it is unexplained... that means there must be sufficient information available to you to allow you to reject all conventional explanations (bird, placem, superman, etc.) But in order for this to be true there must be some characteristic(s) of the thing seen (shape, color, dynamics, brightness, etc... depending upon day, night, distance, etc.) which provide evidence against conventional explanations. As a simple and much argued example of such a characteristic let's consider Arnold and the pelicans: Arnold's clear description of the objects he saw indicated that they reflected the sun very brightly (or were light sources themselves). This one characteristic by itself is sufficient to rule out (gulp) pelicans (regardless of the comments by ornithologists). Similarly, the speed measured by Arnold is enough to rule out jet aircraft of the day and also meteors.

True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft... but they prove something about the objects (according to Arnold they appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces, speeds beyond anything we had achieved). One thing they prove to me is that OI/NHI were involved (Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences). In other words, these weren't "creations" of "dumb" (unintelligent) nature but rater manufactured objects... but we didn't manufacture them.

So, now that I have given an example of how characteristics of the reported phenomenon can be used to at least make a guess as to the nature of the origin of a phenomenon (object), what say you, Dennis?

What characteristic(s) demonstration it was unexplained and unexplainable and what are the implications of these characteristics... NHI? ET? Time travel? Or you don't want to take the next step beyond....

>>However, I can understand your inferred pleading: why hasn't a saucer had an "Ubatuba problem" (explosion) over a city?

>Thank you. Not all ufologists can.

>>The way I see it, the real problem is, is there any evidence of Other Intelligences (OI) or Non-Human Intelligence (NHI) involved, regardless of where it came from.

>As evidenced by what?

Characteristics of the observed phenomena/objects/craft. See above.

>>Ponder this: is there any case which anyone here dares to claim is unexplainable, period. If so, then we can argue over whether or not it represents OI/NHI.

>Yes, see above. So what? No, we can't -- unless you want to argue about everything else it might represent.

Sure, why not. What are the characteristics of the phenomenon? Odd shape? High speed? Instantaneous appearance or disappearance? Creatures "walking through walls?"

>>This, of course, gets us back to ground zero... but what so many "newbies" don't understand is that after all these years we are still at ground zero at least as far as the scientific community, and to a large extent the public at large, is concerned

>Arguably because no UFO evidence has ever broken through the theoretical threshold of containment and cover up. Yes, the ultimate vessel of containment is "self-cover up."

>Think of it as a nice pillow to fall back on. When the evidence itself doesn't convince, then the Government must be to blame (sorta like the budget data).

>Personally, having invested heavily in stocks based on ET technology recovered at Roswell (computer chips, fiber optics, Kevlar, etc.), I tend to fault Alan Greenspan for everything. >I suspect he's the current head of MJ-12.

>But I can't wait for the Missile Defense IPO.

>Anticipated stock symbol: STWRS

I know what you mean. The NASDAQ ride over the last 15 months has clearly been from outerspace to here... wherever "here" is (and I don't want to be here... I'd rather be back in space!).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Protocols Plus - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:22:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 07:58:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Protocols Plus - Maccabee

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Protocols Plus
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 20:46:01 -0600

>List,

>While I'm at it, let me take this opportunity to profusely thank
>ebk for the privilege, platform and spectacle he provides us
>all, whether it be:

I'll second that.

Where's the Crown Royal?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/02/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 10:32:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:00:42 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/02/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 2, 2001

**BUSH REORGANIZES NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
**ASHCROFT ON POLYGRAPH TESTING
**CHINA VIEWS HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE U.S.

BUSH REORGANIZES NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

President Bush has placed his imprint on the structure of national security decision making with the issuance of his first National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD-1). The closely held document has not been formally released, but a copy was obtained by Secrecy News.

The new Directive preserves the NSC Principals Committee and the NSC Deputies Committee, which are the top-level interagency forums for deliberation on national security policy. But it abolishes President Clinton's system of Interagency Working Groups.

To replace them, the Directive establishes eleven Policy Coordination Committees (PCCs) on topics including Proliferation, Counterproliferation, and Homeland Defense; Intelligence and Counterintelligence; Counter-Terrorism and National Preparedness; and Records Access and Information Security.

(The word "counter-terrorism" is hyphenated in the Directive, but "counterproliferation" and "counterintelligence" are not.)

As a consequence of the new Directive, much of the Clinton Administration's prodigious security policy apparatus will be swept away, though portions of it will be reconstituted within the new Policy Coordination Committee framework. Thus, the functions of the Security Policy Board will be distributed among the new PCCs.

The new series of National Security Presidential Directives will replace both the presidential decision directives and the presidential review directives of past Administrations.

Although NSPD-1 is unclassified, the Bush Administration has declined to release it. But a copy of the seven page directive, obtained from a public-spirited source, is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/nspd-1.htm>

ASHCROFT ON POLYGRAPH TESTING

Attorney General John Ashcroft gave a qualified endorsement to polygraph testing at the FBI at a press conference yesterday.

"It's my understanding that there have been cases in the past that polygraphing did not work on. I think you could name them. So the polygraph is not a sure way. The polygraph is said to

have about 15 percent false positives and has an impact on the way an agency operates," he said.

"Nevertheless, I believe that there are applications for polygraph that are important, and the director and I have agreed that because of the national security involved and the risks involved and the very important consequences of breaches, that we should elevate the use of polygraph in certain cases as it relates to the Bureau."

His remarks on polygraph testing and the Hanssen case are posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/ag030101.html>

CHINA VIEWS HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE U.S.

The United States has no right to regard itself as "the arbiter of human rights throughout the world," complained China in response to the U.S. State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2000, released last week.

"Through distortions and fabrications, [the U.S. State Department] gathered human rights offenses against over 190 countries and regions in the world, including China, and falsely accused these countries and regions of certain abuses," the Chinese State Council Information Office in Beijing said. "However, the US report on human rights around the world completely avoided and had nothing to say about the United States' own human rights situation."

To remedy this omission, the Chinese government prepared its own Report on "The US Human Rights Record in 2000."

The Chinese report includes some allegations that are fanciful, such as the claim that the US has violated an international covenant against advocacy of racial or religious hatred "by selling or allowing the sale of Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler's notorious anti-Semitic autobiography, ever since 1933.... It is estimated that at least 300,000 copies of the book have been sold over the past 20 years, generating \$300,000 to \$700,000 in profits."

Other allegations are harder to dispute, including critiques of violence in American society and of the role of money in political affairs. Overall, the report offers a salutary insight into the views of a foreign observer of the United States.

The text of the February 27 report, translated by the CIA's Foreign Broadcast Information Service, is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2001/03/china-rights.html>

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

The Earth As A Sphere?

From: **Matt Hurley** <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:02:20 -0500
Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?

Hi List,

I recently came across this painting :

<http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who resurrected this idea.

Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

Matt

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Lakenheath - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 16:52:07 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:09:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Hale

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:02:44 -0000

>Hi Roy,

>No problems experienced with the excellent service, just a small
>minority of the 'users'!

>"The Skeptick doth neither affirm, neither denie any position;
>but doubteth of it." --Sir Walter Raleigh

Hi,

I try to respect my opponents argument' it makes my debating
even more rigourous.

Roy..

" Life exists in the universe only because the carbon atom
possesses certain exceptional properties."

James Jeans - English Astronomer, Physicist, Mathematician.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 01:35:36 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:17:56 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:07:44 -0800

>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 12:47:34 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Roger wrote:

>>First off you are the biggest defender of Ray, despite his
>>track record of deception and avoidance of responsibility
>>regarding AA. I think 'exonerate' is a pretty good description.
>>Second off I don't think you understand: Ray is not pushing
>>your efforts in any way. He has made it clear that he does not
>>>want to be bothered with your investigations.

>>Doesn't that, in itself, tell you something?

>Roger,

>Yes, It tells me that he cannot support me in any substantial
>way. It doesn't mean that he wouldn't if he could. My feeling,
>from the little that I know him and I admit I don't know him
>well, is that his hands are tied. >Snip

>>I produced a very silly feature film
>>called 'Forever Evil' with over 30 actors that ran 120 minutes
>>back in 1987. It was shot on 16mm film, played on USA twice that
>>I know of and is still available on VHS from VCI Home Video.

>>120 minutes, Ed. That's two hours. And the total budget was only
>>\$120,000. I am not saying that this film was any good; more to
>>the point it was not. But it had mucho special make-up effects
>>that were on par with anything seen in AA.

>No, No, No! The only metallurgist to view the debris stated
>flatly that there was not a single method known to metallurgy
>that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!

Ed,

The bottom line is the "metallurgist" based his opinion on
"seeing" the footage, rather than actually touching and making
an examination of actual debris. Since you are the one promoting
this as fact, why don't you go out and get a number of opinions
from a number of expert "metallurgist's" and see what they say?
You might be surprised to find out that a number of
metallurgists disagree with your one dude.

>And if a person could find a way to do it, then they would make
>far more \$\$\$\$ by making real products. Have you read the
>"Discussion the Debris" in Flatland?

>The debris certainly was not on a par with anything you
>produced. Can you show or tell the List how the debris could be
>made? No. Why? Because you haven't viewed the AA footage with a

>critical eye. And that's just the debris. How about the
>creature? Do you think you could produce something on a "par"
>with it? You need to find a way to open the AA Cds. Then you
>won't make these mistaken judgments about the quality of the AA
>footage.

I don't have any doubts that a hollywood FX type artist could
have made something like that.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 13:07:47 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:21:46 -0500
Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Stacy

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>To: Errol Bruce-Knapp <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 13:32:11 -0500

<snip>

>Never thought I'd see that around here....this far up north! It
>was cool. Wish I had a picture.

>Michel

That's because we're a cool country!

Saw the Roswell UFO U-Haul truck here in San Antonio
last week. Gets your attention, all right.

Dennis

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Andy Roberts Suspension From UpDates

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:41:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 08:41:42 -0500
Subject: Andy Roberts Suspension From UpDates

From: Moderator UFO UpDates - Toronto

>From: Andy Roberts <AndyRoberts@ancientassociates.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 18:44:47 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:10:54 EST
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Pilgrims,

>As my last message to Updates was censored without permission
>or notification you may not be reading what I actually wrote(!).
>These are clearly a sign of the times we live in on Updates.
>But Brad Sparks mentioned my name and thus won
>tonights star prize - a response.....

Since Mr. Roberts has recently demonstrated that he is incapable of maintaining a degree of civility in his posts to UFO UpDates and now claims 'censorship' of rudeness in recent submissions.....

Mr. Roberts is suspended from UFO UpDates for a month. Should he so desire, he may re-apply for a subscription on April 1st, 2001.

Errol Bruce-Knapp
Moderator/Operator
UFO UpDates - Toronto

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 14:47:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:17:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Velez

>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:46:23 EST
>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 15:43:17 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001

><snip>

>>>One area on Mars where there are strong indications of
>>>intelligent life is the area known as Cydonia. The famous face
>>>on Mars is in the Cydonia area and can possibly be explained
>>>away as a trick of nature,

>>I don't think it's as much a "trickery of Nature" as it is of
>>the Human Mind. I think the tubular structures that appear to
>>contain a large 'metallic looking' sphere, (that Arthur C. Clarke
>>has recently raised public questions about,) are much more
>>compelling scientifically than the so called Face. Which I
>>think is more a 'trick of Mind' than Nature.

Hi George, hi All,

You wrote:

>Perhaps because I'm looking for life, I see it. I certainly
>could be wrong, but nature seems to operate in certain ways, and
>I know of know place any where like Cydonia.

"Be it ever so humble, there's no place like Cydonia," I like
it! Has a definite 'ring' to it. ;) B.B.King used to sing an old
song about it. Oh, wait a minute, that was "Caledonia!" I
wonder if the Face has "Big Feets" like Caledonia. <LOL>

>I have been trying to obtain data on the size of the tunnel like
>structures on Mars? Do you happen to know their size? Even a
>good estimate?

That's one of the problems George. (And one of the components of
A.C. Clarke's inquiry about the "glass worms" to NASA.) I
'think' the camera's onboard the craft are able to resolve
ground details down to 50/60 feet or so. (Not sure) If that is
the case we are looking at structures that are well within the
camera's resolution range. Which makes them enormous structures.
That silvery looking sphere inside the tubes must be an
-awesome- sight up close.

>>* George, you're a MUFON director, have you heard -anything-
>>at all about the headquarters investigation into the John
>>Carpenter (sale of abductee files) business? I'm both curious
>>and trying to do a follow up. It's been awhile since we've
>>heard anything new about their "internal investigation."

>Sorry I really don't know anything about John Carpenter's
>situation. Since no one other than the editor and the director
>is paid by MUFON, its tough to criticize people who have done

>major work and look for some kind of remuneration.

Geez George, it's okay for people to eat and make a living. But the 'how' of it becomes an issue when it is the privacy and anonymity of others that is 'on the block.' He didn't sell his own story, he sold everybody else's, and without informing them, securing their permission, or ever providing them with any assurances that all personal information had been properly redacted from the copies that were sold to Bigelow. And because Carpenter was the head of the MUFON Abduction Databank, the question arises if any of those files were 'acquired' for sale to Bigelow privately. Unless MUFON conducts a thorough internal inventory and checks it against the list of files that were sold by JC, they, the public, and the contributors to the databank will never know.

>'NIDS frequently asks me for info, but never pays me.

Attach a 'bill' next time you submit anything. Apparently there is a lot of \$\$\$ to be had if you have the "right stuff."

>Apparently, all the other abductee researchers like John Mack, >Jacobs, get paid by various organizations. I'm unaware if some >kind of confidential trust was broken. I guess that what they >are looking at.

Again, if the files have been properly sanitized, and the subjects of the files have given their permission/been informed, then, no hay problema. Without those assurances and a show of respect for the rights of the individuals involved, all we have is gross violation of ethics, trust, and the privacy of those witnesses.

I shudder to think that every case that walks through their collective doors (Carpenter, Mack, Jacobs, Hopkins, Smith,) all end up in Bigelow's filing cabinet. At \$200. a pop that can be a pretty lucrative little business.

Under those circumstances, being a strong public proponent for belief in abductions would be most self serving. Not to mention fatten the hell out of the old bank account. Every time an 'abductee' walked in you'd hear a loud, "Kaching!" as the cash register rings. Like doctors who use patients to bilk the insurance companies out of millions. It's not an uncommon or unheard of practice.

This is an important issue not be taken lightly or blown off. A lot of people _and_ their families and careers are involved/ at stake. I figure that speaking up for the rights of the abductees and their families that are involved is speaking up and fighting for my own rights. I am an abductee. What happens to them, happens to me.

This issue may be gone from public view/awareness, but it has not been forgotten.

Regards,

John Velez, i812

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's 'Tunnel'

From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:21:27 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's 'Tunnel'

3-2-01

THE CYDONIAN IMPERATIVE

Hoagland's "Tunnel": Geology, Biology, or Technology?

by Mac Tonnies

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of many. Interestingly enough, similar "ribbed" structures can be found in Cydonia. Is this evidence of technology, biology, or geology?

The anomalous Martian "tunnel" (or "worm") discovered by Richard Hoagland and documented on his Enterprise Mission website has enjoyed increased attention after Arthur C. Clarke cited it as evidence of possible life. Life or not, the "worm" remains unexplained, and poses challenging issues for researchers entertaining the idea of a prior technological civilization on the Red Planet.

Whatever the "tunnel" is, it's enormous: a seemingly translucent cylindrical formation resting in a gouge in the Martian surface, giving the impression of a subterranean "pipe." And it might be just that: in Hoagland's scenario, the worm, and other features of the same description, comprise the remains of an intricate water-channeling system comparable to the infamous "canals" described by astronomer Percival Lowell in the 19th century.

If ruin-like complexes such as the one in Cydonia are indeed fragments of a long-vanished Martian civilization, then the "tubes" could have served as a sort of aquatic infrastructure, transferring water from permafrost and lake regions to Martian "cities." This scenario is particularly Bradburian in its portrayal of Mars as a dying world, inhabited by beings dependent on an insulated water supply in the face of postulated temperature changes, atmospheric thinning, and meteor bombardment. (In the book "The Mars Mystery," Graham Hancock suggests that Mars' atmosphere was blasted into space after the impact that produced the vast Helles Planitia basin, erasing most of any planetwide civilization that might have existed.)

Hoagland also speculates that the alleged "tunnel system" could have been used to transport goods: the "tunnel," or "worm," might be a derelict Martian Autobahn.

Ruling out a geological interpretation for the time being I (and none have been forthcoming from NASA officialdom), the "tunnel" may also represent simple Martian life: a literal "worm" of unlikely dimensions (the monsters of Frank Herbert's cult classic science fiction novel "Dune" come immediately to mind). The image captured by the Mars Global Surveyor may show a giant fossil of some sort (although the apparent reflective sphere inside of the structure implies an even more exotic explanation.

Could the "worm" be an example of existing Martian life? The likelihood is extremely low, but is within our ability to test:

future images of the same region will show us if the "sandworm" has changed position or moved in a manner consistent with living organisms. For example, if the unknown object in the "worm's" "throat" is a bolus of some kind, we might reasonably expect to see it in a different position (if it is indeed being "digested" or transported from one end of the apparent tube to another). John Velez, posting on "UFO UpDates," astutely notes that the arched "rings" that constitute the "worm's" segments seem to be the widest where the mystery object is lodged, almost as if the rings are flexible and capable of a form of peristalsis.

Of course, this trait may also be interpreted in technological terms. Hoagland and Mike Bara, for example, propose that certain ambiguous features on Mars may indicate "organic technology." If the "worm" is an automaton of some kind, one cannot help but wonder if it was used for something other than a transportation conduit or pipeline. Maybe, in an attempt to "terraform" Mars after the disaster that killed the planet's oceans and atmosphere, the always-hypothetical Martians made use of giant organic or cybernetically contrived soil-processing machines. This is obvious speculation, but not nearly as bizarre as it seems; the concept of self-replicating machines (i.e. mobile "greenhouse gas factories") have been a staple interest among groups wanting to "thaw" Mars into a habitable world for eventual human colonization.

Arthur C. Clarke's speculation aside, the hypothesis that the "worm" is a geological oddity remains in contention, although what processes could have produced such an apparent glassine, arched structure remain undetermined. If geological, I suspect the "worm's" origins are volcanic (extreme heating and flow might somehow conspire to create the transparent walls through some rare form of vitrification). But given the evidence and noted lack of insight on behalf of planetary geologists, an exotic (i.e. technological or biological) explanation is the most tempting--and perhaps even the most plausible.

The "tunnel's" implications, seen in light of the Artificiality Hypothesis, are nothing less than remarkable. The "tunnel" is an ideal example of an anomalous Martian surface feature that demands closer investigation. Even scientists who refuse to entertain the "Face" because of the pervading notion that "one sees what one wants to see" (neatly summed up by Carl Sagan in his comparison to human faces in eggplants and nachos) wouldn't necessarily rock the anthropocentric boat by conceding possible artificiality.

-end-

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Bug in Big Balloon

From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 15:58:02 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:23:33 -0500
Subject: Bug in Big Balloon

NASA Aborts Space Research Balloon Flight

NASA scientists are working to determine why the maiden flight of a giant research balloon designed to fly around the world at the edge of space was cut short, but are already looking into the possibility of flying a backup balloon.

"A team is reviewing data from the flight and examining the recovered balloon, said Steve Smith, Chief of the Balloon Program Office at Wallops Flight Facility. Smith said a recommendation is expected in the next few days concerning the possible flight of a backup balloon that NASA has available in Alice Springs. "We are confident in the ULDB concept and in providing scientists with a new means of studying the Earth and space," he said.

After developing a leak, the test mission of the Ultra-Long Duration Balloon (ULDB) was terminated a little more than 4 hours into the flight. The large scientific balloon lifted off February 25 from Alice Springs, Australia. The ULDB reached an altitude of nearly 85,000 feet before the decision was made to bring the balloon and its payload down.

For complete details, go to:

<ftp://ftp.hq.nasa.gov/pub/pao/pressrel/2001/01-028.txt>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:09:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:25:40 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:33:47 -0000

>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:02:18 -0000

>>>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 00:20:35 -0600

>>Of course, there have been reports of "samples" of whatever is
>>being observed, as well as landing traces, etc. Somehow all said
>>cases seem to get messed up of covered up or whatever. I am
>>reminded of the metal particles supposedly found in the Zamora
>>case. Or the chemical changes in soil in the DELphos Kansas
>>ring, or reports of "angel hair," Trans-en-Provence changes in
>>chlorophyll (suggesting some weird radiation), and, of course,
>>optical (photos) and radar data.

>Hi,

>I think the problem is that physical evidence cases tend not to
>prove (or even particularly to support) the ETH.

Hi Jenny,

In the Debbie Kauble case (Intruders) soil samples were obtained and tested that proved to have been baked at impossibly hot temperatures (1000+ degrees) in highly 'localized' areas, (where grass and ground outside the immediate perimeter were apparently completely unaffected!) and, in conjunction with a close-up "UFO" sighting/encounter/contact. Debbies neighbors witnessed the "UFOs" (which they declare in testimony given to Budd while he was out there formally investigating the case and interviewing all concerned parties.)

Debbie and her mother saw a UFO. Close-up. Debbie's neighbors -also- saw and reported a "UFO" leaving from the vicinity of Debbie's yard. There were also 'electrical' effects reported by the neighbors. The ground underneath the 'object' (whatever it was) was baked at a 1000+ degrees. It was so dehydrated that it would not absorb moisture, (water would 'bead' up on it) and nothing was able to grow on it for almost 5 years. The grass surrounding the area began to grow at twice the rate of the rest of the (unaffected) lawn. The streak on the ground coincided with the path of the departing 'craft' as per the testimony of Debbie, her mom, and three of her neighbors. (Not to mention the lab results confirming that something unusual had affected the area.)

UFOs, baked ground, multiple witnesses, what's a poor boy to think. At that point in the game, "ET" becomes just as real a possibility and worthy of consideration as any other more prosaic possibility. You make it sound like it's such a 'stretch.'

Sometimes, "a cigar is just a cigar" Jenny. <LOL>;)

Chances are; it isn't people from our own government out scaring the bejesus out of housewives in their mid-western backyards because there's nothing better to do. "We" don't have the kind of technology that these folks witnessed and reported. (That we 'know of' anyway)

Debbie claims she was abducted by non-human beings that night and that she was taken on board a UFO. Her dog, also in the vicinity of the "UFO" died shortly thereafter from a combination of mysterious fevers, open sores, and there was sudden and dramatic hair loss in the animal. I've seen the photos. I don't think it's terribly far fetched to consider the possibility of 'ET' at all. Under certain circumstances it is not the "stretch" you paint it to be.

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Canadian UFO Reports Up 2% Last Year

From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:24:27 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:30:45 -0500
Subject: Canadian UFO Reports Up 2% Last Year

Canadian UFO Reports Up 2% Last Year, Says National Study

<http://farshores.topcities.com/farshores/ufocan02.htm>

Canadian UFO Reports Up 2% Last Year, Says National Study

There were 2% more UFO reports filed in Canada in 2000 than 1999, according to the findings of a national study released today.

"We found a slight increase over the year before," says Chris Rutkowski, editor of the study. "There were 263 UFO sightings reported in Canada in 2000, about 11% more than the average recorded since 1989 when we began compiling this data."

Rutkowski is research coordinator for Ufology Research of Manitoba (UFOROM), a civilian group that gathers and studies UFO reports made to Canadian volunteer civilian groups and government agencies. UFOROM has been publishing an annual survey of Canadian UFO sightings since 1989 and has accumulated almost 3,000 Canadian UFO cases since the beginning of the last decade. They look at details such as where a UFO was seen, the time of day, its colour, shape and observed behaviour.

Other findings of the 2000 study:

In 2000, more UFOs were reported in the late summer and early fall than any other time of the year.

About 13% of all UFO reports were unexplained. This percentage of unknowns falls to about 5% when only high-quality cases are considered.

UFO incidents usually have more than one witness; in fact, most UFO sightings have two witnesses, meaning that sightings can usually be corroborated by someone else.

The typical UFO sighting lasted between five and eight minutes in 2000, giving witness enough time to get a good look at what they were seeing.

Most UFOs were reported in western and northern Canada, including the Yukon.

"We're not saying that aliens are invading Canada, only that people continue to report UFOs quite regularly," explains Rutkowski. "Most UFOs have simple explanations, but the unexplained ones are still interesting, although not necessarily from Mars. Report numbers are increasing, even though in this advanced technological age, science tells us that UFOs aren't real."

He adds: "This research will allow scientists to be better informed concerning the actual characteristics of a popular social phenomenon that is pervasive in our culture."

For further information, contact:

Chris Rutkowski, editor, e-mail: rutk-@cc.umanitoba.ca or phone:

204-269-7553

Geoff Dittman, data analysis, e-mail: gdit-@autobahn.mb.ca

The study is available online at:

<http://www.geocities.com/aristotl.geo>

Story originally published by UFO Research of Manitoba
News Release - February 27 2001

Alfred Webre Vancouver, BC

EcoNews Service

<http://www.ecologynews.com>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

'UFO Clue' To Balloon Flight Flop?

From: Diane Harrison - Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 07:53:23 +1100
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:12:40 -0500
Subject: 'UFO Clue' To Balloon Flight Flop?

UFO clue balloon flight flop

By Glenn Morrison

Centralian Advocate, Friday, March 2nd 2001 page 5

An Alice Springs Video enthusiast thinks he may have some clues on what forced NASA's \$2,8 million balloon down to earth on Sunday. He has captured footage of NASA's ill-fated balloon flight showing a second mysterious object moving close to the balloon. NASA scientist have no explanation for why the balloon launched just before 9am on Sunday, developed a leak forcing a landing near Hermannsburg only hours later. The amateur camera man who wished to remain nameless, was enjoying a quiet Sunday at home when the balloon was first launched. He said: "I went out on my patio with a coffee when I noticed the balloon on the south-west. "I grabbed my video and filmed it about 9am, then about 10.am I decided to roll some more footage. "I thought the altitude of the balloon at that time was about 60,000 (18km) when I noticed the intruder and caught it's movements on film. The man who has extensive flying experience, then used binoculars to track the movements of the unidentified object.

Bright

He described two other similar bright objects which descended vertically into his field of view also moving in both vertical and horizontal directions over the next 45 minutes. The objects appeared with the balloon near it's maximum height, around 23km to high for all but a handful to military aircraft according to NASA scientist Danny Ball. But Mr Ball who viewed the footage on Tuesday thought it was nothing to get excited about. He said: "It's clear to me that it's the tow balloon. "We inflated a smaller balloon to hold the top plate up while we inflated the bigger balloon. "It went up 30 minutes before the big one. "All the movement he is seeing is an optical illusion created by Distance." "I wish it was little green men, it would explain a few things." But the cameraman is adamant. He said: "The biggest factor is the movement. "If all that movement was going on for three separate balloons why isn't the big balloon moving as well. And Bureau of Meteorology technical observer Alan Deane agrees. He released a large weather balloon from the airport site only two minutes after the NASA balloon. He said: "A balloon wouldn't be moving around like that.

Moving

"Winds were fairly steady all the way up." That leaves the identity of the bright moving object a mystery. But the not-to-be-swayed cameraman remained philosophical about the possibility of alien spacecraft. "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion. "It's a topic of conversation that's for sure.

Thank you Matt Pearce for faxing this article and thank you Keith Douglass for Scanning it. I have placed it on the web for all to view.

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Labels And Communication

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:17:57 -0500
Subject: Labels And Communication

Since we all tend to throw labels around rather loosely, sometimes as epithets, I suggest we discuss the meaning of recurring terms so that we can better understand each other and facilitate communication. (In the political world it's liberal, conservative, radical, middle-of-the-road, anarchist, libertarian, etc.)

I would like to see discussion of what you (each of us) means when we label someone as being (in relation to the UFO subject) a:

- (1) skeptic
- (2) believer
- (3) debunker
- (4) scoffer
- (5) apologist
- (6) advocate
- (7) choose your own label

When I hear the term "debunker" or "scoffer," I tend to think of Donald Menzel, Phil Klass, James Oberg...

The term "skeptic" to me is rather sacrosanct because of my philosophical training (though I realize most people don't use the term in the traditional philosophical sense).

To me it is an honorable term to describe critical-minded scholars who doubt, but investigate and don't scoff or debunk. (To me, that definitely excludes 95% of CSICOP.) I think of Jan Aldrich, Dennis Stacy, Jenny Randles, and even myself (except that I have become convinced of the probable explanation) as being skeptics.

There is a lot of room for misunderstanding and friction when we use these terms carelessly and think that we all mean the same thing, which obviously we don't. And often when we use the terms, they are intended to be an insult, or at least to have strong negative connotations.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 17:53:52 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:23:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:00 EST
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
>>Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

>Diane, Bryan, List:

>Compliments on an informative collection on info. Too often what
>we see is only fragmentary and pretty useless to make a
>judgement

>>On Friday evening of 23 February 2001, at 10.45 pm at Collaroy
>>NSW - a large, reddish object with a glowing red hemispherical
>>base and a "dark, unlit, castle-like upper section" passed from
>>west to east, then out to sea before disappearing several
>>kilometers offshore

>Could you provide more information about the "hemispherical"
>object? What was the orientation of the hemisphere, in other
>words, was the rounded part of the hemisphere facing down or up?

Hola Young Bob, hi All,

Bob writes:

>I wonder if this might have been a parachute?

Hmmm...

In which case the "castle" would have been the 'cargo/passenger'
and would have appeared on the bottom of the hemisphere and
not on top as reported. Unless there are parachutes that have
structures on top that beg the description of a "castle." Is
there such an animal?

I always think of 'chutes in the traditional hemispheric-shape
or those more modern, rectangular wing shaped jobs. I've never
seen a chute that could be described as a "castle" on top of a
hemisphere though. Any 'skydivers' out there?

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but

the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 18:02:48 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:27:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Posting Protocol - Lehmborg

>Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 17:48:32 +0000
>From: dddddDon Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Posting Protocol

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Posting Protocol
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 18:53:27 -0600

<snipped>

>>Remember -- this is a man who uses a bathroom, and I don't
>>mean that in a good way! Watch the North! Fear Canada!

>You betcha-Yankeeman.

The only thing I'd bet on is that you'd bring a knife to a gun fight, you "eh" sayin' northern wisp of a flatulent fascist! I wouldn't ordinarily resort to name calling but you provoked me -- sitting up there in your fetid muk-luks and trap-door flannel jammies, sneering at the moral superiority of the envied south... <pant..wheeze> trading with Castro as you try to trap your neighbors with UFO chicanery. Satan spawn!

>We have a secret weapon up here called a
>cold front which we send down there periodically. Course we
>suffer with it too - but we're immune and we withhold it during
>the summer months. For a mere 25 percent of your gross national
>product - we can be reasoned with.

We're not above nuking you, you know. Don't think we won't. We kept Stalin in line with that, eventuality, for years. All those decades fearing the Russians when the real enemy lurked across an open border to the North... The horror.

>Inquiries should be directed through the literary tyrant
>himself the EBKster.

Ha! Like I'd be giving him any ammunition.

>ddddddDon Ledger

Forget the sky! Watch the North! Keep your eyes on the North! Don't be fooled by their ufological hoo-hah and folksy manners! Petition Congress to declare a state of war, and nuke 'em till we have to sell 'em ICE. It's the only way to be sure.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

>~0~

EXPLORE Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/witches/237/lehmborg.html>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail.

\$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:40:40 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:32:12 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:01 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ed,

>Can you provide the name of the metallurgist and info about
>where the List could view his written report as to how he
>determined, through metallurgy that is, that something he
>saw in a movie could not have been produced by any known
>process.

A DISCUSSION OF THE DEBRIS
m. Dennis

The following are my observations on the "Santilli Alien Dissection Film"; specifically the "Debris" footage portion. The "Santilli" footage is either a scripted fictional film or a documentation of a real event. Some of my observations are based on the assumption that the "debris" is real and some are based on the assumption that the film was hoaxed.

I have a degree in Marine Diving Technology from Santa Barbara City College. My commercial diving experience was geared toward the offshore oil industry. One of my skills as a diver was welding. This involved stick arc, brazing, MIG (Metal Inert Gas), resistance, friction and TIG (Tungsten Inert Gas) processes. I've welded materials as thin as 1/16 inch aluminum and laid down welds to fillet a 3 inch steel beam. I've been taught to use metal lathes, precision grinders, milling machines and drill presses and have also taken a course on magnetic particle and ultrasonic weld inspection at the Welding Institute in Cambridge, England. My company, which I own, designs and markets studio furniture layouts to radio stations nationwide using Autocad.

The ergonomic layout of the "Panels" and the possible proof that life exists on other planets or dimensions were the original sparks that ignited my interest in this footage. While I am not a Ufologist, I have always been intrigued with UFO sighting reports and the movies they have spawned.

I-BEAMS DETAILS

An I-beam has two flanges that are connected by the web. The first anomalous detail is found at the root portions of the I-beams. The root is where the web meets the flanges at a right angle. What I do not see at these locations on the I-beams is a radius. There would be a radius at that point (the root) to prevent cracks from forming. Any material that I know of, that has a crystalline structure, will develop cracks if two planes meet at right angles. I am assuming from the appearance of the break in the I-beams that the material has a crystalline structure.

The second detail is the thickness of the web in relation to the thickness of the flanges. I have not seen an I-beam that has a

web that is as thick as these, as compared to the thickness of the flange faces. I have never seen anything that resembles the manufacturing technique used in the construction of these I-Beams. I know of no manufacturing process that could produce the multitude of details found on the I-beams.

DEBRIS MANUFACTURING OPTIONS

MILLING: Could the beams have been milled? When milling something you start with a solid block of material and remove everything except what you need. Milling would be a good option if it were not for the thinness of some of the beams and the raised letters on both sides of the beams. When milling, the cutting tool is forced against the material. If the material is thin, especially at a root, meeting at acute right angles, the force of the tool against the material will cause it to break. The raised lettering would have to be done with a very precise CNC (computer numeric control) machine. When I look at the lettering I see precise rounds as parts of the symbols. I don't think you can do this with current milling machines.

EXTRUSION: Extrusion is not a possibility because of the acute right angles of the roots and the raised lettering. There are some I-beams in the film that have more than two right angled roots. The raised lettering would be impossible.

ROLLING: Rolling isn't possible because of the acute right angle roots and raised symbols. Rolling implies that the final material shape is formed by passing hot material back and forth through rollers. If there are acute right angles, the material will break at the root during manufacturing. To form the raised symbols the hot material would have to be passed through rollers with the symbols engraved into them. This would mean you would only be allowed one pass through the rollers and you would have to keep the rollers clean through out the run. The detailed definition of the symbols would argue against this as a possibility.

MOLDING &CASTING: At first glance molding or casting would seem the only way to make the I-beams and the panels but there are a number of factors that argue against this process:the apparent lack of weight for all the pieces ; the acute right angles at the roots; the thinness of the flanges of the I-beams; and the finely detailed definition of the raised symbols. The detail of the symbols on two sides of the I-beams would mean that if the I-beams were molded or cast you would have to use a very high density material to get the detail exhibited in the raised symbols. High density means that the pieces would be much heavier than the indicated weight (the way in which the panels are handled by the soldiers). The I-beams are handled many times during the footage. One piece is even held in one hand by pinching it between the thumb and fingers. The weight of high density material would prevent this type of effortless handling. The material that the I-beams are made from appears to be very rigid and does not show any indication of bending while being handled in this manor.

LASER MILLING:. This might be a valid process to form the I-beams if it were not for the super smooth appearance on the flat surfaces. The raised symbols have many multifaceted details. These exhibit a smooth fine finish on tiny areas of their facets as well. These surfaces, including the ones in the symbols, are too smooth for laser milling.

FOAM CORE: The debris could be made from foam-core paper board to solve the weight issue, but the following facts argue against this:The symbols are present on both sides of the webbing on the I-beams; the crystalline nature of the break in the broken beams; the reflectivity of the material in the break; and the rigidity of the I-beams.

Conclusion: I do not see how the debris seen in the Santilli footage could be manufactured by any of the processes I've mentioned. If any of these processes could be made to work, or if this type of detail could be produced with some other type of process, then far more money could be made producing real products than would ever be made from an Alien Dissection hoax film.

FILM DETAILS

There is a small I-beam that has been broken. This break goes right through one of the symbols and is not straight. It would have been straight if it had not broken in the middle of one of the symbols. You can clearly see that the fracture line starts straight down the face of the web of the beam until it gets to the raised symbol. The fracture line then shifts just to the right of a raised portion of a symbol, skirts the raised portion of the symbol and then jumps back to the left and continues down to the next flange face. The path of least resistance creates these dynamics. When the fracture line encountered the raised symbol, which can be thought of as increased thickness, it shifts away from the thicker material. It is a very small detail, minute, but this is the type of detail that says this is a real manufactured I-beam. I cannot imagine someone planning to put this small detail in a hoax film.

One of the I-beams I reviewed was about 5 cm from flange to flange. This is one of the smaller I-beams. I noticed that it had a melted circular shaped puddle on the left end (it was orientated with the symbols going from left to right). I have seen this puddle shape before in melted aluminum. The thing that caught my eye was that the puddle had collapsed and the puddled area appeared thinner than the unmelted part of the I-beam in the same area. An analogy would be if you took a thin piece of Styrofoam sheet and heated the sheet with a flame just enough in one area so that the foam lost its trapped air form. When the area cooled off it would be thinner than the rest of the Styrofoam sheet (meaning lost volume in that area) but it would still weigh the same.

There are a lot of melted looking pieces of debris on the table. The large blobs of debris material seen on the table look like puddles that formed when the debris material melted. The curious thing about some of the smaller melted pieces is the shape they took after they cooled. What catches my eye is the thickness of the puddles. The surface tension was strong enough to counter gravity making some of the smaller pieces thick.

To understand what I'm saying, think of small drops of water in a clean pan. If the drops are small you'll have a fairly round droplet. But as you increase the size of the droplet by adding more fluid, it starts to flatten out and turn into a puddle because gravity pulls on the center of the droplet and forces it down. A water droplet soon turns into a thin puddle. In order to keep the appearance of the debris droplets round and thick, the material would have to have a very high surface tension or be a really light or be really viscous. There are consistent appearance characteristics in the the way these droplets melted and cooled.

There are large puddles of melted looking debris. One appears to be a melted I-beam because it has a hemispherical ridge running through the center of it. This detail matches hemispherical ridges found on the flange face of all the other I-beams. In another this ridge detail is missing.

The raised symbols indicate some type of writing. Each symbol has a myriad of detail and appears to be machine perfect. The symbols are located on the web of the I-beams and are the same symbols on both sides except they are in reverse order. I cannot think of a harder detail to undertake from a time and money standpoint if this is a hoax. The symbols do not look phony to me.

The detail that puzzles me most is the lack of mass that the panels and I-beams exhibit when they are moved. No material I have handled or seen handled that would be this light, would exhibit the properties of rigidity, reflectivity and the ability to show fine detail. I get the impression from watching the film that these things are so light that the only air resistance impedes their movement.

One soldier handles the large I -beam by squeezing the flanges between his thumb and fingers; this tells me that this I-beam is very light. Here is a problem for the hoaxer. The bigger I-beam would have to be made out of some type of foam to make it as light as it appears. Foam that is as thin as that on the large I-beam flanges would flex if it was twisted, squeezed or handled like the soldier does in the film. The material is so

reflective, any bend would be easily noticed, especially if it were pinched between two fingers at the very edge of the flange faces. This debris appears to be extremely stiff.

The panels exhibit the same weight qualities as the big I-beams. One of the interesting things about the panels is that they are all different. If they are props then the prop maker had to make three different molds, two for the undamaged panels and one for the damaged panel.

An indication that the panels could be props is that the backside of the undamaged panels were never filmed. If the panels were hollow it would make the prop maker's job much simpler. I tried to think of a test that would prove that the panels were hollow and had no back. I looked to see if the soldier's fingers curled up inside a panel as he was handling it. I viewed the footage frame by frame over and over. His fingers never seemed to go up inside the backs of the panels; in fact, I think I see just the opposite.

I did see something that I think proves that the panels have a backside that is as reflective as the front side. The shadows from the panels on the table indicate to me that there are two light sources separated by a foot or so. In one shot a soldier sets a panel down on the table. The light reflecting off the table, onto the back of the panel and then back onto the table can be seen if you look closely. There must be a shiny surface that reflects the light from the surface of the table back down to the surface of the table. This reflecting surface must be located on the underside of the panel.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The panels with indentations for six fingered hands are the most obvious link to the dissection footage and its six-fingered creature. While the dissection shows how the bodies are put together; the debris shows the workings of the entity's mind.

I am impressed by the reflectivity of all the debris and the panels. Why would they make something so reflective? I see two initial options to explain this reflectivity. The first is that the debris material naturally happened to have a high reflectivity. The second option would be that they wanted the debris to be very reflective, so they picked a highly reflective material to make the debris.

Lets think about the second option. The creature has very large eyes and pink skin and very dark contact lenses. I am assuming that these contacts are sun glasses for a world that is brighter than its home environment. These details indicate that this creature came from somewhere with less light than our planet. What requirements might a low light environment place on a technologically advancing species? By looking closely at the panels we find that there are twenty raised buttons per hand or forty raised buttons per panel. When the hands are placed in the hand positions of the panels, there are then fourteen raised buttons in constant contact with each hand. The raised buttons are situated so that eight buttons touch the base of the fingers and the palm of the hand only. These buttons are not there to be pushed because they are situated in the palms and at the base of the fingers. If they are not there to be pushed by the hand then they must be there to push against the hand.

When we look at the I-beams we see raised symbols and keyed type detail such as the raised hemispherical ridge that runs along the middle of one of the flange faces. These details tell me that the creatures are very tactile and use a form of Braille. The panels are not only keyboards, but also appear to be a tactile interface.

A human hand is fairly sensitive and can feel something as small as .001 of an inch (.0025cm). I would guess that the creatures' hands were less sensitive than human hands. I base this opinion on the size of the panel buttons and on the size of the raised symbols on the I-beams. Compared to Braille these features appear very coarse.

The debris footage looks as if it were shot in a tent. The tent is seen to bellow in and out. The tent pole with the gas mask

hanging from it moves when the walls of the tent move. This detail would indicate the tent was setup outside and not on a sound stage.

The soldier holding the debris for the cameraman has large sweat stains around his armpits. This would tie in with the cameraman's story that states that the film was shot in the desert in the month of June.

The panels are about 1 1/2" thick, are 25" wide at the top of the panel and 20" wide at the bottom of the panel. The panels appear to be really light. My guess is that they weight less than 2 pounds. The panels have six sides. The sides are perpendicular to the top and bottom faces. The edges where the sides meet the top and bottom faces of the panels have a 3/16" quarter round radius on the edges

The panels are curved (arced) slightly in an ergonomic manner and have a skin or what might be called a shell that appears to be about 3/16" thick. This can be seen in the edge view of the broken panel. The skin of the panels appears to have a shinny metallic crystalline composition. It appears crystalline from the jagged way the panel broke.

The panels are not identical. There are (6) fingered hand indentations in the panels Hands Face. These panel indentations appear to be cast. They are not stamped because the wrist area indentation protrudes down into the bottom side. They are not milled because from the side view of the broken panel the skin appears to be a uniform thickness. I would guess that the panels are custom fitted to the individual who was to use that particular panel. The left and right hands are not the same size in a given panel. It appears that the left hand has longer fingers and a longer palm indentation than the right hand in the same panel. It appears that the left hand in the other panel also has the left hand longer than the right hand. You can also look at how close the top indentation comes to the top side of the panels. In at least two of the panels this top row left indentation is closer to the top side of the panel than the top row of the right side indentation.

The left and right hands are not symmetrical in layout of the buttons for the hands. There are four raised buttons on the panels in the palms of the hands. One button is located where the heel of human hand would be. One button is located in the center of the palm in line with the outside base of the thumb. Two buttons are in a row straddling the center of the palm and in line with the inside base of the thumb. This layout appears to be the same from hand to hand and from panel to panel. There are four raised buttons just below the point where the base of the fingers meets with the palm of the hand and there are five raised buttons, one at the tip of each of the five fingers. There appears to be different numbers of buttons in the first row arc indentation just above the finger tip indentations. I count five buttons on one in the right hand and six buttons on the left hand in one of the panels. In another panel I count six buttons in the top row on the right hand and three buttons in the top row of the left hand.

The debris materials look manufactured because they have a radius at the ends of the flanges, machine produced raised symbols, fracture lines and highly uniform reflectivity. What these small details argue for is a unique material with special properties. The material appears to melt, but it does not appear to be burnt. I do not see any oxidation on the melted material. When the material breaks, it does not bend or shatter. I do not see anything that is bent. I see only fractures along a jagged line. One puddle of material has the same reflectivity as the unmelted material. How do I know? The reflection of a man's face can be seen in this puddle.

Conclusion

The "Santilli Footage" consists of three different films that include the debris footage, the tent footage and the dissection of the creature. Every detail that is put in a hoaxed film costs money and increases the risk of exposure as a fraud. If this film were a hoax, there would be as little detail as possible. There is enough detail in the debris footage to convince me that it would be expensive to produce. If this film is a hoax, it is

well researched, elaborately scripted and therefore, an expensive undertaking.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

NASA Terminates Space Plane Project

From: **Steven L. Wilson, Sr** <Ndunlks@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 21:53:51 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:34:07 -0500
Subject: NASA Terminates Space Plane Project

Researcher Steven L. Wilson, Sr
To submit paranormal activity email Ndunlks@aol.com

NASA Terminates Space Plane Project

WASHINGTON, March 2 (Reuters) - NASA has terminated its experimental X-33 space plane project that had been envisioned as a lower-cost successor to the aging space shuttle fleet for missions into orbit, space agency officials have announced.

The X-33 program was given the ax after five years of development that never even reached the point of a test flight.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration said it spent \$912 million on the project -- hoping to create an effective new-generation reusable spacecraft to transport people and cargo into space. X-33 designer Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT.N) spent \$357 million, NASA said.

NASA also said the X-34, another, smaller suborbital test vehicle, was being killed. NASA said it is in the process of ending its X-34 contract with Orbital Sciences Corp. (ORB.N) of Dulles, Virginia.

"This has been a very tough decision but we think it is the right business decision," Art Stephenson, director of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, said in a statement on Thursday.

"We have gained a tremendous amount of knowledge from these X-programs, but one of the things we have learned is that our technology has not yet advanced to the point that we can successfully develop a new reusable launch vehicle that substantially improves safety, reliability and affordability," Stephenson added.

The Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama, managed the X-33 and X-34 programs for NASA.

In November 1999, the X-33's composite liquid hydrogen fuel tank failed during testing, the space agency said. NASA said Lockheed Martin proposed to complete development of the space plane by replacing its two composite liquid hydrogen tanks with aluminum tanks. But NASA said the benefits of testing the X-33 in flight did not justify the cost.

NASA began the X-33 program in 1996 as part of its Reusable Launch Vehicle program.

The space agency said the program called for the demonstration of a single-stage-to-orbit vehicle -- one that would go from launch stand to orbit without using multiple stages as the Saturn moon rocket did or dropping rocket motors and fuel tank like the space shuttle.

NASA said the X-33 program will end when the cooperative agreement between the space agency and Lockheed Martin expires

on March 31 unless Lockheed Martin chooses to go forward with the program with its own funds.

08:13 03-02-01

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 23:58:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:40:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 00:58:22 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01s

>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 12:19:16 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:54:46 -0600
>>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 14:16:27 -0500
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>>Previously, John wrote:

>>>>NASA makes me feel like I'm trapped in a bad B&W 'cine noir'
>>>>50's flick. What's up with that! This 2001 not 1951. Tell me
>>>>that those dolts don't have any working 'color' imaging cameras
>>>>on that craft because I have a bridge in Brooklyn that I'd like
>>>>to sell you. ;)

>>Lan replied:

>>>>The MGS low-resolution (approx. 200 meter) camera does have
>>>>color capability - sort of. It has a red filter and a blue
>>>>filter, so red and blue images can be combined into a color
>>>>image.

>>>>The problem with this is, aside from the low resolution,
>>>>that nothing like the true color of a scene can be reproduced to
>>>>any degree of certainty with only red and blue.

>>Hi, Lan, John.

>>I understand that you are talking about the specific low-rez camera of
>>the MGS. However, you give the impression that using color filters in
>>conjunction with a black and white camera will yield lower resolution
>>pictures than a color camera and this is not the case. Black and white
>>video cameras and scanners are inherently higher in resolution than
>>their color counterparts. In fact, one of the best images you can get on
>>video (next to a scanner) is to use a modern, high resolution black and
>>white CCD camera and make three passes; red, blue and green and then
>>combine them in Photoshop for use on TV productions. I do this for color
>>artwork and graphics that are too big for my scanner and the resolution
>>and color definition is far superior to that of any 3-chip color camera.
>>Of course, the subject matter must not be moving, but the results are
>>superior.

>Hello Roger, Lan, John and others:

Hiya Larry, hi All,

Larry writes:

>I think there may be another issue here, that of "bandwidth" (I
>hate the term) or file size.

Larry, it has nothing to do with 'file size.' They sent full color pictures back (in glorious detail) from Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Uranus, all of which are billions of miles farther out/away from us than Mars is. They managed to capture excellent RGB signals from the outer solar system. Why would a body as close as Mars is to us (practically on top of us in comparison to the distances were talking about to the outer solar system) suddenly present problems? Doesn't make sense. A data stream of RGB color images from Mars should be a much easier 'trick' to pull off I would think. "File size" as you put it, (signal intensity in real life) is the issue, and Mars doesn't pose a problem on that score. In terms of signal transmission, Mars is a stone throw away.

>Take any picture, say 1000 by 1000 pixels. That's a million
>pixels. In black and white (lets say 16 shades of grey from
>black up to white) we have 16 million bits of info, or 2
>megabytes.

You can ask Bruce about this Larry, but one thing I do when I want to see greater detail in a color photo is to remove all the color. Contrast is always much better, and details are 'easier' to see in the 8 grey scale shades because you remove a lot of the visual "noise" that the color information introduces. B&W makes sense in terms of resolution, but color would provide visual clues that simple B&W does not. If there are areas where some kind of ground hugging algae appears, a color image would reveal it immediately. Especially if it's anything using photosynthesis. It'll likely be green.

That impossible worm-like thingy that we've been discussing could be an electric blue with bright yellow streaks for all we know. What I would really like to know is, What is the ground level resolution of those "glass worm" pix. Does anybody know? I'm dying to know how big those things really are.

>All that has to be sent back to Earth. To avoid noise, a
>relatively slow redundant channel might be used. In short, we
>have an information bottleneck.

See above Larry. You saw Jupiter and it's moons for the first time with the rest of us in glorious color and breathtaking detail. If they can image Jupiter and get the signal back loud and clear, they can sure as hell image Mars in color too. It's all a trade off as you say anyway. Why not grab all the gusto we can get? They already spent a kazillion bux of tax payer \$, so what's another color camera gonna cost? A few million more? I'm sure it has nothing to do with not having the technology.

>Now, put this into color. How about the nice 4096 colors your
>computer screen likely can handle? Well, that's 4096 x a million
>bits..

One signal, three components, red, green, blue. They did it before from farther away, they can do it again. ;)

>Personally, I'm very glad they cast their net wide enough to
>capture images which as much as prove the recent or present
>existence of liquid water, obvious former river channels etc.

>I think that is exciting.

I want to know what you make of that impossible tubular structure and its attendant "ball" Larry. That sucker has me completely bamboozled. I have no idea what it is or could be. What do -you- make of it?

***Yoo-hoo Bob Shell, Mr. Photography Expert who has taken many pictures of 'scenes in the desert' (in the company of gorgeous women other men only dream of, I'm still willing to be your make-up man so I can powder the girls dry in between set-ups!) what do you make of these 'worm' pictures from Mars?

>The scientists are charged with getting the best science out
>of a large but not unlimited bandwidth, over the useful
>lifetime of the MGS probe. Maybe we should put ourselves in

>their shoes as a sort of thought experiment.

No thanx. I'll leave the swapping of socks and shoes to the Schmenge bros. (Old SCTV skit where the men have a tradition of swapping socks - the ones they are wearing - at the X-mas family gathering. <LOL>

What do you make of that 'worm' thingy?

Regards,

John Velez

You stand in your shoes, and I'll stand in mine. <lol>

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Crackers Steal US Space System Codes

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 21:51:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:47:25 -0500
Subject: Crackers Steal US Space System Codes

CRACKERS STEAL COMMAND & CONTROL CODES FOR US SPACE SYSTEMS

The Electric Warrior : News March 2, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0012.htm>

CRACKERS STEAL COMMAND & CONTROL CODES FOR US SPACE SYSTEMS

According to a report by Reuters news agency, crackers have stolen computer system source code deployed by the US Air Force.

A copy of the software program, developed by the US company Exigent Software Technology, was discovered last month by the FBI on the Internet Web server Freebox.com, run by a Swedish IT company.

Computer source code allows experts to determine how a software program works. The USAF Global Positioning System (GPS) is used to guide space ships, rockets and satellites.

"We couldn't get any further information about where it came from or find out if it had been copied and sent elsewhere," a lawyer for Exigent in Sweden told Reuters. "Sweden seems like a closed chapter."

Exigent said the program OS/COMET was deployed in December by the NAVSTAR Global GPS. The suspected source code theft occurred via Internet last Christmas Eve, by hackers who broke into the US Naval Research Laboratory in Washington DC.

According to UK high-tech news hounds, "Enquiries to Exigent about the matter from 'The Register' were by met by stony silence by the firm, which told us it had no comment on the subject."

RELATED RESOURCES

Rocket-Guiding Codes Stolen?
<http://www.wirednews.com/news/politics/0,1283,42139,00.html>
(Wired News/Reuters)

Crackers lift space command and control source code
<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/8/17315.html>
(The Register)

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 2, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0012.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this

article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report -

From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:11:19 +1100
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:04:30 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report -

Hi Bob, John & List-folk,

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:37:44 EST
>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:52:01 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
> >To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>>>without causing any apparent harm.

>>_Fired_ upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
>>one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
>>OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
>>repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
>>genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
>>an order?

>Hi John, Diane, Bill, anybody:

>What kind of genius equips his interceptors with "bullets",
>nowadays. Snoopy or the Red Baron? And was it a Sopwith Camel?
>"OZ Air Force", indeed. This story, or at least this exciting
>detail, is fiction.

>Clear skies,

>Bob Young

Let me put this Collaroy saga into context.

I learnt of the events over Collaroy of Friday, March 23rd, on Saturday, March 24th, via Peter Khoury, who had received a call from one of the witnesses. This witness had called a local investigators number. That investigator was not available, but the person taking the call made some garble mention to the witness of the suggestion that the UFO had been in trouble and that no doubt it had escape pods and there would be a rescue! The witness didn't seem impressed with that, but tried to contact the UFO Network hotline. Unfortunately there were technical problems apparently at that time. Peter Khoury was called.

Peter advised me of the call and details which suggested that at least 2 people had seen fairly briefly (less than a minute, and more like several seconds) a quite large object passing overhead. The 2 witnesses were in adjacent apartment blocks.

The 2 witnesses were certain that the noise likened to a large number of motorbikes was connected to the aerial object. It seemed to be quite low and heading east out over the ocean. The impression was given that it seemed to be in trouble but was struggling to make altitude. Neither witness saw it go into the sea. A number of other people heard it.

As it seemed interesting and one of the witnesses mentioned some other interesting anecdotes, Peter and I arranged to visit the area on Sunday, March 25th. We spoke with both visual witnesses and a number of others who heard the noise. The details above were confirmed. One of the witnesses had heard from a woman in the street on Saturday, March 25th, about suggestions that the RAAF had attempted an intercept of a number of identical UFOs from Darwin in the Northern Territory and that the pursuit had occurred earlier in the evening of March 23rd and had led to at least one of the UFOs appearing over Collaroy. The witness at Collaroy hearing this took it fairly lightly as the woman (who he did not know) seemed (in his words) "a bit under the weather".

So the Darwin RAAF UFO intercept anecdote didn't seem highly credible, so we concentrated our attention on the Collaroy incident itself. We determined from local hotel management and security that to their knowledge their "bouncers" were not involved in a UFO event on the Friday night but they did mention that a contingent of bikers had come into the area earlier in the night. Police at Dee Why (the closest station) did not have any information on the incident, when I enquired with them in person on Sunday afternoon.

The local area paper "The Manly Daily" were unaware of the incident and indicated they would not run a story unless locals contacted them.

The witnesses witnessed unusual aircraft activity on Saturday, February 24th and lesser activity on the Sunday. Peter and I did not see any unusual aircraft activity relevant to the situation on the Sunday.

On Wednesday March 28th, Bryan Dickeson of UFOR (NSW) posted a report to the Australian UFO Research Network based on phone calls he had made and on phone enquiries Moira McGhee of INUFOR had made. The Collaroy aspects were similar to what Peter and I had found on our on site investigations of Sunday March 25th. However Bryan's report implied the event may have lasted 15 minutes. None of our interviews supported this longer duration and the "bouncer" connection seemed in question given our direct enquiries with the Hotel.

Bryan's report attributed to "an Australian Air Force source" a more detailed version of the alleged RAAF Darwin intercept. When I spoke to Bryan about this he indicated this contact came via a source living in Collaroy, known to Moira. I tried to contact Moira on Wednesday but have not heard from her. It seemed, according to Bryan, that she had made a number of enquiries. Perhaps she can be persuaded to share her information with the wider UFO community. Bryan's suggestion of PRA & Monash University advice & support "for the Defence investigation", seemed to have no strong foundation in facts.

I encouraged Bryan to assist in an open and cooperative investigation, to ensure that there was no duplication of effort and to facilitate a more rapid and coordinated investigation utilising all interested parties. Hopefully a sensible and transparent investigation process will emerge from this situation.

Because of the questionable nature of the Darwin part of this saga I did not focus too strongly on it in my enquiries with the Department of Defence. As Moira & Bryan seem to have a more direct account of this aspect, perhaps it would be more appropriate for them to advise us why we should take that aspect more seriously. Wing Commander Geoff Patchett, Public Affairs Coordinator - Air Force (RAAF), further advised me on March 1st, "I am not sure what was going on last weekend but I am certain it didn't involve us!" In conclusion, something clearly happened over Collaroy on Friday, February 23rd. Maybe we might get to the bottom of it? As for the more extraordinary alleged Darwin RAAF attempted UFO intercept lets see if it grows and gains any credibility. At this stage I would treat it as an unconfirmed

"rumour", pending further enquiries and supported detail from
Bryan Dickeson and Moira McGhee.

Regards,

Bill Chalker
UFOIC

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Kelly

From: Christopher Kelly <tophar@pacific.net.au>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 18:17:40 +1100
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:22:43 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Kelly

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:37:44 EST
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>>>without causing any apparent harm.

>>_Fired_ upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
>>one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
>>OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
>>repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
>>genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
>>an order?

>Hi John, Diane, Bill, anybody:

>What kind of genius equips his interceptors with "bullets",
>nowadays. Snoopy or the Red Baron? And was it a Sopwith Camel?
>"OZ Air Force", indeed. This story, or at least this exciting
>detail, is fiction.

Hi All,

I hate to be the bringer of bad news, But there is no way in hell that a RAAF plane would fire on a unknown craft. 99% of the time, The RAAF jets fly without amour of any kind. They are lucky if they are aloud to carry long range fuel tanks when flying in populated areas.

I live near the RAAF base at Richmond and there were jets doing fly overs that weekend. Which is normal for them and they only land if they are stopping over night. The Jets were in fact I believe just doing some practice for this weekend Formula 1 fly overs down in Vic.

The bright orange lights could have been the F-111's doing there Dump and Burn practice. Either way the RAAF is the last one's to ask as they have rules and protocols to follow. The Air traffic control at Sydney air port would be a better choose and they are no covered by limited informations acts.

A call to them might prove more informative.

Chris

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Why Don't They Land On The White House Lawn?

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 01:22:46 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:49:28 -0500
Subject: Why Don't They Land On The White House Lawn?

WHY DON'T THEY LAND ON THE WHITE HOUSE LAWN?

The Electric Warrior : Front Page March 3, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

"Given all the splendid evidence the UFO community has assembled demonstrating the reality and the extraterrestrial nature of UFOs, why do scientists, and the media, and the public, still giggle and roll their eyes? Let's bottomline the situation right now..."

MUFON's Elaine Douglass tells why the government won't tell the truth about UFOs.

IT'S NO GAME

When some people hear about UFOs, they become deeply involved in the topic. Other people hear about the phenomenon, and half believe it, half doubt it. Still others hear talk about Unidentified Flying Objects and laugh out loud.

MUFON's Elaine Douglass has been interested in UFOs as long as she can remember. She has learned to ignore the laughter:
"Ridicule itself is a more powerful deterrent to action than punishment."

Based on her study of the evidence, Douglass became so convinced of the reality of the UFO phenomenon that between 1992 and 1995 she took to the streets as an activist, organizing demonstrations for Operation Right to Know.

Douglass says ORTK disbanded because the organization reached an impasse: Public demonstrations were a more powerful tactic than the UFO community cared to use. People were as unwilling to tell the whole truth as others were unwilling to hear it.

Elaine Douglass thinks she knows why the government won't tell the truth about UFOs. Electric warriors will enjoy her frank assessment of the topic:

"If you've got the faintest inkling that what we're talking about is true, you have to be brain-dead not to be very, very interested in it."

WHY DOESN'T THE US GOVERNMENT TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT UFOs?

by Elaine Douglass
MUFON Co-State Director, Utah
regehr@lasal.net

[Elaine Douglass's article was published in the February 2001 issue of the Mutual UFO Network "UFO Journal". Her entire article is published for the World Wide Web, by the author's

permission, on The Electric Warrior Website. The following are selected excerpts.]

..."Why is there all this government denial and secrecy? What 'sane reason' can there be for the government cover-up? And why do scientists still respond with the 'giggle factor' whenever the subject of UFOs comes up?"

That was probably the thousandth time I've heard those questions asked, and it set me to thinking about them for probably the thousandth time...

...Why indeed doesn't the US government just come clean and tell the American people everything it knows about UFOs?...

...Silence about UFOs is something everyone wants. There is not just one cover-up. There are three--the government cover-up, the public's cover-up, and the aliens' cover-up. All involved are plainly determined to keep quiet about the alien presence on the planet...

...Of course, the aliens are imposing something else on the government, and on the people, that we don't want, and that is the crux of the issue...

ABOUT THE IMAGES

More about the artwork for this feature.

WHY DON'T THEY LAND ON THE WHITE HOUSE LAWN?

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/ewWhiteHouseLawnThumb.jpg>

A classic UFO question posed by skeptic and Ufologist alike.

This view of the White House, based on a photo from the National Archives, is from Pennsylvania Avenue, facing Washington DC's Lafayette Park, which is perhaps somewhat less accessible than the more familiar view from Constitution Avenue.

The UFO in the foreground is based on movie footage by the world's first UFO contactee, George Adamski. Adamski's scout ship appears to change shape in flight, which is consistent with his claims that the craft operated by manipulating gravitational fields.

Mac Tonnies, a frequent EW collaborator, says, "Needless to say, this aerial 'morphing' effect isn't something you can accomplish by filming a small hanging model, as so many others have (and continue to do)."

THOSE WHO KNOW DON'T TALK

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/ewTrumanEisenhowerThumb.jpg>

The letters "SOM1-01" on the document held by Truman and Eisenhower's alien companion represent the notorious MJ-12 Operations Manual.

The MJ-12 documents are a set of allegedly highly classified government documents relating to the UFO cover-up.

Note that Truman wears sun-glasses at night, indicating both the covert nature of the meeting, and an implicit approval of their strange collaborator's appearance and agenda.

Both scenarios are imaginative. The Electric Warrior's images are unabashedly hoaxed.

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR

March 3, 2001

Silicon Valley, CA

<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/Expose004.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:09:52 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:51:17 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Ledger

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>Hi List,

>I recently came across this painting :

><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

>Matt

Hi Matt,

Or a round flat disc? This to explain the Earth's curved shadow
on the Moom during an elclipse. I believe the Earth as a round
flat disxc was a popular theory or conception at the time. I
must admit though, it does look like a sphere in the painting.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Larry Hatch E-Mail Troubles

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@JPS.NET>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 03:14:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:54:13 -0500
Subject: Larry Hatch E-Mail Troubles

Dear List,

My ISP, JPS.NET has been giving me atrocious email service for the last two weeks. JPS was bought out by OneMain.com, which was bought out by some other concern in turn.

Apparently they are trying to combine their electronics under one roof or the like; the result is that their email service is dead slow.

I know its the ISP because others using the same outfit are having the same problems.

Typically, I can send myself a test message, and see it within minutes if not seconds. Lately it has taken up to two days. My most recent received messages from the list and others were sent a good 18 hours ago if not more.

Because of this, I will be late with responses to List messages and private emails.

I tried to call their help lines, at least two of them, but they are either busy or out of order.

I will try to find the name of the company that bought the whole mess, maybe their stock is listed somewhere. Its probably too late now, but it looks like a nifty short sale for you, market players. [burp!]

Very best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Fireballs seen in Angol, Chile

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 06:26:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 12:56:21 -0500
Subject: Fireballs seen in Angol, Chile

SOURCE: Las Ultimas Noticias (Chile)
DATE: March 2, 2001

LOCAL RESIDENTS SHARE STRANGE EXPERIENCES; FIREBALLS SEEN IN BUTACO

Lights and human silhouettes frighten animals and residents alike.

Ancient araucarias and boldos, willows and eucalyptus trees dot Butaco Valley. Over the past few months, UFOs have been seen in this locale, to the north of Angol, with unusual frequency.

Pedro Rivas drives his horse-drawn wagon at six in the morning and at ten o'clock each night for over three years. But a month ago, as he transited through the area, he witnessed an incredible sight: "There was an enormous thing in the sky that lit the entire valley...it was orange in color. My horse was spooked, although no noise whatsoever could be heard. The thing was very large and moved very high up, I think more than a thousand meters up."

This 42 year old sharecropper states that the incident occurred once more last month.

Not far from there, Armando Ulises recalls that late last year he was "near the willows, by the riverside" with other people when they witnessed three gigantic circular objects one evening. The unknown forms formed a very bright triangle as they traveled. "I've only seen it once, but it can't be a satellite or a star, because how are they going to send three satellites to space in such an exact position, forming a perfect triangle? I don't think it was a star, either, because the objects were some 600 meters high."

According to researchers and the accounts of Angol's residents, there was a UFO flap last year which included rhomboidal and barrel shaped vehicles, invariably issuing yellow and orange lights, traveling from north to south and disappearing in an instant.

Seven kilometers into the valley, in a scarcely populated area, one reaches a tiny wooden chapel painted white. Behind it dwells Maria Humilde Concha Rivas, 77, who doesn't like to discuss the oddities she's seen. "Since 1968 we've seen these lights in the sky, but for a long time we thought we were just seeing things. The last time, [my husband and I] saw the shape of a very tall man, some 3 meters tall, in a straight line from the house down by the riverside. It was a kind of red shape with a man's body...head, arms..We didn't dare take a closer look because it frightened us, and we got back inside the house."

Her husband, 84 year old Mario Huaiquil, holds his head in his hands and mumbles: "We don't know what it is, but it was as large as a giant flame. It frightened us and we went straight to bed. All of the people around here have seen something strange."

According to the locals, there is a huge circular imprint--left

behind by a UFO-- on one of the local mountains. Local researchers are preparing an expedition to said location, which is at some point in the precordilleran locations of Verdun and Deuco.

#####

Translation (C) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology
Special thanks to Rodrigo Cuadra and Gloria Coluchi

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 04:36:43 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:00:14 -0500
Subject: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident

Dear Sirs and Mmes:

The latest booklet from the indefatigable Loren Gross has come out, and I want to quote from one interesting incident.

Documents found by Jan Aldrich and others indicate that there was a serious concern about aerial phenomenon, mainly seen as lights, flares etc. which should not be in that area.

One Project Grudge report lists a number of these, including an odd report from a sentry at Camp Hood.

On 09 APR 1949 this sentinel saw a blue Ford sedan stop at the side of the road by the base around noon, adjacent to a restricted area. It looked like mechanical trouble, two men got out and opened the hood of the car and "engaged in a discussion".

At 0945 the next day, the same car stopped at the same spot with (again) two men in it, and repeated the same actions.

"In addition, they searched the edge of the roadside and picked up two objects, one roughly circular in shape, the other of the approximate size and shape of a beer can .."[burp!]

"After placing the objects in the car, they departed at a fairly high rate of speed..."[These actions were observed by a sentry via field glasses.]

"The car carried Texas license plates.. "(CU 8551) which were found to belong to one Mike J. Bird; a civilian who worked for the base roads and grounds division.

An FBI investigation revealed that Bird could not drink or store beer at his home due to the objections of his wife [!]

"To circumvent this restriction, he had been in the practice of hiding beer in the range area, and then going out in his car to drink it. .. "

- - - - -

No beer? In West Texas?

I find the account entirely credible regardless. I see no men-in-black here, no MJ-12 ruling the world; just some awful beast ruling the roost.

Credits and kudos go to Loren and Jan et. al. for finding room for this welcome chuckle, especially Loren.

Very best wishes

- Larry (single, fat dumb and happy) Hatch.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 13:25:00 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:05:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:10:54 EST
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:16:32 -0000

Hi Brad,

I've already wasted enough valuable time I could have spent on research and investigation addressing your repetitive and redundant posts, so this will be short and to the point.

Before you go any further you should decide what you are and where you stand - one minute you are describing yourself as a "sceptic" and in the next breath you are railing against your perceived enemies, viz "sceptics and debunkers".

You say all you receive are insults, but your tone and attitude right from day one did nothing but invite dismissal - you even write off evidence the evidence of the RAF controller as being the product of "jealousy" because you don't like what he says, and expect us to take you seriously!

Then you are telling us that you aren't really interested in the Lakenheath case after all, and that all we have done is repeated errors that date back to 1996 and haven't found out anything which might question the Lakenheath Biblical Tablet. Well if that's the case, why are you so desperate to find out what we have found to the extent that one can virtually see the sweat and exasperation emerging from your postings?

The bottom line is this - we have put energy and much valuable time into pursuing this investigation and we will publish the material when it suits us not when it suits you or the ufological choir.

You seem incredulous that we have not formulated our conclusions, but this just illustrates how little experience you seem to have of dealing with first-hand witnesses.

During the time this fruitless exchange of emails has been taking place we have traced a further four witnesses and in the last few days located a highly important original document which throws new light on the whole saga.

Following your logic should we would have immediately posted everything we had found to the List and your good self, so you were able to give your sagelike opinion upon its worth, given your exalted status as expert on the Lakenheath case.

Well I'm sorry but this is a free country and we will do what we want, when we want and when it suits us!

>>Rather than listening to Brad Sparks you should be asking
>>pertinent questions like why he and Thayer suppressed the
>>contradictory evidence of the RAF Fighter Controller in their
>>account of 1980 - a question Sparks has pointedly failed to
>>address on this List (see the post from Joe McGonagle, and my
>>reply).

>I certainly did address your false allegation and refuted it.
>It's a matter of record.

There was nothing false about it - and you did not refute it.
I'll repeat it again - why did you omit any mention of major
contradictions between the accounts of the RAF controller and
the USAF controller from your 1980 account; and why were the
details of the alleged exchange between the pilots omitted
without explanation?

Your answer to this was simply that the RAF account was broadly
supportive (hardly!) but that it became obvious that Freddie
Wimbledon was tainted by jealousy over the role the USAF man
played!

I suggest these fundamental problems have been omitted from the
1980 account in order to give the impression that the version
of the events you like to support is the right one.

You have not provided any evidence to suggest this
interpretation is wrong.

Best Wishes

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Lakenheath - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 13:28:22 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:08:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Clarke

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 15:41:34 -0000

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 18:40:13 -0000

Hi Georgina,

>First of all I would like to point out to the List how you
>change things to suit your thinking. In a previous post (Thu, 22
>Feb 2001)

I also checked the archives and found that my quotation of your
phrase at:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/feb/m23-031.shtml>

is an exact copy of your original phrase as posted on:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/feb/m21-044.shtml>

with neither containing a no in the phrase discussed. The
"no" appears in a subsequent message where I did not snip
directly from your original posting, therefore I had clearly
mis-read right from the beginning.

A reading of all these postings in context quite clearly demonstrates
that the error was not a deliberate one as you allege.

>So you adding the word "NO" to change my quote was a very nasty
>thing to do.

If that's how you want to see it go ahead, but we all make
mistakes as you yourself have acknowledged in quoting the wrong
names of two alleged witnesses to the Lakenheath incident in
your book (and you had three years to get this one right).

So you have my apologies - but it does not change my contention
that your interest in this subject is not to bring rational
criticism to bear upon the Rendlesham farce but to use it as a
springboard to fame and the lucrative lecture circuit.

To address your contention, therefore, that there is no money
to be made out of UFOlogy, my point is that there is money to
be made if you adopt a sensational ETH approach rather than a
sceptical, rational one. That is a fact demonstrated by book
sales alone, and was noted in another context by Carl Jung as
far back as 1958 viz "that news affirming the existence of UFOs
is welcome, but that scepticism seems to be undesirable."

>And if there is anybody who has made a comfortable living out of
>studying ufology, please give me your secret.

Is your agent really Andrew Lownie? If so perhaps you should

be asking him this question, or checking out the figures quoted on his website! I'm sure he doesn't sign up UFO writers for purely philanthropic motives - ETH = clanging cash registers, simple as that, whatever some would prefer to believe.

>

>My 3 years of research has already cost me dearly.

I can appreciate that, believe me. But answer this question - if your three years of research into Rendlesham had led you to conclude there was nothing in the case, would you have really gone ahead with a book based upon such a conclusion, and if you had would it ever have been published?

Publishers want sensational stories about aliens landing and Government cover-ups - that's what sells, not the mundane and down-to-earth explanations which seem to lie at the heart of these 'happenings.'

But as you say, you can't tell the people about UFOs!

>Why on earth do you have to be so bitter and nasty when
>debating on this List. You act as if you are a 75 year old
>professor with years of experience, when all you have really
>done (and we've already had reams of information in earlier
>posts on your PhD) is study fairies.

Although neither my PhD or any of my other studies have had the slightest connection with fairies (see, we all make mistakes!), what is wrong with studying fairy folklore?

There are certainly as many sincere eyewitnesses who claim to have had experiences with 'fairies' and other 'elemental' creatures, both in the past and in the present, as there are those who claim to have experienced UFOs.

This can be judged by the huge literature the subject has generated, and to use the very idea of studying of fairies as a means of dismissing what you see as silly or ephemeral just belies how fundamentally ignorant you are of everything except the tiny UFological niche which you have chosen to inhabit.

Many Ufologists - and pro-UFO writers who claim not to be Ufologists - would benefit from the study of other traditions of belief, including those connected with apparitions, fairies and other supernatural happenings. By doing so you might find many interesting parallels - for instance, how witness testimony is shaped by culture and media, and reflected back to influence the way experiences themselves are interpreted in the first place.

Take the Cottingley fairy photos as one perfect example - faked photographs that fooled none other than Arthur Conan Doyle, propped up the belief systems of thousands for almost a century, and are still invested with belief to this day - but were the product of imaginative minds, wish fulfilment and the very human desire to believe in something - anything.

But of course belief in UFOs is nothing like fairy beliefs, it is based upon hard evidence like ...well, for example - photographs!

But enough of my babbling - you don't want to hear this, you want to hear about aliens, Government cover-ups, abductions, etc.

Back to the ufological choir!

Best wishes,

Dave Clarke

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:33:46 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:11:31 -0500
Subject: Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 22:25:18 EST
>Subject: Re: P-47 - ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>And for the record, this List should know that as a perceived
>abductee, I hate the little bastards for what they've done to
>me. I am a gentle man who cannot even shoot a rabbit or a
>woodcock for lunch. Can't hurt or kill anymore. I have this
>special love for anything which lives. Even you.

>But when it comes to those whom I expect have done to me what
>they have likely done to me, especially me as an innocent child
>who was extremely modest and clean minded, with a good and very
>healthy respect for my body even as a three year old, I could, I
>believe sadly, hurt the little mothers.

>In conclusion, I hate what they've done to me. Maybe even
>more than you do. I'm Sicilian.

>Jimmy, The Doc, Mortellaro

Jim,

This obviously is a heartfelt statement, and I've heard very similar from many dozens of other abductees. Clearly, we don't know exactly what is going on, but that does not excuse sneering and ridicule. More power to you.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:42:50 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:13:16 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

<snip>

>let's consider Arnold and the
>pelicans: Arnold's clear description of the objects he saw
>indicated that they reflected the sun very brightly (or were
>light sources themselves). This one characteristic by itself is
>sufficient to rule out (gulp) _pelicans_ (regardless of the
>comments by ornithologists). Similarly, the speed measured by
>Arnold is enough to rule out jet aircraft of the day and also
>meteors.

>True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft... but they
>prove _something_ about the objects (according to Arnold they
>appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces, speeds
>beyond anything we had achieved). One thing they prove to me is
>that OI/NHI were involved (Other Intelligences/Non-Human
>Intelligences). In other words, these weren't "creations" of
>"dumb" (unintelligent) nature but rater manufactured objects...
>but we didn't manufacture them.

Bruce, List:

I'm afraid that this revealing analysis helps explain a lot
about how you manage to reach your pro-ET conclusions about
cases as disparate as Arnold's and Ed Walter's pixs. The
witness says that he thinks he saw something reflect the Sun
brightly, and that it was fast.

These opinions, alone, prove [I'm using your word, here] that
what was seen were created by non-human intelligences.

Wheee --

Clear, cloudless, pelican-free skies to you, Dr.

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:45:33 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 13:15:31 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

>You don't understand (or I don't understand... someone here
>doesn't understand)... Mainstream science says , "Space Travel,
>yes!" It is not a conceptually difficult extrapolation beyond
>what we already can do to image taking long trips in space... So
>it might takes years, decades, millenia to get somewhere. The
>argument against is not based on physics but sociology or "what
>people would or wouldn't want to do." The arguments about the
>physics of space travel have already been presented here ad
>nauseum_/... in 10/100/1000/ 10000/100000/1000000, etc. years we
>will be able to do X, where X is "fast space travel" or space
>travel in which the travelers age hardly at all , etc. So please
>don't say "science has non to offer" regarding ET/space travel.
>(And note developements as recent as the last few weeks in which
>more planets are found and evidence of organic molecules in
>spaces, life on Mars, etc... indicating tha there probably is
>life "out there.")

>>To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>>this country, as well as every other country in the world.

>What you are doing is putting the cart before the horse... or
>trying to... by saying science has no support for ET type space
>travel and therefore ufologists resort to UFO data to prove ET
>space travel is possible. Actually, one can argue for space
>travel without resort to UFO sightings... and numerous
>conventional but forward thinking scientists have already done
>that. (One "forward thinking" individual is Robert Forward...
>who has argued for zero point energy as a source of "fuel" for
>space travel... if I recall correctly.)

Bruce & List,

This entire posting by Bruce is very well stated, and I can only
add "ditto". Dennis still is arguing (deducing) from theory that
ET UFOs can't be.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:50:48 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:23:19 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>I recently came across this painting :

><http://www.musexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

Hi, Matt, List:

The idea that the earth had to be flat was not a universal belief. I think that this is one of the myths we have learned about the "ignorance" of the past. Any mariner who sailed "over the horizon" knew it was curved.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:54:22 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:25:03 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Young

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>I recently came across this painting :

><http://www.musexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

Hi, again, Matt:

It looks to me that the object pictures is the crescent Moon.
The title of the picture is "God createing the stars".

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:09:02 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:27:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: Hoagland's "Tunnel"
>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

><http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

>The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of
>many. Interestingly enough, similar "ribbed" structures can be
>found in Cydonia. Is this evidence of technology, biology, or
>geology?

Hi, Mac, List:

I think this may be a picture of windblown sand dunes at the
bottom of a canyon. What is the direction of the prevailing wind
and the picture?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

ACERN Article

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 15:15:32 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:29:50 -0500
Subject: ACERN Article

Hi All,

Just to inform you that I have just published a very interesting article from Mary Rodwell of ACERN - Australian Close Encounter Resource Network - you can find it at the following link:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/awakecontact.htm>

Regards,

Roy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast

From: David Bolton <David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 15:19:14 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:33:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 17:44:39 -0000

>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 20:22:33 -0500
>>From: Todd Lemire <tlemire@home.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Mystery Bang Rocks Yorkshire Coast

Thanks Todd & Dave,

>I've been in communication with Glenn Ford at the British
>Geological Survey (BGS) re. the sonic boom, and got the
>following conclusion:

>4. MOD have confirmed aircraft in the area at the time, but have not
>stated if they had gone supersonic or stated if it was the RAF, USAF
>or Navy. You must draw your own conclusions from this.

The only conclusion is that there is no proof.

>5. Almost identical historic cases available to compare, were we have
>had confirmation of supersonic flight. Most recent 20 January 2000,
>town of Elgin and other villages in area of NE Scotland shook up by
>RAF tornado.

Hmm. Unless RAF/USAF/Navy own up - or radar reports confirm it
was a supersonic jet - it remains an anomalous bang or
"explosive sound".

Try looking the term up in Fort's books to see all the other
"explanations" that have been propounded over the years for
similar noises. Remote earth tremors were popular explanations
before the advent of accurate seismology - but quarries and
artillery were also occasionally blamed (again without proof).

Nowadays we have military aircraft to blame - and the natural
reticence of the military to say what they have been doing as
part of their normal training gives us the excuse to *still*
blame them even when they deny they have had anything to do with
it.

David G Bolton

<David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 09:34:51 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:35:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 00:58:22 -0800
>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:12:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

>I think there may be another issue here, that of "bandwidth" (I
>hate the term) or file size.

>Take any picture, say 1000 by 1000 pixels. That's a million
>pixels. In black and white (lets say 16 shades of grey from
>black up to white) we have 16 million bits of info, or 2
>megabytes.

>All that has to be sent back to Earth. To avoid noise, a
>relatively slow redundant channel might be used. In short, we
>have an information bottleneck.

Larry,

The reason given for not including a third sensor array for green images was that it would have added too much weight to the spacecraft. Bandwidth apparently had nothing to do with the decision. Including a green image to combine with the existing capability for red and blue images would, of course, add 50% to the total bandwidth, but there would have been no need to use it all the time. A sensible scientific approach given bandwidth and memory limitations would be to sample small selected areas using all three sensors, and then extrapolate the true color of the larger surrounding region in images taken using one or two sensors. As it is, I can see little scientific value in having only two sensors, since the color of the scenes photographed are mostly left to the imagination (or the prejudices) of the people doing the image processing. I won't say they are of no scientific value at all, but it looks to me like main reason they included a color capability was for pretty pictures suitable for PR uses.

>On top of all this, there are the many many regions which have
>not been imaged at all, as opposed to lets say Cydonia, which
>now has multiple images.

Nobody I know of ever suggested that JPL concentrate on Cydonia to the detriment of any other scientific objective of the mission. The MGS has taken something like 56,000 images. They've released a grand total of about 10 Cydonia images that include features of interest to planetary SETI. That's roughly 2 thousandths of one percent of the total. Why would that insignificant fraction of resources and effort adversely affect anything else?

JPL's fondness for releasing multiple images of "smiley face" crater and other nonsense doesn't suggest to me they have much concern about bandwidth.

And those 10 images they were "persuaded" to get include the one bad image of the Face in '98, and a good image of it in 2000, which they blocked off so that only a small part of the landform would show. JPL did not want to take any images of Cydonia at all (except for a crater or two, perhaps). The main reason they

got the targeted images was because NASA, evidently concerned about its reputation after previous lies about Cydonia were exposed, ordered JPL to do it to show they were "open to the public" and "not a conspiracy." They aren't doing anyone any favors.

>The scientists are charged with getting the best science out of
>a large but not unlimited bandwidth, over the useful lifetime of
>the MGS probe. Maybe we should put ourselves in their shoes as a
>sort of thought experiment.

After putting yourself in their shoes, maybe you can explain the reason why they released the grossly misleading Catbox "enhancement" of the Face, why they have broken their promise about announcing Cydonia imaging opportunities in advance and immediately releasing the images (the latest Face image was released 6 months after it was taken), and why they blocked off the latest Face image to exclude the entire eastern side of the landform.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 11:44:19 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:36:38 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Young

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 17:53:52 -0500
>Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:23:23 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:00 EST
>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01
>>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>>Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
>>Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

>>I wonder if this might have been a parachute?

>In which case the "castle" would have been the 'cargo/passenger'
>and would have appeared on the bottom of the hemisphere and
>not on top as reported. Unless there are parachutes that have
>structures on top that beg the description of a "castle." Is
>there such an animal?

>I always think of 'chutes in the traditional hemispheric-shape
>or those more modern, rectangular wing shaped jobs. I've never
>seen a chute that could be described as a "castle" on top of a
>hemisphere though. Any 'skydivers' out there?

Hi, John, List:

You may be right. But, without knowing what is meant by a
hemisphere, this could just be another Castle in the Air.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 17:27:56 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:40:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Morris

>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 00:58:22 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01s

>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 12:19:16 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Hello Roger, Lan, John and others:

>I think there may be another issue here, that of "bandwidth" (I
>hate the term) or file size.

>Take any picture, say 1000 by 1000 pixels. That's a million
>pixels. In black and white (lets say 16 shades of grey from
>black up to white) we have 16 million bits of info, or 2
>megabytes.

>All that has to be sent back to Earth. To avoid noise, a
>relatively slow redundant channel might be used. In short, we
>have an information bottleneck.

>Now, put this into color. How about the nice 4096 colors your
>computer screen likely can handle? Well, that's 4096 x a million
>bits..

Larry,

The system would have been a bit simpler in this case they had
wanted to get a colour image out of the b+w system they have on
board.

The usual trick was to provide the camera with 3 coloured
filters and to take the scene in each of the red, blue and green
spectra together with a b+w reference image.

Using your example, that's only 4 x the initial 2 meg image
data. But that could balloon up in size by burying the data
within large amounts of error correction code for the downlink
back to earth.

I recall reading thst some of the earlier Mar's missions(Viking)
were encoding the likes of 16 data bits within 64 bits or more
of error correction coding, the larger the encoding factor the
more "damaged in transit" data bits could be recovered
successfully back here.

Neil

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 3](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:47:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:41:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 23:58:58 -0500
>Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:40:59 -0500
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>Larry, it has nothing to do with 'file size.' They sent full
>color pictures back (in glorious detail) from Jupiter, Saturn,
>Neptune, Uranus, all of which are billions of miles farther
>out/away from us than Mars is. They managed to capture excellent
>RGB signals from the outer solar system. Why would a body as
>close as Mars is to us (practically on top of us in comparison
>to the distances were talking about to the outer solar system)
>suddenly present problems?

That's a good question. You could write to JPL and ask them, but I doubt you'll get a good answer.

>That impossible worm-like thingy that we've been discussing
>could be an electric blue with bright yellow streaks for all we
>know. What I would really like to know is, What is the ground
>level resolution of those "glass worm" pix. Does anybody know?
>I'm dying to know how big those things really are.

The image information is at:

http://www.msss.com/moc_gallery/ab1_m04/images/M0400291.html

The image width is 3.5 kilometers, so the "tubes" are are roughly 200 meters wide and about 2 kilometers long. That would be one humungous worm! Personally, I don't think the possibility can be ruled out that these are subsurface lava tubes that have been exposed by fractures and erosion of the rock above them. Maybe they have a shiny appearance because the molten rock fused into a glassy substance as it cooled. I don't know why lava tubes would have these bright "rib" features, but then I don't know very much about lava tube formation. Perhaps we'll eventually find a geologist who's brave enough to venture a more informed opinion than mine.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton

From: David Bolton <David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:23:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 17:58:24 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:40:40 -0800

>An I-beam has two flanges that are connected by the web. The
>first anomalous detail is found at the root portions of the
>I-beams. The root is where the web meets the flanges at a right
>angle. What I do not see at these locations on the I-beams is a
>radius. There would be a radius at that point (the root) to
>prevent cracks from forming. Any material that I know of, that
>has a crystalline structure, will develop cracks if two planes
>meet at right angles. I am assuming from the appearance of the
>break in the I-beams that the material has a crystalline
>structure.

>The second detail is the thickness of the web in relation to the
>thickness of the flanges. I have not seen an I-beam that has a web
>that is as thick as these, as compared to the thickness of the flange
>faces. I have never seen anything that resembles the manufacturing
>technique used in the construction of these I-Beams. I know of no
>manufacturing process that could produce the multitude of details
>found on the I-beams.

I beams will look like this if they are made by bonding the
flanges to the web. To get a decent bond you have to use a wide
section web, or the flanges will have insufficient bonding area.
Another consequence of this technique is the lack of radius at
the root - the joint forms a sharp right angle (just as you
describe).

Basically, this could be made by bonding styrofoam "flanges" to
a styrofoam core "web" and then spraying the resultant "I Beam"
with silver paint. I would imagine that this is standard fair
for a theatre or film set builder.

Oh yes, and if you snap any, they will exhibit a
crystalline-type fracture, with no evidence of local yielding (as
per your description).

David G Bolton

<David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 12:42:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:01:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clark

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 13:25:00 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:10:54 EST
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:16:32 -0000

Hi, Dave,

>I've already wasted enough valuable time I could have spent
>on research and investigation addressing your repetitive and
>redundant posts, so this will be short and to the point.

It seems to me that we won't get anywhere productive in a discussion of the Lakenheath case unless you and your associates either start sharing your information on other than a selected basis with fellow Lakenheath experts (e.g., Brad Sparks) or decide to publish your conclusions so that the rest of us have a chance to weigh their merits. (And allow me to remark as an aside here that this current controversy makes the late James McDonald's absence all the more keenly felt. McDonald, I am sure, would have had much of interest to contribute to the discussion.)

In the meantime, the sounds coming from your camp can't help raising concerns about how objectively the investigation is being conducted. If you were on the outside looking in, as I am, I am confident you would feel exactly as I and others do. I also note that you do not try to defend Andy Roberts's excesses, and that's wise, but you neglect to tell us whether you agree or disagree with the sentiments he has expressed.

If you can debunk Lakenheath, as seems to be what you believe you're doing, and that debunking stands up to inevitable and necessary scrutiny by colleagues, that's great, and you will deserve all the applause you get. But if this is all about ax-grinding, ideologically driven posturing -- the only possible reading of Roberts's postings, for example -- then we're getting precisely nowhere. That hardly is a controversial assertion. It would apply equally to pro-UFO true-believing ax-grinders.

As for your remarks about Brad Sparks:

I have known Brad for more than two decades and regard him as among the most skilled, principled, intelligent, and critical-minded investigators in the history of ufology, in every way the antithesis of the true believer or the TB's mirror image, the fanatic debunker. Your attempt to characterize him as some kind of foolish partisan could hardly be more misguided and less justified.

On top of that, Brad's technical qualifications in aviation technology (at which he works professionally) and related matters far exceed any of yours, and these of course are crucial to any understanding of what really happened at Lakenheath. You would do your own case a world of good by working with him rather than treating him as a perceived enemy.

And finally, I guess what I don't understand is why you and your associates didn't conduct your investigation quietly, saying nothing about it one way or another until you were ready to publicize your findings, evidence, and conclusions. Had you done so, none of these posting exchanges about which you so bitterly and repeatedly complain would have occurred.

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: -Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans

From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:30:11 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:07:23 -0500
Subject: Re: -Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 13:32:11 -0500
>Subject: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Michel wrote:

>While waiting for my bus to go to work on Wednesday, at around
>1:50 p.m., in Sudbury, Ontario, a U-Haul truck went by and on
>its side, I noticed a scene depicting Area 51 with a stealth
>fighter-type aircraft lifting off its surface, and the word
>'Tonopah' (if I remember correctly) written vertically near the
>back end. Ever neat!

>I'd seen the 'Roswell' one on the Internet before, but not this
>one.

>Never thought I'd see that around here....this far up north! It
>was cool. Wish I had a picture.

Hi, Michel!

What difference would it make? You claim to have genuine, no-doubt-about-it shots of a flying saucer. Yet, despite such claims, you have yet to share such ground breaking photos with the list! Why should this be any different? I bring this up because you continually berate anyone that casts a skeptical eye toward UFO reports, all the while hoarding the very proof that convinced you, 100%, that flying saucers are real. Why should I even believe that the U-haul you mention exists, at all? What difference would a picture make if you have no intention of sharing it?

More to the point, why share a shot of a UFO painted on the side of a U-haul truck and not share a picture or video of a real flying saucer you claim to have in your possession?

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:59:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:08:43 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 01:35:36 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ed,

>The bottom line is the "metallurgist" based his opinion on
>"seeing" the footage, rather than actually touching and making
>an examination of actual debris. Since you are the one promoting
>this as fact, why don't you go out and get a number of opinions
>from a number of expert "metallurgist's" and see what they say?
>You might be surprised to find out that a number of
>metallurgists disagree with your one dude.

Robert,

M.Dennis (an alias) is not one of my "dudes" as you put it. He worked with Theresa Carlson, Mark Center and others to see if they could prove, once and for all, whether the AA was a hoax. I came upon his report after the fact and asked for permission to publish it in "Flatland".

I think his insights and the depth of his observations are brilliant. I would love to have another metallurgist take a look at the debris but I doubt any would be willing unless I paid them. m. Dennis told me he spent hundreds of hours viewing the debris footage, frame by frame. Now where am I going to get someone to devote this amount of time? And where will I get the money to pay them? I can't even get you to take a look!

>I don't have any doubts that a hollywood FX type artist could
>have made something like that.

If you took a close look at the AA CDs, you'd never make that statement again. Yes an FX type might be able to make "something like that" but not the creature shown in the AA. You'll see just how impossible that would be if you'd just break down and order the AA CDs. Again my address is:

Ed Gehrman
PO Box 543
Quincy, Ca. 95971

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 14:41:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:13:42 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:11:19 +1100

>Hi Bob, John & List-folk,

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:37:44 EST
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:52:01 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>>>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>>>>without causing any apparent harm.

>>>_Fired_ upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
>>>one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
>>>OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
>>>repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
>>>genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
>>>an order?

>>Hi John, Diane, Bill, anybody:

>>What kind of genius equips his interceptors with "bullets",
>>nowadays. Snoopy or the Red Baron? And was it a Sopwith Camel?
>>"OZ Air Force", indeed. This story, or at least this exciting
>>detail, is fiction.

>>Clear skies,

>>Bob Young

>Let me put this Collaroy saga into context.

>I learnt of the events over Collaroy of Friday, March 23rd, on
>Saturday, March 24th, via Peter Khoury, who had received a call
>from one of the witnesses. This witness had called a local
>investigators number. That investigator was not available, but
>the person taking the call made some garble mention to the
>witness of the suggestion that the UFO had been in trouble and
>that no doubt it had escape pods and there would be a rescue!
>The witness didn't seem impressed with that, but tried to
>contact the UFO Network hotline. Unfortunately there were
>technical problems apparently at that time. Peter Khoury was
>called.

<snip>

>Because of the questionable nature of the Darwin part of this
>saga I did not focus too strongly on it in my enquiries with the
>Department of Defence. As Moira & Bryan seem to have a more
>direct account of this aspect, perhaps it would be more
>appropriate for them to advise us why we should take that aspect
>more seriously. Wing Commander Geoff Patchett, Public Affairs
>Coordinator - Air Force (RAAF), further advised me on March 1st,
>"I am not sure what was going on last weekend but I am certain
>it didn't involve us!" In conclusion, something clearly happened
>over Collaroy on Friday, February 23rd. Maybe we might get to
>the bottom of it? As for the more extraordinary alleged Darwin
>RAAF attempted UFO intercept lets see if it grows and gains any
>credibility. At this stage I would treat it as an unconfirmed
>"rumour", pending further enquiries and supported detail from
>Bryan Dickeson and Moira McGhee.

Hiya Bill, hi All,

Thanks for taking the time to explain your involvement in
this and for sharing the details of what you've learned so
far.

I myself was upset to read that the military of any nation was
"firing bullets" at a "UFO". It turns out that the 'source' for
the military component of the report may have been an old bitty
that was "out of sorts" (I assume that "out of sorts" is polite
Aussie code for, the old lady was "hammered.")

Good! I said I'd rather that it was all a result of week-end
drinking and group of 1200 cc Harley Davidson Hogs. Better that,
than "the military fired on a UFO."

I think that it would be wise for all concerned to hold off
publishing/announcing _any_ UFO reports (at least) until it can
be established that the details that are being released have
some grounding in reality. It just doesn't pay to be "trigger
happy" about reporting (internationally) the details of cases
that are still in the process of being confirmed. (Diane!) ;)

Thanks again for the clarification Bill. It was needed.

Regards,

John Velez, "Boowits Indeed!"

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 14:46:43 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:16:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Labels And Communication
>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000

>Since we all tend to throw labels around rather loosely,
>sometimes as epithets, I suggest we discuss the meaning of
>recurring terms so that we can better understand each other and
>facilitate communication. (In the political world it's liberal,
>conservative, radical, middle-of-the-road, anarchist,
>libertarian, etc.)

>I would like to see discussion of what you (each of us) means
>when we label someone as being (in relation to the UFO subject)
>a:

>(1) skeptic

>(2) believer

>(3) debunker

>(4) scoffer

>(5) apologist

>(6) advocate

>(7) choose your own label

>When I hear the term "debunker" or "scoffer," I tend to think of
>Donald Menzel, Phil Klass, James Oberg...

>The term "skeptic" to me is rather sacrosanct because of my
>philosophical training (though I realize most people don't use
>the term in the traditional philosophical sense).

>To me it is an honorable term to describe critical-minded
>scholars who doubt, but investigate and don't scoff or debunk.
>(To me, that definitely excludes 95% of CSICOP.) I think of Jan
>Aldrich, Dennis Stacy, Jenny Randles, and even myself (except
>that I have become convinced of the probable explanation) as
>being skeptics.

>There is a lot of room for misunderstanding and friction when we
>use these terms carelessly and think that we all mean the same
>thing, which obviously we don't. And often when we use the
>terms, they are intended to be an insult, or at least to have
>strong negative connotations.

Hi Richard, hi All,

You inquired:

>(1) skeptic

To save the wear and tear on my fingers I'll just 'ditto' your own
interpretation. I do not have any 'negative' connotations attached
to the term skeptic.

>(2) believer

To me is someone that has become _convinced_ through some kind of first hand experience(s) "True Believer" is something else and I too have a negative slant on that term. True believer to me indicates someone who is not capable of clear thinking or evaluating things for themselves. A "follower" that unquestioningly buys into every new theory or concoction that rolls down the pike.

>(3) debunker

Anti-Christ

>(4) scoffer

Minion of the Anti-Christ

>(5) apologist

Tough call. Would have to be taken on a case by case basis. That term is 'usually' used by the person on the receiving end of the "apologists'" arguments! When used it's always comes off as "name calling" and "finger-pointing." I don't consider it to be a valid 'label' at all. It's most times interchangeable with other more blatant insults like calling someone an uncritical moron.

>(6) advocate

See 'Apologist!'

>(7) choose your own label

"People!"

We're all just a group of 'individuals' that are struggling to come to grips with, and to understand, a common subject. We each bring all of our varied points of view, foibles, and shortcomings as well as our strengths and talents to the job. At least I like to think so. None of us are "experts" or "have the market cornered on the truth." We're just "people". Period.

Labels can define as well as separate people from one another. It all depends on 'how' it is being used, and the 'context' that they appear in. They are neither collectively good or bad as far as I'm concerned. Only good or bad usage/application of them.

Although I must admit that when Alfred Lehmborg called Don Ledger a "flatulent Fascist" (a farting Nazi?) I thought it was a hoot! <LOL>

Regards,

John Velez, Puerto Rican Abductee. (How's that for a 'label!')

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Crackers Steal US Space System Codes - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 14:49:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:18:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Crackers Steal US Space System Codes - Velez

>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>To: UFO UpDates <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Crackers Steal US Space System Codes
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 21:51:42 -0800

>-----
>CRACKERS STEAL COMMAND & CONTROL CODES FOR US SPACE SYSTEMS

>The Electric Warrior : News March 2, 2001
><http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0012.htm>

>-----
>CRACKERS STEAL COMMAND & CONTROL CODES FOR US SPACE SYSTEMS

Southern Crackers?

There's no telling what those hood wearing, cross burning, bigots will do with those codes now that they have them! God help us all!

Maybe they'll take over the TV satellites and broadcast programs that are directed at "White Only" audiences. No, wait, that's already the case.

Well, I may not know 'what' they'll do, but you can bet it won't be very nice whatever it is!

Southern crackers! The worst. <LOL>

John Velez,

(Just kidding Kurt! American 'humor.')

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 15:16:33 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:26:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Sparks

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 13:25:00 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 23:10:54 EST
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 21:16:32 -0000

>Hi Brad,

>I've already wasted enough valuable time I could have spent
>on research and investigation addressing your repetitive and
>redundant posts, so this will be short and to the point.

You don't answer any of my questions on the case details hence
some very understandable repetitiveness.

>Before you go any further you should decide what you are and
>where you stand - one minute you are describing yourself as a
>"sceptic" and in the next breath you are railing against your
>perceived enemies, viz "sceptics and debunkers".

Neutrality and objectivity baffle you, obviously. It drives you
up the wall that someone can not be a partisan of one side in
this battle against UFO stupidity and ignorance that you deem
the subject to be.

>You say all you receive are insults, but your tone and attitude
>right from day one did nothing but invite dismissal - you even
>write off evidence the evidence of the RAF controller as being
>the product of "jealousy" because you don't like what he says,
>and expect us to take you seriously!

You falsify and distort what I said -- I never said Wimbledon
was being "written off" merely because I noted his obvious
jealousy of the USAF radar controller Perkins. Wimbledon was
insisting that only he Wimbledon could possibly have even
been in contact with the Venom fighters -- he said Perkins would
not even have the radio frequencies -- and therefore what
Perkins said should be as you say "written off."

The irony is that while you wrongly accuse me of "writing off" a
witness you yourself write me off ("invite dismissal") when I
seek all available data and get abuse for doing so. You excuse
your "dismissal" or "writing off" of me on such contrived and
flimsy grounds as an alleged case interpretation, one I did not
even make!

>Then you are telling us that you aren't really interested in
>the Lakenheath case after all, and that all we have done is
>repeated errors that date back to 1996 and haven't found

You can't even get this one point of mine straight. I'd actually said you have so far been repeating skeptical issues going back to Klass in 1974 -- not just 5 years back in 1996, that was one example cited -- and I didn't say "errors" as I'd tried to be neutral on the point to avoid acrimony here as I just wanted some acknowledgment that your claim of "oldness" really applied both ways.

And yes the marginal Lakenheath 1956 case would barely make my top 100 list of best evidence UFO cases, as I've said many times, should I compile such a list (as I hope to do over the next year or so). I had a huge public argument with Fran Ridge over his overemphasis of the importance of this case back in 1997-8 due to the problems with it and lack of prompt investigation back in 1956 when memories were still fresh, as I pointed out to him. That's a matter of record.

>out anything which might question the Lakenheath Biblical
>Tablet. Well if that's the case, why are you so desperate
>to find out what we have found to the extent that one can
>virtually see the sweat and exasperation emerging from
>your postings?

Your colorful prose is no substitute for solid case data. I am curious about a great many subjects that I inquire into but because I do not have thousands of dollars to spend traveling to UK to investigate whereas you are local, I am necessarily limited to email inquiries. But you perversely misinterpret cross-continent email inquiries as "desperation" instead of seeing the good faith and spirit of scholarly collegiality in which they were made. Evidently your journalistic attack dog mode allows you only to see allies in the crusade against UFO evils or enemies to be destroyed.

>The bottom line is this - we have put energy and much
>valuable time into pursuing this investigation and we will
>publish the material when it suits us not when it suits
>you or the ufological choir.

You've made your unwillingness to conduct an open and freely shared inquiry abundantly clear. If it was for commercial reasons that you are hoarding your data, as you are so fond of accusing others of being motivated by, or national security classification reasons and need for sources' anonymity one might understand the suppression. But these reasons have never been given by your team.

>You seem incredulous that we have not formulated our
>conclusions, but this just illustrates how little experience
>you seem to have of dealing with first-hand witnesses.

More barbed false insults. I'm "incredulous" of your asserted lack of formulated conclusions because you and Andy Roberts have already announced your case conclusions many times on this List -- that the case has been destroyed as a UFO classic. Jenny Randles has agreed and formulated the conclusion that the classic "cat and mouse chase" is utterly refuted now. Are we mistaken about this?

>During the time this fruitless exchange of emails has been
>taking place we have traced a further four witnesses and
>in the last few days located a highly important original
>document which throws new light on the whole saga.

And we won't be able to see this "important" new data until the "end of the year" now, as you've recently stated, instead of the previous promises back to late 2000 of the UFOIN report coming "soon." What's to say that when the end of 2001 is reached that the release date won't slip again till sometime in 2002?

>Following your logic should we would have immediately
>posted everything we had found to the List and your
>good self, so you were able to give your sagelike opinion
>upon its worth, given your exalted status as expert on the
>Lakenheath case.

Minus the barbs and insults, why don't you freely post the data? This refusal to openly share data gives the appearance that you are running into serious problems debunking the case

and need more time in private to resolve the problems in order to fully and completely destroy it. If your problem was simply that there are problems or discrepancies with no bias one way or another in the interpretation then why not post the data and let the many very bright minds on UFO UpDates take a crack at it (instead of singling me out for sarcastic insult)? There are a good number of very bright skeptical thinkers here on UFO UpDates as well as pro-UFO thinkers and some who are objectively neutral.

>Well I'm sorry but this is a free country and we will do
>what we want, when we want and when it suits us!

Yes you've made that crystal clear and collegiality and cooperation be damned!

>>>Rather than listening to Brad Sparks you should be asking
>>>pertinent questions like why he and Thayer suppressed the
>>>contradictory evidence of the RAF Fighter Controller in their
>>>account of 1980 - a question Sparks has pointedly failed to
>>>address on this List (see the post from Joe McGonagle, and my
>>>reply).

>>I certainly did address your false allegation and refuted it.
>>It's a matter of record.

>There was nothing false about it - and you did not refute it.
>I'll repeat it again - why did you omit any mention of major
>contradictions between the accounts of the RAF controller and
>the USAF controller from your 1980 account; and why were the
>details of the alleged exchange between the pilots omitted
>without explanation?

I didn't omit anything -- this was Thayer's article, not mine, and I merely helped Ron Story (the book editor-author) with the editing, which involved technical corrections and suggestions but not major additions of new material (there were severe space limitations) as you want to believe so you can make unfounded spurious accusations. I had to work with what Thayer had and each sentence of space was carefully measured out. Why are you not focusing on your all-important current case investigations as you complain this is keeping you from doing, instead of nitpicking about the edits in an article done back in 1979?

>Your answer to this was simply that the RAF account was broadly
>supportive (hardly!) but that it became obvious that Freddie
>Wimbledon was tainted by jealousy over the role the USAF man
>played!

Not true and you distort what I'd said conveniently not quoting it. See below. You deny that Wimbledon is jealous of Perkins' role and tries to deny he had any role at all? You deny that this distorts Wimbledon's recollections to the point that he denies that Perkins could possibly know anything about the Venom interceptions when it is obvious that Perkins did? Or have you in fact "written off" Perkins in favor of Wimbledon, doing the "writing off" of a witness that you accused me of doing when I had not?

>I suggest these fundamental problems have been omitted from the
>1980 account in order to give the impression that the version
>of the events you like to support is the right one.

>You have not provided any evidence to suggest this
>interpretation is wrong.

Yes I have and I did but you don't want to read the plain English. I told you straight out that Thayer had just started corresponding with Wimbledon in 1979 when the deadline came for the Ron Story Encyclopedia of UFOs article on Lakenheath and Thayer wasn't finished with corresponding when the article was submitted and edited, and he (Thayer) evidently wasn't ready to discuss every detail that you now 20+ years later decide in your acid Monday morning quarterbacking style should have been discussed. Many other details from the original USAF documents, etc., were also omitted for reasons of space and relevance as the article was already at the maximum allotted space.

I might add that you like many other debunker types have a muckraking journalistic orientation in which you rank fighter-pilot conversation as of first importance because it

titillates (or deadens if you debunk it) the public fancy.
Thayer was a radar physicist who cared more about radar target
analysis and anomalous propagation calculations, none of which
are possible to derive from the _discrepancies_ between versions
of fighter-pilot dialogue neither version of which gave target
range or altitude or exact times.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 16:30:09 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:28:41 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:09:17 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:33:47 -0000

>>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>>Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:02:18 -0000

>>>>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 00:20:35 -0600

>>>Of course, there have been reports of "samples" of whatever is
>>>being observed, as well as landing traces, etc. Somehow all said
>>>cases seem to get messed up of covered up or whatever. I am
>>>reminded of the metal particles supposedly found in the Zamora
>>>case. Or the chemical changes in soil in the Delphos Kansas
>>>ring, or reports of "angel hair," Trans-en-Provence changes in
>>>chlorophyll (suggesting some weird radiation), and, of course,
>>>optical (photos) and radar data.

>>Hi,

>>I think the problem is that physical evidence cases tend not to
>>prove (or even particularly to support) the ETH.

>Hi Jenny,

>In the Debbie Kauble case (Intruders) soil samples were obtained
>and tested that proved to have been baked at impossibly hot
>temperatures (1000+ degrees) in highly 'localized' areas, (where
>grass and ground outside the immediate perimeter were apparently
>completely unaffected!) and, in conjunction with a close-up
>"UFO" sighting/encounter/contact. Debbies neighbors witnessed
>the "UFOs" (which they declare in testimony given to Budd while
>he was out there formally investigating the case and
>interviewing all concerned parties.)

>Debbie and her mother saw a UFO. Close-up. Debbie's neighbors
>-also- saw and reported a "UFO" leaving from the vicinity of
>Debbie's yard. There were also 'electrical' effects reported by
>the neighbors. The ground underneath the 'object' (whatever it
>was) was baked at a 1000+ degrees. It was so dehydrated that it
>would not absorb moisture, (water would 'bead' up on it) and
>nothing was able to grow on it for almost 5 years. The grass
>surrounding the area began to grow at twice the rate of the rest

>of the (unaffected) lawn. The streak on the ground coincided
>with the path of the departing 'craft' as per the testimony of
>Debbie, her mom, and three of her neighbors. (Not to mention the
>lab results confirming that something unusual had affected the
>area.)

>UFOs, baked ground, multiple witnesses, what's a poor boy to
>think. At that point in the game, "ET" becomes just as real a
>possibility and worthy of consideration as any other more
>prosaic possibility. You make it sound like it's such a
>'stretch.'

>Sometimes, "a cigar is just a cigar" Jenny. <LOL>;)

>Chances are; it isn't people from our own government out scaring
>the bejesus out of housewives in their mid-western backyards
>because there's nothing better to do. "We" don't have the kind
>of technology that these folks witnessed and reported. (That we
>'know of' anyway)

>Debbie claims she was abducted by non-human beings that night
>and that she was taken on board a UFO. Her dog, also in the
>vicinity of the "UFO" died shortly thereafter from a combination
>of mysterious fevers, open sores, and there was sudden and
>dramatic hair loss in the animal. I've seen the photos. I don't
>think it's terribly far fetched to consider the possibility of
>'ET' at all. Under certain circumstances it is not the
>"stretch" you paint it to be.

Hi John,

The problem is that the baked soil doesn't have a label asying
"Made in Zeta Reticuli 2" (or wherever) nor does it have a space
trajectory pointing to Zeta Reticuli's coordinates. This seems
to be what skeptics want but pro-ETHers object that aliens
wouldn't write in English and use earth-based coordinate
systems, and even hyperbolic orbits curve and would not likely
point straight to the source.

Brad

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

From: Donald Ledger <rdledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 17:48:49 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:31:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:09:02 EST
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's 'Tunnel'
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: Hoagland's "Tunnel"
>>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

><snip>

>><http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

>>The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of
>>many. Interestingly enough, similar "ribbed" structures can be
>>found in Cydonia. Is this evidence of technology, biology, or
>>geology?

>Hi, Mac, List:

>I think this may be a picture of windblown sand dunes at the
>bottom of a canyon. What is the direction of the prevailing wind
>and the picture?

>Clear skies,

>Bob Young

Hi Bob,

Sand dunes are a little simplistic don't you think? I'd tend to think some kind of rills in the canyon, perhaps caused by wind erosion due to windtunnel effect. Torrential rainfall perhaps?:-)

Seriously I lost the page site. Had a look a week or so ago but each time I try to bring it up from the main page this old machine of mine gets overwhelmed by Javascript errors and crashes.

The next time someone goes to the actual page will they save the URL for me?

Thanks,

Don

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:31:39 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:33:28 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Sparks

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:50:48 EST
>Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>>I recently came across this painting :

>><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>>resurrected this idea.

>>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

>Hi, Matt, List:

>The idea that the earth had to be flat was not a universal
>belief. I think that this is one of the myths we have learned
>about the "ignorance" of the past. Any mariner who sailed "over
>the horizon" knew it was curved.

Hi,

Yes it is a modern myth that the earth was widely deemed flat in the Middle Ages. Italian mapmakers even made globes in the 1400's! None other than George Washington's biographer who invented the cherry tree story, Washington Irving, created or promoted the "Flat Earth Myth" in 1802, inserting it into his bio of Columbus, and it has taken root in uncritically rehashed textbooks and history books ever since. After Darwin the story was embellished further with the fable that the Church made it a dogma to believe in a flat earth in medieval times. UC-Santa Barbara Prof. Jeffrey Russell has a book out on this, Inventing the Flat Earth.

Brad

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:08:10 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:35:08 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Salvaille

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

Bruce, Dennis and List

<snip>

>>"Simple" if you can point to non-UFO, mainstream science data in
>>support of same. But science itself has none to offer.

>You don't understand (or I don't understand... someone here
>doesn't understand)... Mainstream science says , "Space Travel,
>yes!" It is not a conceptually difficult extrapolation beyond
>what we already can do to image taking long trips in space...

<snip>

Medieval obscurantism in the XXIst century?

This is another example of dishonest skepticism. It's either
that or plain stupidity.

One has to be plain stupid to put forth the argument that, since
we can't do it now, it will never be.

I would think Dennis is a lot smarter than that.

If you can't figure out that one, too late, too bad and goodbye.

<snip>

>>To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>t>his country, as well as every other country in the world.

[...]

>4) Self-Cover Up: the implications of True UFO sightings... ET
>craft or whatever... are so overwhelming as to make people try
>to ignore it... wish it away (I wish UFOs would go away)...
>because it (a) represents a loss of status for mankind in the
>universe, or (b) introduces (another) uncertainty into our lives
>or (c) makes us feel uncomfortable or (d) makes us angry or (e)
>has no direct impact on the lives of most of us or (f) a
>combination of the preceding a - e.

<snip>

Well, it's probably much much worse than that.

In the modern era, America is at the head of the class and the sorest loser in international affairs. A good example: the economical battles lost by US in international courts and the almost automatic economical retaliations against the winning parties (Canada has first hand experience of that).

America must be the boss and acts accordingly.

Not to say that this is condemnable. This is the game and they make the rules. And if they weren't, somebody else would be doing it.

(Of course, my perception wouldn't be the same if I were Palestinian, Iranian or at the wrong end of some gun manufactured by America.)

Let's try to imagine what it would be for US, Canada, Europe and Japan to loose a war, their respective economies and their cultures.

Keep in mind this is the fate of the inferior culture clashing with the superior one.

Do Aliens have any equivalent for cheeseburgers or Coca Cola?

<Gulp>

Best,

Serge

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Leakers [was: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception]

From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:14:48 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:39:33 -0500
Subject: Leakers [was: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception]

>From: John W. Auchettl <Praufu@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 05:10:14 EST
>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 08:12:17 -0500
>Subject: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception

>TITLE: F-86D UFO Interception
>SOURCE: Duncan Curtis
>DATA: May 20th, 1957
> Kent - England
> The 406th Fighter Interceptor Wing (FIW)
>AIRCRAFT: USAF North American F-86D Sabres
>CREWS: Dave Roberson - Flight Leader 406th FIW
> Milt Torres's - 406th FIW
>CASE REPORT:

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 01:43:29 -0000
>Fwd Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2001 09:56:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath - Bruni

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath
>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 17:10:00 -0000

>>But of course, I wager not one of these scientists and
>>investigative journalists would stand up and allow their names
>>to be associated with your claims about time-travellers, would
>>they? Anyone can quote 'unamed sources' who have made polite
>>noises during cocktail parties to make themselves sound
>>important. It doesn't impress me.

>It might interest you to know that Mike Maloney, Chief of
>Photography for the Mirror Group, stood up in front of 100
>guests at my book launch at the MOD and told everybody how
>credible I was. Even more amazing was that he told his own story
>of how he had been privileged to see a certain film of an alien
>autopsy twenty years ago. This is one of the most respected
>media people in the business.

In recent posts, Dennis Stacy has posed the following question.
If UFOs are real and there is a government cover-up, then why
aren't there any leaks? This is a fair question assuming there
have been no credible leaks. But there have been credible leaks
- lots of them.

The above two posts from Updates just in the last week are
illustrations of "leaks" that happen all the time. In the first
post, submitted by Auchettl, a former RAF pilot described a UFO
interception involving a very bright and apparently very large
UFO which he was ordered to fire upon with rockets.

In the second post by Georgina Bruni, a fellow journalist
admitted to seeing an alien autopsy some 20 years ago.

There are many, many such stories. Leonard Stringfield, e.g.,
wrote of perhaps half a dozen people, most of them military,
claiming to have been show film footage of alien autopsies

and/or crash retrievals dating back to the early 1950's. One doctor who contacted Stringfield claimed to have been involved in an alien autopsy. I spoke to Stringfield shortly before his death, and he said he had to negotiate with this doctor for over a year before he could get any details out of him. Stringfield thought the man very credible.

Most of Stringfield's witnesses remained anonymous. One famous name who claimed to having been shown an alien autopsy while a military pilot was astronaut Ellison Onizuka. Stringfield learned of this through an intermediary and had the intermediary arrange for an interview after Onizuka's Challenger mission. But as Stringfield said, fate intervened and Onizuka was killed in the Challenger disaster.

When I challenged Dennis on the many leakers, of course his refrain was "What leakers?" I knew Dennis would inevitably bring up someone like Bill Cooper, the least credible "leaker" anybody could think of. And of course he did. That's Dennis' typical way of doing business: ignore the best stuff and pretend the worst stuff is all there is to any of this.

But I had in mind a lot of other people whom I consider to be very credible, such as the other Cooper, astronaut Gordon Cooper, who has often stated UFOs are real and cited his own experience, including viewing very clear photographs of one that landed at Edwards AFB in 1957 while he was there. I brought this incident up with the Edwards' base historian about 2 years ago, who knew nothing of it, but basically dismissed Cooper as being mentally ill. That's a pretty typical response among the "nonbelievers" when the subject of a leaker is brought up.

Another astronaut who's recently stuck his neck out is Edgar Mitchell. Though denying personal knowledge, he has said he has spoken to high-level military people who have confirmed UFO reality and such things as the Roswell saucer crash also being for real. Maybe we should call Mitchell a "second-hand leaker."

Another person I consider to be very credible is Gen. Arthur Exon with his comments on Roswell being a crashed spaceship and knowing of other crash retrievals while he was C/O of Wright Patterson. Or Sen. Barry Goldwater many times telling the story of being chewed out by Gen. Curtis LeMay when he asked to see the so-called Blue Room holding alien artifacts at W-P.

There was Canadian engineer Wilbert Smith and related authentic highly-classified documents dating back to 1950. Many of us know of his 1950 interview with Dr. Robert Sarbacher and the top secret documents that followed, where Sarbacher stated that crashed saucers were real, the whole subject was classified higher than the H-bomb, and a special group under the direction of Vannevar Bush was investigating them. Sarbacher tracked down 30 years later confirmed the substance of what was in the documents. Smith and Sarbacher were both "leakers."

Dr. Eric Walker, fingered by Sarbacher as being involved, when initially interviewed confirmed his involvement and knowing of the secret UFO study group. Later Walker started playing games with investigators, and finally just ducked the questions. Walker might be called a "careless leaker" who was initially caught unprepared, but who later "got smart" and started backpedaling.

Another person I consider to be a "coy leaker" was Cpt. Edward Ruppelt, first director of Project Blue Book, who gave us an insider's view of the Air Force investigations of the phenomenon. Several times he slyly referred to the "other group", i.e., at least one highly secretive group also carrying out UFO investigations out of the public eye. There were other revelations, such as many of the scientists and technicians at Los Alamos believing the green fireball phenomenon represented alien probes fired into our atmosphere by orbiting spacecraft. This was in 1952. Ruppelt was also the first to publicly reveal Project Sign's Top Secret Estimate of the Situation, which came to the conclusion that UFO's were interplanetary and which Gen. Vandenberg ordered destroyed.

There was Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, the CIA's first director, who wrote Congress in 1960: "It is time for the truth to be brought out... Behind the scenes, high-ranking Air Force officers are soberly concerned about the UFOs. But through

official secrecy and ridicule, many citizens are led to believe the unknown flying objects are nonsense..." In 1962 after a Congressional investigation into UFO's was killed, Hillenkoetter wrote a letter to Donald Keyhoe of NICAP: "I know the UFOs are not U.S. or Soviet devices. All we can do now is wait for some action by the UFOs."

Or how about physicist Dr. Paul Santorini, Greece's top scientist, Manhattan Project scientist, who publicly declared that he was forced to cease his investigation into the European ghost rockets back in 1946/1947 by the U.S. military? Later Santorini told researchers [such as Raymond Fowler] that secrecy was invoked because officials were afraid to admit of a superior technology against which we have "no possibility of defense." Santorini was a "leaker."

Or how about German rocketry expert Dr. Hermann Oberth who was very public in his statements that UFOs were real? There was NACA/NASA engineer Paul Hill, who described his own extraordinary UFO sightings, and served as an unofficial UFO clearing house for others at NACA/NASA. His conclusions were published in his posthumous book "Unconventional Flying Objects."

Rear Adm. Delmar S. Fahrney, once head of the Navy's guided missile program, publicly stated in 1957 at a press conference, "...there are objects coming into our atmosphere at very high speeds. No agency in this country or Russia is able to duplicate at this time the speeds and accelerations which radars and observers indicate these flying objects are able to achieve." Also, "an intelligence" directs such objects "because of the way they fly. They are not entirely actuated by automatic equipment. The way they change position in formations and override each other would indicate that their motion is directed." [N.Y. Times, 1/17/57; p. 31].

Another Naval rocket expert, Commander R. B. McLaughlin, in charge of the guided missile program at White Sands, wrote a tattle-tale article for the March 1950 "TRUE Magazine" entitled "How Scientists Tracked Flying Saucers" based on various UFO incidents at White Sands and in New Mexico while he was there. One of his comments was, ". . . It was a flying saucer, and further, that these disks are spaceships from another planet, operated by animate, intelligent beings."

On Roswell alone, we have people like Maj. Jesse Marcel, the head intelligence officer, who stated the crash materials were "not of this Earth," and Louis Rickett, the CIC man in Marcel's office who corroborated Marcel's story and told us other details, such as the large recovery operation and high security. There was Col. Edwin Easley, the base provost marshal, who finally admitted to Kevin Randle that there were non-human bodies. There was Oliver Henderson, one of the senior pilots, who told many people before he died that he had flown alien bodies and crash wreckage from Roswell to Wright Field. There was Robert Smith in the air transport unit testifying to multiple cargo planes of crash wreckage being shipped out, seeing some of the mysterious debris, and of an unknown unit at the base flashing badges and ordering people around.

Sometimes documents can be treated as "leaks." E.g., We know little of George Marshall's "Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit," other than the Air Force has confirmed that it once existed. What were they studying: Martian weather balloons? I think the title of the unit gives the whole game away.

The Ramey Roswell teletype message to Gen. Vandenberg of July 8, 1947, I consider to be an inadvertent or careless leak since it was accidentally photographed. Ramey clearly speaks of "the victims of the wreck". He also clearly refers to the crash object as a "disc" and shipping something by B29 or C47 "in the disc" to some 8th ArmyAF Al or division chief at Fort Worth.

Since Mogul balloons had no crews that could be "victims" or insides to be shipped, does anybody seriously believe Ramey was speaking of a Mogul balloon crash? Maybe "the disc" was one of those interplanetary balloons being studied by Marshall's IPU.

But back to the leakers. We could keep adding to the list above. As a group, I'm sure we could create a top 50 or top 100 leakers list. I'm not saying that everyone who makes such statements is

necessarily telling the truth. But basically it comes down to this. Is absolutely everyone, and I mean everyone, in a position to know who makes such statements lying or crazy?

I would like a straight answer to this question from Dennis Stacy or anybody else who says none of this is to be believed. If you dismiss everyone making such statements, then you are essentially calling them ALL liars or crazies, or at best, sadly mistaken, whether you use the actual words or not. You should, at the very least, state very clearly why you think they shouldn't be believed and be prepared to back this up with specifics.

David Rudiak

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:18:21 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:40:59 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Salvaille

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

<snip>

><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

Hello Matt,

Christopher Columbus, 1492, sailed west towards India because he knew the world what round - a notion shared by many sailors of his time.

India was reachable eastwardly, circling Africa; but that was a difficult trip.

Regards,

Serge

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 17:49:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:43:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001 - Hart

>>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:46:23 EST
>>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Sorry I really don't know anything about John Carpenter's
>>situation. Since no one other than the editor and the director
>>is paid by MUFON, its tough to criticize people who have done
>>major work and look for some kind of remuneration.

George,

Since I have a copy of a MUFON federal tax form, I can say my
statement that both the secretary and treasurer get paid
substantial sums annually is true. I was unaware that the MUFON
Journal editor also gets paid.

In any case, MUFON is not investigating the situation or I would
have some feedback from the witnesses. MUFON has no other
magical way to investigate other than working to interview
witnesses and it is just not happening.

My guess is that a majority but not all of MUFON's directors
feel exactly as you do: if the money is right, information can
and will be sold whatever the source or destination. Thankfully,
my estimation is that some few MUFON officials do_not_feel this
way and are as incensed enough about this state of affairs to
cause them to investigate.

Time for MUFON to be recreated from within or this process of
using witnesses, abductees for profit will continue unchecked.
Despite all that has been said here and to the board directors
directly, nothing has changed yet.

Gary Hart

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:00:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:45:04 -0500
Subject: Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Stacy

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: Toronto List <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 04:36:43 -0800
>Subject: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident

<snip>

>No beer? In West Texas?

>I find the account entirely credible regardless. I see no
>men-in-black here, no MJ-12 ruling the world; just some awful
>beast ruling the roost.

>Credits and kudos go to Loren and Jan et. al. for finding room
>for this welcome chuckle, especially Loren.

>Very best wishes

>- Larry (single, fat dumb and happy) Hatch.

Larry,

I'm always available to set straight any misconceptions about
the Great Lone Star state!

To begin with, Camp (now Fort) Hood is outside Killeen in
Central, not West, Texas. Texas at the time was a predominantly
Southern Baptist state and great swathes of it were dry, meaning
no public sales of alcohol. Last time the wife and me were in
San Angelo, which is in West Texas, it was still dry, although I
think you could order drinks in restaurants and hotel bars.

Today, the largest area of contiguous counties in the US still
dry is to be found in the Panhandle of Texas.

This could well explain why I haven't personally looked into the
Levelland case any more than I have.

Dennis Stacy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:48:04 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:45:33 -0000

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>>(And note developements as recent as the last few weeks in which
>>more planets are found and evidence of organic molecules in
>>spaces, life on Mars, etc... indicating tha there probably is
>>life "out there.")

Bruce, Dick,

And notice developments as recent as this week (NY Times, 3-2-2001, p. A20) where, because of those discoveries, scientists are now questioning what it means to be a planet. The article quotes Dr. Neil deGrasse Tyson, head of the Hayden planetarium at the American Museum of Natural History as follows: "Our view here is [that] the concept of planet has little to no scientific meaning or pedagogical value."

The prevalence of these new, so-called "planets" (most are gas giants multiple times larger than our own Jupiter) actually argue against any kind of intelligent life in those "solar systems," not for same.

In addition, someone who argues that ET life is far less common than most ufologists seem to think, is not arguing for a largely lifeless universe. Microbial life is probably quite common, it may even be a sort of universal "rule." But microbial life hung around on this planet for something like 3.5 billion years before it began the long, evolutionary (and highly contingent) march toward large land animals capable of manufacturing spacefaring technology.

>>>To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>>>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>>>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>>>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>>>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>>>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>>>this country, as well as every other country in the world.

>>What you are doing is putting the cart before the horse... or
>>trying to... by saying science has no support for ET type space
>>travel and therefore ufologists resort to UFO data to prove ET
>>space travel is possible. Actually, one can argue for space
>>travel without resort to UFO sightings... and numerous
>>conventional but forward thinking scientists have already done
>>that. (One "forward thinking" individual is Robert Forward...
>>who has argued for zero point energy as a source of "fuel" for
>>space travel... if I recall correctly.)

Well, I don't think that's what I said or implied, but everyone, I suppose, is welcome to their own opinion and interpretation. What I said was, that it is quite easy to imagine UFO scenarios in which mainstream science would have already recognized and accepted ET evidence -- if it was indeed as straightforward and plentiful as many ufologists seem to think. Indeed, one can imagine several plausible UFO evidence scenarios that would not require the existence of a single ufologist. I simply find it curious that none of those scenarios have unfolded to date. If neither of you do, so be it.

And where and when did I ever say or imply that one couldn't come up with abstract principles or theories for space travel? Show me, and I'll buy myself a case of Shiner Bock -- and drink it. Come to think of it, I'll do that anyway.

What I have said before and will say again is this: There are no doubt other intelligent life forms in the universe -- just not as many as most ufologists think, and, for that matter, not even as many as most mainstream scientists thought just a few years ago.

Deep space travel may well one day be a relatively safe and "affordable" (in terms of energy expense & so on) commodity. It's possible that we may have been visited and are still being visited. It is not possible, in my humble opinion, that Planet Earth is a pit stop on the Galactic Autobahn. (re: Hynek's "embarrassment of riches.") Sorry, that's just the kind of guy I am.

>Bruce & List,

>This entire posting by Bruce is very well stated, and I can only
>add "ditto". Dennis still is arguing (deducing) from theory that
>ET UFOs can't be.

>Dick

Again, where have I said that ET UFOs *can't* be? Citations, please.

I'm doing nothing more than positing a hypothesis, just as you are. What's more, I have just as much evidence in my favor as you do, which, yes, includes the absence of incontrovertible UFO evidence.

Since both of you have such a hard time ingesting the hypothesis, let me summarize it one more time: We have been visited by physical, intelligent beings from another solar system a lot fewer times than most ufologists believe.

The theory includes a number of corollaries, but let's not bore everyone on what would otherwise be a perfectly pleasant Saturday night on Planet Earth.

Which makes me wonder: do the aliens have a preferential abduction night? Would be funny if it turned out that they were just weekend binging. (Not funny ha, ha, of course, but funny as in curious.)

Dennis

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Murray

From: **Marty Murray** <mmurray31@home.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 19:19:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:49:33 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Murray

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

Matt wrote:

>Hi List,

>I recently came across this painting :

<http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

>Matt

Howdy Matt!

I can't answer your question, but being somewhat of Ancient Egypt fanatic I do know that the Egyptians were aware that the Earth was a sphere several thousand years ago. Not only that, but they had calculated its size mathematically and were fairly accurate.

Take care,

Marty

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: 1949 Camp Hood, TX Incident - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <project1947@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 16:35:08 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:52:49 -0500
Subject: Re: 1949 Camp Hood, TX Incident - Aldrich

>Dear Sirs and Mmes:

>The latest booklet from the indefatigable
>Loren Gross has come out, and I want to quote
>from one interesting incident.

>Documents found by Jan Aldrich and others indicate
>that there was a serious concern about aerial
>phenomenon, mainly seen as lights, flares etc.
>which should not be in that area.

>One Project Grudge report lists a number of these,
>including an odd report from a sentry at Camp Hood.

>On 09 APR 1949 this sentinel saw a blue Ford sedan
>stop at the side of the road by the base around noon,
>adjacent to a restricted area. It looked like
>mechanical trouble, two men got out and opened the
>hood of the car and "engaged in a discussion".

>At 0945 the next day, the same car stopped at the
>same spot with (again) two men in it, and repeated
>the same actions.

>" In addition, they searched the edge of the roadside
>and picked up two objects, one roughly circular in
>shape, the other of the approximate size and shape
>of a beer can .." [burp!]

>" After placing the objects in the car, they departed
>at a fairly high rate of speed..." [These actions
>were observed by a sentry via field glasses.]

>" The car carried Texas license plates.. " (CU8551)
>which were found to belong to one Mike J. Bird; a
>civilian who worked for the base roads and grounds
>division.

>An FBI investigation revealed that Bird could not
>drink or store beer at his home due to the
>objections
>of his wife [!]

>"To circumvent this restriction, he had been in the
>practice of hiding beer in the range area, and then
>going out in his car to drink it. .. "

>- - - - -

>No beer? In West Texas?

>I find the account entirely credible regardless.
>I see no men-in-black here, no MJ-12 ruling the world;
>just some awful beast ruling the roost.

>Credits and kudos go to Loren and Jan et. al. for
>finding room for this welcome chuckle, especially Loren.

>Very best wishes

>- Larry (single, fat dumb and happy) Hatch.

>cc: LG & JA

Hi Larry

Thanks for the nice mention, however I didn't find most of these documents. I was able to get copies of some of the Project Blue Book and OSI originals, and as a result to provide better clearer copies to Loren for his "The Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse," truly one of the best works in Ufology. Loren's insights are unique and discerning.

The Jan.-Jun. 1949 supplemental is fascinating!
Beer cans and all!

Regards,

Jan Aldrich

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 4](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:55:55 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:56:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:09:02 EST
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's 'Tunnel'
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>><http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

>>The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of
>>many. Interestingly enough, similar "ribbed" structures can be
>>found in Cydonia. Is this evidence of technology, biology, or
>>geology?

>Hi, Mac, List:

>I think this may be a picture of windblown sand dunes at the
>bottom of a canyon. What is the direction of the prevailing wind
>and the picture?

I'm not sure but I'm looking into it. The sand dune theory is
sort of attractive but lacking, in my opinion. Time will tell.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 05:45:44 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:26:32 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Aubeck

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:54:22 EST
>Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>>I recently came across this painting :

>><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>Hi, again, Matt:

>It looks to me that the object pictures is the crescent Moon.
>The title of the picture is "God createing the stars".

>Clear skies,

>Bob Young

Hi Matt, Bob:

Even if it was a depiction of a spherical earth there would be nothing odd about it.

The earth has hardly ever been considered flat. EVER. If anyone wants a full explanation with a chronology, I'd be happy to post one.

Chris Aubeck

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 01:06:08 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:30:29 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 09:26:01 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:07:44 -0800

>>>Date: Sun, 25 Feb 2001 12:47:34 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>>No, No, No! The only metallurgist to view the debris stated
>>flatly that there was not a single method known to metallurgy
>>that could produce the AA craft debris. Not one method!

>Ed,

>Can you provide the name of the metallurgist and info about
>where the List could view his written report as to how he
>determined, through metallurgy that is, that something he
>saw in a movie could not have been produced by any known
>process.

When I hear this discussion about the footage I think of times
in shows and movies when we see someone thrown through a glass
window, except it isn't glass, its made out of sugar and water,
likewise we see a gun firing, but no bullets "actually" go out
of the barrel; we see the good guy being thrown over a very
sturdy looking table, yet the table breaks up and is either a
cut away or made out of balsa wood... but it "looks" real.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: NASA Terminates Space Plane Project - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 01:19:25 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:32:17 -0500
Subject: Re: NASA Terminates Space Plane Project - Gates

>From: Steven L. Wilson, Sr <Ndunlks@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 21:53:51 EST
>Subject: NASA Terminates Space Plane Project
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Researcher Steven L. Wilson, Sr
>To submit paranormal activity email Ndunlks@aol.com

>NASA Terminates Space Plane Project

>WASHINGTON, March 2 (Reuters) - NASA has terminated its
>experimental X-33 space plane project that had been envisioned
>as a lower-cost successor to the aging space shuttle fleet for
>missions into orbit, space agency officials have announced.

>The X-33 program was given the ax after five years of
>development that never even reached the point of a test flight.

>The National Aeronautics and Space Administration said it spent
>\$912 million on the project -- hoping to create an effective
>new-generation reusable spacecraft to transport people and cargo
>into space. X-33 designer Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT.N) spent
>\$357 million, NASA said.

The bottom line was that Lockheed and NASA spent almost a billion dollars for absolutely nothing other than theorys, artwork and notions. Lockheed did the same thing up in Idaho where they blew a bundle of the tax payers dollars to clean up a radioactive pit and according to DOE they spent the money and did virtually nothing.

I suspect that the Bush administration is going through the budget and cutting wasteful programs that haven't generated anything.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 07:18:46 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:34:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Aubeck

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 13:59:02 +1100
>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 21:58:30 -0500
>Subject: Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Feb 2001 15:58:03 -0000
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Feb 2001 07:35:38 -0500
>>Subject: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

>>I have been researching African folklore in connection
>>with CE-IIIs and CE-IVs, and have come upon a wealth of
>>new and old material. However, I have been having some
>>difficulty validating many of South African philosopher
>>/healer/guru Credo Mutwa's claims.

>>I can verify a few of his stories about African belief
>>but many of them seem (seem, but I am not accusing him
>>of anything just yet) of his own invention. What Mack
>>mentions in 'Passport to the Cosmos' is just the tip
>>of an iceberg that stands quite Way Out.

<snip>

>Chris Aubeck

>Hi Chris & the List,

>I feel it would be unfair and inappropriate to judge
>Credo Mutwa on David Icke's presentation of and
>influence on him.

>His story and "otherworldly" claims are not just
>artifacts of Icke's "reptilian" agenda. They have a
>long lineage of which Icke's is a recent aberration.
>Watching Icke's Mutwa interview is fascinating, but
>care must be taken in judging where Icke's influence
>ends and pure Mutwa comes in.

<snip>

>Credo's personal abduction experiences are detailed
>in the Larsen/Mutwa book, Mack's book and more recently
>in Icke's taped video interview ("The Reptilian agenda")
>and an interview partially facilitated by Icke in The
>Spectrum newspaper, by its editor Rick Martin
>(unfortunately now not available on the web - originally
>present as a 37 page transcript). Both Icke's video
>interview and Martin's phone interview occurred in 1999,
>and are worth seeking out, with appropriate caveats.

>Trust this helps in your attempts to reconcile the issue
>of "credibility and Credo Mutwa".

>Regards,

>Bill Chalker

Hello Bill, Glennys, everyone:

Thank you for the feedback on my letter. I appreciate your comments.

The Rick Martin interview which you say is worth a cautious look is still available at this address:

<http://www.nvo.com/dialogue/zulushaman/>

If anyone out there is unaware of Credo Mutwa's life and claims they will find food for thought in this interview. Admitting that Mutwa may have 'updated' his version of Zulu tradition, we are still left with the claims he makes about his own experiences. This is my real concern. The Rick Martin interview in question contains the following gems:

1) Mutwa claims alien craft have repeatedly crashed into a mountain in Lesotho since about 1949. (Where are the remains and reports?)

2) He says he and others have eaten fried alien flesh from bodies of dead Greys. (Does this sound likely to you?)

3) He claims his penis was so damaged after mating with an alien that it is still covered with cracks and scars that have not healed decades later. (This is quite unprecedented in UFO literature.)

4) Mutwa says an implant showed up in an X-ray of his 65-year-old wife's womb. (Why has this picture not been seen? It would prove the reality of abductions once and for all.)

In Mack's book, Credo Mutwa claims that Masai warriors wear codpieces to prevent aliens from draining their semen. I am pretty sure the average warrior has a more prosaic reason for wearing this article.

Also in Mack's book, he states the 'aliens' are not from space but are our future descendants (p.186). This is not what he says in other publications. If his knowledge truly came from ancient traditions this kind of contradiction would not exist.

We can see from the Rick Martin interview that Mutwa has a wide knowledge of UFO culture. He talks freely about Reptilians, Bigfoots, Nordics and Greys. He mentions the work of his friend Zecharia Sitchin favourably and compares some of the alien types to a character in the latest Star Wars movie. Having travelled extensively, he says he knows about Native Australian and Hopi ET beliefs. Mutwa is not naive.

I don't think any of us will be fooled into believing this man's testimony just because he is a old political and religious leader in a hot, largely underdeveloped country and wears the traditional costume of the Zulus, and can give us primitive-sounding translations for our everyday ufological terminology. A little common sense is required, the kind that doesn't let us fall for the tall tales of aged Roswell witnesses, even uniformed ones.

Now, I am not saying that everything Credo Mutwa says is BS but he does seem to be spouting a lot of nonsense that does not come from Icke's influence. This nonsense invalidates his testimony at all levels.

If Mutwa has been talking about UFOs for as long as you say, my suggestion is that somebody with access to his earliest dictated writings makes a comparison between them and his latest claims. If he has not altered his abduction claims in any significant way since the early 1960s I will be forced to acknowledge their validity as a contribution to the UFO debate and hail Mr. Mutwa as the father of abduction research.

Regarding Native Australian ET contact, everything that has been published internationally so far - whether genuine or not - has been superficial and fragmentary. Unless a deeper study is carried out in the near future, before the UFO craze sets in too deeply, I fear the truth will never emerge. Outside influence has entered there, too, as one leading Australian ufologist has told me recently. To what extent can we know which parts of

which beliefs predate the genesis of the modern Flying Saucer era?

Bill, I urge you to post or collect as much information about Aborigine ET belief as possible, if only for the sake of posterity. There is the danger that this problem will turn into another 'Sirius Mystery' conundrum ("Was Dogon cosmology so accurate and detailed prior to contact with Western teaching or not?" etc).

Chicken and Egg problems can't easily be solved but they can be avoided with foresight.

Best Regards,

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

From: Chris Aubeck <chrisaubeck@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 07:21:51 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:36:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 13:59:02 +1100
>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 21:58:30 -0500
>Subject: Re: Credibility and Credo Mutwa - Chalker

>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Feb 2001 15:58:03 -0000
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Feb 2001 07:35:38 -0500
>>Subject: Credibility and Credo Mutwa

>>I have been researching African folklore in connection
>>with CE-IIIs and CE-IVs, and have come upon a wealth of
>>new and old material. However, I have been having some
>>difficulty validating many of South African philosopher
>>/healer/guru Credo Mutwa's claims.

>>I can verify a few of his stories about African belief
>>but many of them seem (seem, but I am not accusing him
>>of anything just yet) of his own invention. What Mack
>>mentions in 'Passport to the Cosmos' is just the tip
>>of an iceberg that stands quite Way Out.

<snip>

>I feel it would be unfair and inappropriate to judge
>Credo Mutwa on David Icke's presentation of and
>influence on him.

>His story and "otherworldly" claims are not just
>artifacts of Icke's "reptilian" agenda. They have a
>long lineage of which Icke's is a recent aberration.
>Watching Icke's Mutwa interview is fascinating, but
>care must be taken in judging where Icke's influence
>ends and pure Mutwa comes in.

<snip>

>Credo's personal abduction experiences are detailed
>in the Larsen/Mutwa book, Mack's book and more recently
>in Icke's taped video interview ("The Reptilian agenda")
>and an interview partially facilitated by Icke in The
>Spectrum newspaper, by its editor Rick Martin
>(unfortunately now not available on the web - originally
>present as a 37 page transcript). Both Icke's video
>interview and Martin's phone interview occurred in 1999,
>and are worth seeking out, with appropriate caveats.

>Trust this helps in your attempts to reconcile the issue
>of "credibility and Credo Mutwa".

Hello Bill, Glennys, everyone:

Thank you for the feedback on my letter. I appreciate your
comments.

The Rick Martin interview which you say is worth a cautious look
is still available at this address:

<http://www.nvo.com/dialogue/zulushaman/>

If anyone out there is unaware of Credo Mutwa's life and claims they will find food for thought in this interview. Admitting that Mutwa may have 'updated' his version of Zulu tradition, we are still left with the claims he makes about his own experiences. This is my real concern. The Rick Martin interview in question contains the following gems:

1) Mutwa claims alien craft have repeatedly crashed into a mountain in Lesotho since about 1949. (Where are the remains and reports?)

2) He says he and others have eaten fried alien flesh from bodies of dead Greys. (Does this sound likely to you?)

3) He claims his penis was so damaged after mating with an alien that it is still covered with cracks and scars that have not healed decades later. (This is quite unprecedented in UFO literature.)

4) Mutwa says an implant showed up in an X-ray of his 65-year-old wife's womb. (Why has this picture not been seen? It would prove the reality of abductions once and for all.)

In Mack's book, Credo Mutwa claims that Masai warriors wear codpieces to prevent aliens from draining their semen. I am pretty sure the average warrior has a more prosaic reason for wearing this article.

Also in Mack's book, he states the 'aliens' are not from space but are our future descendants (p.186). This is not what he says in other publications. If his knowledge truly came from ancient traditions this kind of contradiction would not exist.

We can see from the Rick Martin interview that Mutwa has a wide knowledge of UFO culture. He talks freely about Reptilians, Bigfoots, Nordics and Greys. He mentions the work of his friend Zecharia Sitchin favourably and compares some of the alien types to a character in the latest Star Wars movie. Having travelled extensively, he says he knows about Native Australian and Hopi ET beliefs. Mutwa is not naive.

I don't think any of us will be fooled into believing this man's testimony just because he is a old political and religious leader in a hot, largely underdeveloped country and wears the traditional costume of the Zulus, and can give us primitive-sounding translations for our everyday ufological terminology. A little common sense is required, the kind that doesn't let us fall for the tall tales of aged Roswell witnesses, even uniformed ones.

Now, I am not saying that everything Credo Mutwa says is BS but he does seem to be spouting a lot of nonsense that does not come from Icke's influence. This nonsense invalidates his testimony at all levels.

If Mutwa has been talking about UFOs for as long as you say, my suggestion is that somebody with access to his earliest dictated writings makes a comparison between them and his latest claims. If he has not altered his abduction claims in any significant way since the early 1960s I will be forced to acknowledge their validity as a contribution to the UFO debate and hail Mr. Mutwa as the father of abduction research.

Regarding Native Australian ET contact, everything that has been published internationally so far - whether genuine or not - has been superficial and fragmentary. Unless a deeper study is carried out in the near future, before the UFO craze sets in too deeply, I fear the truth will never emerge. Outside influence has entered there, too, as one leading Australian ufologist has told me recently. To what extent can we know which parts of which beliefs predate the genesis of the modern Flying Saucer era?

Bill, I urge you to post or collect as much information about Aborigine ET belief as possible, if only for the sake of posterity. There is the danger that this problem will turn into another 'Sirius Mystery' conundrum ("Was Dogon cosmology so accurate and detailed prior to contact with Western teaching or

not?" etc).

Chicken and Egg problems can't easily be solved but they can be avoided with foresight.

Best Regards,

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 03:58:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:48:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:47:13 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 23:58:58 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:40:59 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>>Larry, it has nothing to do with 'file size.' They sent full
>>color pictures back (in glorious detail) from Jupiter, Saturn,
>>Neptune, Uranus, all of which are billions of miles farther
>>out/away from us than Mars is. They managed to capture excellent
>>RGB signals from the outer solar system. Why would a body as
>>close as Mars is to us (practically on top of us in comparison
>>to the distances were talking about to the outer solar system)
>>suddenly present problems?

>That's a good question. You could write to JPL and ask them, but
>I doubt you'll get a good answer.

>>That impossible worm-like thingy that we've been discussing
>>could be an electric blue with bright yellow streaks for all we
>>know. What I would really like to know is, What is the ground
>>level resolution of those "glass worm" pix. Does anybody know?
>>I'm dying to know how big those things really are.

>The image information is at:

>http://www.msss.com/moc_gallery/ab1_m04/images/M0400291.html

Hi Lan, hi All,

Lan wrote:

>The image width is 3.5 kilometers, so the "tubes" are are
>roughly 200 meters wide and about 2 kilometers long. That would
>be one humungous worm! Personally, I don't think the possibility
>can be ruled out that these are subsurface lava tubes that have
>been exposed by fractures and erosion of the rock above them.
>Maybe they have a shiny appearance because the molten rock fused
>into a glassy substance as it cooled. I don't know why lava
>tubes would have these bright "rib" features, but then I don't
>know very much about lava tube formation. Perhaps we'll
>eventually find a geologist who's brave enough to venture a more
>informed opinion than mine.

I'm no geologist but, wouldn't exposed 'lava tubes' be solid?
Filled with the cooled lava that once flowed through them. These
things are transparent Lan. Careful scrutiny reveals the ground
is visible under and behind them.

Bob Young proposed that they may be 'wind blown' sand dunes.
Those things are tubular/cylindrical, not flat ground
features. There are similar looking ground features in the area
that appear to be flat but, the 'worm' part is tubular and can
be seen entering and re-emerging from a 'hole/crater.' At 200

meters wide by 2 clix long that's some piece of plumbing!

I'd buy your 'lava tube' theory if it wasn't for the fact that these things are hollow. I would think lava tubes would be opaque, solid affairs. Not 'glass-like' hollow tubes.

No one has tried to address the large 'sphere' that appears to be lodged 'inside' the tube. I'd like to know what yourself or Bob (or anybody) can make of that thing. Thank you for the URL and the info on size. I knew it had to be big to show up so clearly in the pix. I had 'guessed' at one point that may be as large as 200 meters across. But at that point it was only a guess. Tubular structures 200 meters across. Wow! That means that the 'sphere' thingamabob which is inside must be at least that wide.

Curiouser and curiouser. ;)

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 10:05:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:50:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish' - Aubeck

>From: Kelly Peterborough <kellymcb@attcanada.ca>
>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 15:57:10 -0500
>Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:50:47 -0500
>Subject: Wife Sees Husband 'Vanish'

><http://www.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2001/2/27/nation/2714pkal&sec=nation>

>The Star [Malaysia] | 27 Feb. 2001

>Wife sees husband 'vanish'
>By Muguntan Vanar

>TAMBUNAN: A police report has been lodged about an incident that
>could have come right of an X-Files episode.

>A woman told police that her husband became "invisible" right
>before her eyes, and has not been seen since the incident last
>week.

<snip>

Hello to all,

Yabi Gintukad has returned home after a mysterious absence of eleven days.

Apparently he is none the worse for his experience, which he still has not spoken about to anyone.

A search party of 700 villagers could not find him but on Friday night he walked out of a forest area just 150m from his house, looking fresh and physically well.

Nobody knows where he went. Nobody knows how he survived in the forest - if that is where he was - for a week and a half. Only Yabi knows, and he's not telling. Not yet.

Abduction or mental illness?

Either way, we have just witnessed folklore in the making. He will be remembered, probably as a victim of the little people who so predominate the entity types sighted in Malaysia.

Details can be found by following this link to the original report:

<http://www.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2001/3/4/nation/0403pkal&newspage=Search>

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 05:34:19 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:52:04 -0500
Subject: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck

Hello again,

Maybe someone can shed some light on these matters:

1) There are several historical UFO reports involving the finding of a jelly-like substance as a result. These are the dates of the incidents known to me:

1718 (East Indies)
1803 (Silesia)
1811 (Heidelberg)
1819 (Massachusetts)
1846 (New York)
1958 (Ireland)

In most cases the objects look like comets falling to earth and the jelly is found where the impact crater would normally be (but usually isn't).

Are there any other cases to add to the list? Is there a scientific explanation for these events?

2) In 1655 a businessman mysteriously turned up in Portugal and was taken before the Catholic Inquisition. The man claimed he had been standing outside his office in Goa, a Portuguese territory in India, when he was suddenly taken through the air and transported to Portugal. The Inquisition decided he had to be a witch, so he was burnt at the stake.

This tale appears in a UFO book with no bibliographical reference. Does anyone know it's origin?

3) Another teleportation is said to have taken place in Selangor, Malaysia, on August 5th 1970. Somebody was transported 140 miles, but I haven't found a complete or even partial report. It could be an interesting story...

Chris Aubeck

P.S. I am experimenting with different E-mail addresses to see which ones don't mess my postings up, but I will check all my addresses regularly.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Another MJ12 Source

From: **Bob Huff** <bobhuff@tidalwave.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 08:22:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:57:26 -0500
Subject: Another MJ12 Source

Hi,

Spoke to a retired Marine O6 - full-bird Colonel who currently works for a small DoD think tank in Colorado Springs, CO

After graduating from Wisconsin in 1977 he first became a Marine aviator flying A6 Intruders before moving into an intelligence specialty. While stationed in Colorado Springs he worked a variety of national program including TENCAP - Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities.

While in Colorado Springs and at nearby NORAD, the Colonel was briefed into MJ-12. He indicated that it was a Special Access Program that dealt with one-of-a-kind systems and technologies. One of his responsibilities was to help oversee the sharing of technology. He indicated that MJ-12 was involved with highly secret signals intelligence and satellite imaging data.

He refereed to MJ-12 as a relic of the Cold War but still very necessary. Funding for MJ-12 is well hidden and convoluted.

He does not believe that the US Government understands the UFO phenomenon and does not think that MJ-12 activities are alien-based.

He also confirmed that the Aurora spy plane used a 'pulsed engine' design.

Very Best,

Bob

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Meiners

From: Jean Meiners <legalco@uswest.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 07:19:19 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 09:49:12 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Meiners

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>Hi List,

>I recently came across this painting :

><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts? Any one any thoughts?

Sure do. Did you notice that it appears to be the United States
and may show a complete separation of North and South America by
a channel where Central America now exists. Also it would depict
the Baja section of California longer and wider apparently than
it is today. Any other thoughts on this?

Jean

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 09:36:04 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 09:53:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Fleming

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:09:02 EST
>Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 16:27:13 -0500
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

>I think this may be a picture of windblown sand dunes at the
>bottom of a canyon. What is the direction of the prevailing wind
>and the picture?

I think the prevailing winds would probably be in the direction
the canyons are running. This does sometimes result in dunes on
the floor of a ravine or canyon.

The "worm" image is at:
http://www.msss.com/moc_gallery/ab1_m04/images/M0400291.html

The closest match I've been able to find to it for features
identified by MSSS as dunes is:

http://www.msss.com/mars_images/moc/9_7_98_poly_rel/index.html

There is a resemblance. Both have bright, roughly parallel
ridges running along the floors of ravines, something like
railroad tracks. But the resemblance appears strictly
superficial. The floors of the ravines through which the dunes
run are flat or slightly concave. The shading in the "worm"
image suggests that the bright ridges, at least at some points,
are wrapped around a convex tube-like structure. The "worm"
also plunges down into completely dark recesses in the ravines,
almost like a worm burrowing into the ground. The ridges of the
"worm" also form distinct arcs at some positions, unlike the
dunes.

But if this is a giant worm, I think it probably went to
whatever reward giant Martian worms have in the afterlife a long
time ago. There is a discontinuity in one branch of the ravine.
The missing section of the ravine appears to have been buried.
But a few of the ridges run along the higher-level surface, as
if erosion of the "top soil" has partially exposed the upper
surface of the structure below. Whatever this thing is, it's
apparently been motionless long enough to have been buried.

I'm inclined to think these "tunnels" are probably some unusual
geological formations, but I don't think they're dunes. If they
are dunes, they're definitely out of the ordinary.

BTW, I want to make a correction to a previous post.

In a message at:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m03-041.shtml>

I wrote:

"The MGS has taken something like 56,000 images. They've
released a grand total of about 10 Cydonia images that include
features of interest to planetary SETI. That's roughly 2
thousandths of one percent of the total"

That should have been two hundredths of one percent, not two thousandths. Sorry for the misplaced decimal point.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 15:49:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 09:58:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Labels And Communication

Hi Dick,

A most interesting post!

>Since we all tend to throw labels around rather loosely,
>sometimes as epithets, I suggest we discuss the meaning of
>recurring terms so that we can better understand each other and
>facilitate communication. (In the political world it's liberal,
>conservative, radical, middle-of-the-road, anarchist,
>libertarian, etc.)

>I would like to see discussion of what you (each of us) means
>when we label someone as being (in relation to the UFO subject)
a:

>(1) skeptic

Well, I don't think the word itself has anything wrong with it. However, in ufology it has ideological meanings. My experience with skepticism is not philosophical, but more in the religious area. So a skeptic is a doubter.

In everyday life there is much to be skeptical about, the latest announced cures for cancer, AIDS, disease of the month, etc.; evidence of life in meteorites (a recurring theme going back to 19th century that seems to easily entrap scientists); extra solar planets (NBC stated that there were 50 such announcements in the last 50 years which turned out to be false--the "discoveries" having natural or man-made explanations); and finally why something will never happen (space travel is "utter blige."). A good dose of healthy skepticism would do in these areas.

Some self-styled UFO skeptics would probably be better termed "wranglers," (i. e. bickering disputants). They see any UFO case say as explainable in easy terms. Many are. Those that are no little use in the study of UFOs. They see no reason to study the subject except to show how gullible people are, and finally, they are on a crusade for truth, justice and the future of Western Civilization which is somehow threatened by idiot UFO beliefs. A la Condon, there is nothing new to learn here.

Wranglers, seem automatically jump to the conclusion that nothing of interest exists here. They are well verse in evasion and obfuscation. A la Klass. You can't have a discussion with him. If you prove him wrong, he changes the subject, ignores what you said, or suddenly becomes too busy to answer.

Wranglers are also characterized by distorting well established physical laws or scientific principles to explain UFOs. That doesn't seem to bother them or their supporters and science writers eat this stuff up. So much for the righteous cause!

>(2) believer

This word has, for me, again, a religious connotation. In the ufological sense, this word gives me the willies as in conversation with a newly introduced person, "Well, what do you believe UFOs are?"

I believe, I'll have another drink. And that is about all I want to believe in. What can you prove? In ufology, damn little. We would all be better off if there were far less belief here and far more rigorous examination of the facts.

I hear the word believer, in ufological terms, and I think, gullible, credulous, etc.

>(3) debunker

Debunker is not a four letter word; bunk is. In ufology there are legions of bunk generators. Bunk generators make everyday April Fools' Day in ufology. Ufology is not a self-correcting entity. Bunk goes away for awhile and eventually comes back because someone wants to reconsider some generally dubious thing for the nth time.

There is so much bunk in ufology that we are easy prey for scoffers. "Debunker" is no a bad word. I would once again use the wrangler here for what everyone seems to think about "debunker."

I have sometimes generated bunk, and dare I say Dick Hall has sometimes done so, also? However, mostly not on purpose and we try to clean up our messes. The main thing wrong with ufology is, it, generally, does not clean up its own messes, and in fact calls people who attempt to do so "negative" and not open minded.

Dick did a column for UFO Magazine. In it he exposed a number of cons, exploiters and other rather low down characters. You won't find it there any more. The reasons given by the editors for the column's end were not true. They, and unfortunately, ufology in general cannot stomach self-criticism.

>(4) scoffer

I would say the dictionary term works well here.

>(5) apologist

My conception would be a wrangler... obfuscate, evade, and do anything to show an argument in a good light regardless of the facts.

>(6) advocate

I like to think of myself as an advocate for:

- a) raising the standards of ufology
- b) for serious study of the UFO phenomenon (a)

>(7) choose your own label

I like critical thinker as opposed to skeptic. From what I read most ufologists seem to think that "critical thinking" is like "common sense," in that you have or you don't. However, critical thinking requires training and discipline and is sadly lacking in our subject. There are some critical thinkers in ufology. I would say, they make great contributions.

>When I hear the term "debunker" or "scoffer," I tend to think of
>Donald Menzel, Phil Klass, James Oberg...

I think both Menzel and Klass are obfuscators and evaders and are not above pounding square pegs into round holes. That does not mean that they have not been correct many times.

>The term "skeptic" to me is rather sacrosanct because of my
>philosophical training (though I realize most people don't use
>the term in the traditional philosophical sense).

>To me it is an honorable term to describe critical-minded

>scholars who doubt, but investigate and don't scoff or debunk.
>(To me, that definitely excludes 95% of CSICOP.) I think of Jan
>Aldrich, Dennis Stacy, Jenny Randles, and even myself (except
>that I have become convinced of the probable explanation) as
>being skeptics.

I feel like William Donovan when Vandevan Bush said that for the
OSS he didn't need Sherlock Holmes, but rather Prof Moriarty,
and Donovan was his selection as Moriarty.

>There is a lot of room for misunderstanding and friction when we
>use these terms carelessly and think that we all mean the same
>thing, which obviously we don't. And often when we use the
>terms, they are intended to be an insult, or at least to have
>strong negative connotations.

Some further points.

Fortean....Wow! Many people who go by this label today are some
of the most dogmatic people in the world... Fort said, "Accept
only temporarily." You wouldn't know that to read some of the
things these guys say today!

Conspiracy freaks. There must be several hundred ufo conspiracy
theories running around. Not all can be true. Remember NICAP
days, if only we could get the Project Blue Book files, the case
would be proved....well we got them and lots of other stuff
besides, but the conspiracy has now receded to other agencies,
CIA, NSA, NRO, you name it, they are in on it. That is not to
say the officialdom has been candid here. They haven't.

Imperialism. We can't handle UFO reports as it is, but
everything strange or seemingly unexplainable is thrown into the
pot. Dr. Bullard said that the UFO phenomenon is an
imperialistic phenomenon which tries to incorporate these other
"mysteries." We have given up on disappearing garden hoses, sink
holes, pitted window shields, but we still have too much
marginal stuff with no established connection cluttering up the
landscape. Ditto, pet theories.

ET UFO believers and ETH advocates. Well, it is necessary to
make gradations and graduations on what might be meant here.
UFOs started out coming from Mars, maybe. Now that has receded
to interstellar space. Seems like most of this ET stuff is
dedicated to popular culture and/or singing to the choir without
any advancement of ufology.

ETH blasters. Parts of officialdom have been at war with their
own citizens for decades. They have in some case called people
who simply dissent from the official position on UFOs disloyal.
The Condon Committee was not, in the end, to determine anything
about UFOs, it was to blast the ETH. (Did it consider Klassma, a
theory that engage large segments of High Culture at the time?
Hardly. Klassma, had little to do with plasma or ball lightning
as it turned out, however, nearly every science writer fell all
over themselves touting it.) They did find UFO cases that were
unexplainable. Oh, well, you wouldn't get this from reading the
executive summary. Slap some stuff on a weighty study and the
size of the thing keep people from checking the summary against
the item itself. (I have use this trick myself in the Service.)

There are no ETs coming this way because:

1953 (USAF Special Study Group): "the long range patrol would
have picked them up."

1966 (USAF): Project Ozma found nothing

scientists and others at all times: it is just too hard
physically and economically too costly to come here

Fermi paradox: If they exist, we would know it, because they
would already be here. (Don't want to argue ETH, which for me
is a deadend, but I can't resist these examples.)

UFO wackos. These are bunk generators or eaters. No theory too
stupid, the facts don't matter as long as the story sounds good.

I am no ETH advocate. I just want to know what UFOs are, that is
the fraction of UFO reports that are not easily explainable. One
guy said, "you are a 'truth seeker.'" Sound too "New Age-y for

me.

It is also possible with the obsession that UFOs amount to nothing, to miss out on rare phenomena which might occur once a year, once in a decade, once in a century, etc., etc.

I think some very important things about electrical, biological, and astronomical phenomena have been missed here. Satellite velocity meteors, double dippers, ballooning spiders' unusual activities, etc., etc.

Jan Aldrich
Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331, USA
(860) 546-9135

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Man Who 'Vanished' Re-appears Near Home

From: Kelly <kellymcg@attcanada.ca>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 17:58:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 10:04:54 -0500
Subject: Man Who 'Vanished' Re-appears Near Home

<http://www.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2001/3/4/nation/0403pkal&sec=nation>

The Star [Malaysia] | 4 March 2001

Man who 'vanished' reappears near home

By Muguntan Vanar

TAMBUNAN: A man, whose family claimed was abducted by aliens, has returned home after 11 days.

Hospital assistant Yabi Gintukod, 45, was seen walking towards his stilt house in Kampung Kepayan Baru as dogs broke out howling at 10.30pm on Friday.

But he is not talking to anyone, including the police and district hospital doctors.

He keeps his eyes closed most of the time and communicates only with his wife Mainis Gumpat in sign language.

Doctors found him physically well and have referred him for psychiatric treatment. He is currently under observation in the district hospital ward.

"I thank God he is back. I thank everyone who helped in the search for my husband," said Mainis who reported to police that her husband vanished in front of her very eyes after dinner on Feb 20.

Keningau district police chief Deputy Supt Abdul Hadi Baharudin said yesterday they would record Yabi's statement after he completed his medical treatment.

"We are happy that he was found. We don't know why he left or where he went but he seemed to have returned the same way he left," he said.

He said family members told Tambunan police that they heard dogs barking and on checking they found Yabi coming out of a forested area, some 150m from his house.

Yabi was wearing the same trousers and shirt he was last seen in.

"According to my OCS (officer in charge of station), Yabi looked fresh and there seemed to be nothing wrong with him physically," DSP Hadi said.

Yabi's disappearance caused a stir and some 700 villagers in the district mounted a search for him while bomohs and other mediums were brought in to communicate with "his soul".

His brother-in-law Mahat Kulimpang had claimed that Yabi might have been taken by aliens or other supernatural beings.

As mysteriously as Yabi went missing, he has re-appeared. However, many questions remain unanswered, just like in the

X-Files.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Joseph Smith - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 16:34:39 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 10:00:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Joseph Smith - Aubeck

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 26 Jan 2001 15:23:20 EST
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Joseph Smith - Sparks

>>Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2001 09:15:52 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Joseph Smith
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>Joseph Smith's ideas were not as "astonishingly" advanced as
>they might seem, because he believed there were human
>inhabitants _on_ the Sun and other stars, _on_ the alleged star
>Kolob, not near it, as well as Quaker-style men and women living
>on the Moon. Very quaint. Recent Mormon doctrine considers the
>Earth itself a "living thing."

>Regards,

>Brad

Hello again Brad,

In the Book of Mormon God was not from Kolob but from somewhere nearby, as I originally stated. In the third chapter of the Book of Abraham, first published in 1842, we read:

"And I saw the stars, that were very bgreat, and that one of them was nearest unto the throne of God... "And the Lord said unto me: These are the governing ones, and the name of the great one is Kolob, because it is near unto me..."

Just to set the record straight.

Regards,

Chris

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 15:58:55 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 15:54:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01 - Hoagland's

>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 17:48:49 +0000
>From: Donald Ledger <rdledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01
>Hoagland's 'Tunnel'

<snip>

>Sand dunes are a little simplistic don't you think? I'd tend to
>think some kind of rills in the canyon, perhaps caused by wind
>erosion due to windtunnel effect. Torrential rainfall
>perhaps?:-)

I think "sand dunes" is an unlikely explanation, but you never know. I think some form of virtification is more likely.

>Seriously I lost the page site. Had a look a week or so ago but
>each time I try to bring it up from the main page this old
>machine of mine gets overwhelmed by Javascript errors and
>crashes.

I've got all the links I know of at

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/imperative13.html>

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:13:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 15:56:37 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 10:59:57 -0800
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 01:35:36 EST
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Robert wrote:

>>The bottom line is the "metallurgist" based his opinion on
>>"seeing" the footage, rather than actually touching and making
>>an examination of actual debris.

>>I don't have any doubts that a hollywood FX type artist could
>>have made something like that.

Ed replied:

>I think his insights and the depth of his observations are
>brilliant. I would love to have another metallurgist take a look
>at the debris but I doubt any would be willing unless I paid
>them.

Hello, Ed, all...

Note that Ed first complains that no "experts" will stop and look AA seriously, ignoring that fact that yours truly works in film, video and special effects for a living. Oh, sure, I'm not on the level of Francis Ford Coppola or Stan Winston, but I've been in this business for over 25 years. I certainly know as much about film, video production and special effects as the metallurgist does about metal. More to the point, I can actually look at the video, itself, to form an opinion; it's my medium. On the other hand, the metallurgist has never held the debris in his hands; he has no idea if it's metal or not! But my opinions don't count because I don't believe in AA.

Further proof of this exists in his line about the metallurgist, "I think his insights and the depth of his observations are brilliant." Why are they brilliant? Because his views support that of Ed, never mind the fact that a metallurgist can't tell if something is metal or not by looking at images only. Never mind the fact that no tests or analysis can be performed by looking at video tape, only. Just how "serious" can a metallurgist look at video tape to determine the metallic properties of the objects displayed within?

Finally Ed wrote:

>If you took a close look at the AA CDs, you'd never make that
>statement again. Yes an FX type might be able to make "something
>like that" but not the creature shown in the AA. You'll see just
>how impossible that would be if you'd just break down and order
>the AA CDs.

Here we see the classic "bait and switch" that is the hallmark

of Ed's form of debate. When Robert correctly points out the obvious problems with a metallurgist forming an expert opinion from images only, Ed changes the subject, acting as if we are now supposed to have been talking about the "creature shown in the AA". What has that got to do with the topic at hand? Instead of addressing the issues he presented about the metallurgist and the debris, Ed switches gears as usual and moves on to something else altogether!

Ed, why should anyone spend good money on your CDs when intelligent opinions counter to your belief in AA will simply be discounted as "not serious"? More to the point, why is it okay for the metallurgist to form an opinion based on images only and not anyone else?

The irony here is that Ed prefers the opinion of an expert metallurgist about metal he doesn't even have access to over the opinion of an expert videographer about video that he does have access to. In the end, Ed wants other experts to look at AA, but only if they look at it "seriously".

What defines "seriously"? Agreeing that AA is real, it would seem.

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 17:05:04 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 15:59:28 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: David Bolton <David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:23:31 -0000
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>I beams will look like this if they are made by bonding the
>flanges to the web. To get a decent bond you have to use a wide
>section web, or the flanges will have insufficient bonding area.
>Another consequence of this technique is the lack of radius at
>the root - the joint forms a sharp right angle (just as you
>describe).

>Basically, this could be made by bonding styrofoam "flanges" to
>a styrofoam core "web" and then spraying the resultant "I Beam"
>with silver paint. I would imagine that this is standard fair
>for a theatre or film set builder.

David,

Have you viewed the debris footage? Yes, it is theoretically correct that the debris could be spray-painted, bonded, Styrofoam. It could be, theoretically, anything; but viewing sets certain limitations beyond the theoretical. Why not take a look for yourself? I know that Dennis considered your contention. Maybe you can find the bond line and prove your case.

>Oh yes, and if you snap any, they will exhibit a
>crystalline-type fracture, with no evidence of local yielding (as
>per your description).

Yes, I agree it might fracture in this manner, but would it melt as Dennis describes and how would the symbols be engraved in the I beam, and how were the hand imprints created? Why didn't it bend when held in a manner that might cause bending if it were Styrofoam?

Take a look for yourself and see if you think Dennis' observations were out of step with reality. You'll probably find something he missed. We want everyone involved, skeptics and true believers alike, and are willing to share our discoveries with anyone genuinely interested, but we must have a common ground for discussing our evidence. So far the List has been unresponsive to our offers of collaboration.

Ed

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:51:37 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 16:03:45 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:45:33 -0000

>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

><snip>

>>>(And note developments as recent as the last few weeks in which
>>>more planets are found and evidence of organic molecules in
>>>spaces, life on Mars, etc... indicating tha there probably is
>>>life "out there.")

>Bruce, Dick,

>And notice developments as recent as this week (NY Times, 3-2-
>2001, p. A20) where, because of those discoveries, scientists are
>now questioning what it means to be a planet. The article quotes
>Dr. Neil deGrasse Tyson, head of the Hayden planetarium at the
>American Museum of Natural History as follows: "Our view here is
>[that] the concept of planet has little to no scientific meaning or
>pedagogical value."

>The prevalence of these new, so-called "planets" (most are gas
>giants multiple times larger than our own Jupiter) actually
>argue against any kind of intelligent life in those "solar
>systems," not for same.

>In addition, someone who argues that ET life is far less common
>than most ufologists seem to think, is not arguing for a largely
>lifeless universe. Microbial life is probably quite common, it
>may even be a sort of universal "rule." But microbial life hung
>around on this planet for something like 3.5 billion years
>before it began the long, evolutionary (and highly contingent)
>march toward large land animals capable of manufacturing
>spacefaring technology.

>>>>To counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>>>>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>>>>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>>>>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>>>>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>>>>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>>>>this country, as well as every other country in the world.

>>>What you are doing is putting the cart before the horse... or
>>>trying to... by saying science has no support for ET type space
>>>travel and therefore ufologists resort to UFO data to prove ET
>>>space travel is possible. Actually, one can argue for space

>>>travel _without_ resort to UFO sightings... and numerous
>>>conventional but forward thinking scientists have already done
>>>that. (One "forward thinking" individual is Robert Forward...
>>>who has argued for zero point energy as a source of "fuel" for
>>>space travel... if I recall correctly.)

>Well, I don't think that's what I said or implied, but everyone,
>I suppose, is welcome to their own opinion and interpretation.
>What I said was, that it is quite easy to imagine UFO scenarios
>in which mainstream science would have already recognized and
>accepted ET evidence -- if it was indeed as straightforward and
>plentiful as many ufologists seem to think. Indeed, one can
>imagine several plausible UFO evidence scenarios that would not
>require the existence of a single ufologist. I simply find it
>curious that none of those scenarios have unfolded to date. If
>neither of you do, so be it.

>And where and when did I ever say or imply that one couldn't
>come up with abstract principles or theories for space travel?
>Show me, and I'll buy myself a case of Shiner Bock -- and drink
>it. Come to think of it, I'll do that anyway.

>What I have said before and will say again is this: There are no
>doubt other intelligent life forms in the universe -- just not
>as many as most ufologists think, and, for that matter, not even
>as many as most mainstream scientists thought just a few years
>ago.

>Deep space travel may well one day be a relatively safe and
>"affordable" (in terms of energy expense & so on) commodity.
>It's possible that we may have been visited and are still being
>visited. It is not possible, in my humble opinion, that Planet
>Earth is a pit stop on the Galactic Autobahn. (re: Hynek's
>"embarrassment of riches.") Sorry, that's just the kind of guy I
>am.

>>Bruce & List,

>>This entire posting by Bruce is very well stated, and I can only
>>add "ditto". Dennis still is arguing (deducing) from theory that
>>ET UFOs can't be.

>>Dick

>Again, where have I said that ET UFOs *can't* be? Citations,
>please.

>I'm doing nothing more than positing a hypothesis, just as you
>are. What's more, I have just as much evidence in my favor as
>you do, which, yes, includes the absence of incontrovertible UFO
>evidence.

>Since both of you have such a hard time ingesting the
>hypothesis, let me summarize it one more time: We have been
>visited by physical, intelligent beings from another solar
>system a lot fewer times than most ufologists believe.

>The theory includes a number of corollaries, but let's not bore
>everyone on what would otherwise be a perfectly pleasant
>Saturday night on Planet Earth.

>Which makes me wonder: do the aliens have a preferential
>abduction night? Would be funny if it turned out that they were
>just weekend binging. (Not funny ha, ha, of course, but funny as
>in curious.)

>Dennis

Hi Dennis,

Isn't the issue simply this: ETH proponents argue that proof of
Non-Terrestriality = proof of ETH because ETH tops the
plausibility of possible non-terrestrial explanations? (See
Dick's list). But skeptics deny that this is a good reason
because (a) they deny that unexplainable UFO cases are
sufficient proof of non-terrestriality and (b) they claim that
ETH is not necessarily the most plausible of the non-terrestrial
explanations. Skeptics seem to want more a Proof of UFO Reality
rather than ETH Origin and they want it in the form of a massive
alien intrusion into human affairs (space war, invasion, mass

destruction, mass public landings, alien addressing UN, etc.) or a "Made in Zeta Reticuli" type information left in an openly investigated crashed saucer.

It's the intrusiveness that skeptics want, not the information about origin, because contactees and abductees after all have provided loads of "origin information" that skeptics reject as not probative (e.g., Hill case). In which case a non-intrusive UFO case or set of cases could not possibly ever prove ETH, regardless how unexplainable they may be. Isn't that so?

If UFO intrusiveness is required by skeptics, in order to prove UFO reality more than simply inference or even specific information about ET origin, then we need to discuss if this is reasonable. If this is not true then what evidence will skeptics accept as reasonable to prove or demonstrate (if "prove" is too threatening a word or standard) the ET origin of UFO's? Someone needs to model what an ET origin of UFO's would look like in terms of evidence of expected ET behavior and activity in order for us to know what will prove or demonstrate ETH.

We need not personalize this discussion as Dennis-says, Brad-says, Dick-says, etc. We just need to discuss the issues clearly.

Brad

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:51:47 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 16:09:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 17:27:56 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01

>>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 00:58:22 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01s

>>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 12:19:16 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Hello Roger, Lan, John and others:

>>I think there may be another issue here, that of "bandwidth" (I
>>hate the term) or file size.

>>Take any picture, say 1000 by 1000 pixels. That's a million
>>pixels. In black and white (lets say 16 shades of grey from
>>black up to white) we have 16 million bits of info, or 2
>>megabytes.

>>All that has to be sent back to Earth. To avoid noise, a
>>relatively slow redundant channel might be used. In short, we
>>have an information bottleneck.

>>Now, put this into color. How about the nice 4096 colors your
>>computer screen likely can handle? Well, that's 4096 x a million
>>bits..

>The system would have been a bit simpler in this case they had
>>wanted to get a colour image out of the b+w system they have on
>board.

>The usual trick was to provide the camera with 3 coloured
>filters and to take the scene in each of the red, blue and green
>spectra together with a b+w reference image.

>Using your example, that's only 4 x the initial 2 meg image
>data. But that could balloon up in size by burying the data
>within large amounts of error correction code for the downlink
>back to earth.

>I recall reading thst some of the earlier Mar's missions(Viking)
>were encoding the likes of 16 data bits within 64 bits or more
>of error correction coding, the larger the encoding factor the
>more "damaged in transit" data bits could be recovered
>successfully back here.

Hello Neil:

Points well taken! Back on Earth, they could play games with the
levels of blue-red-green in differing proportions to get more
than four pseudo-colors.

Regardless, even by a factor of four, color multiplies the amount of info that must be sent back to Earth, again a bottleneck.

I don't know how powerful the transmitter is, I suppose we could browse that up. Whatever the power, it has to come from some supply which is probably heavy and definitely finite .. and it has to reliably transmit the data back to Earth from Mars.

In short, the scientists must pick and choose what they want to image, at which resolution, color vs B&W, and weigh all this against the possible benefits of the images.

I'll bet there are heated discussions over what to shoot and how.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report -

From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 13:04:44 +1100
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 16:17:58 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report -

Hello everyone :>)

I just got in wow a debate is going on poor.... Bill Chalker.

>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 14:41:58 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report
>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:11:19 +1100

>>Hi Bob, John & List-folk,

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 10:37:44 EST
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:52:01 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 15:57:14 -0500
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>>>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

>>>>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>>>>One object had been fired upon but bullets had been deflected
>>>>>without causing any apparent harm.

>>>>>_Fired_ upon!? Has this been confirmed? If so, it is bar none
>>>>>one of the most outrageous reports I have ever heard. Does the
>>>>>OZ Air Force go out of their way to recruit people that were
>>>>>repeatedly dropped on their heads as infants? What kind of
>>>>>genius pulls the trigger on a UFO? What kind of moron gives such
>>>>>an order?

>>>Hi John, Diane, Bill, anybody:

>>>What kind of genius equips his interceptors with "bullets",
>>>nowadays. Snoopy or the Red Baron? And was it a Sopwith Camel?
>>>"OZ Air Force", indeed. This story, or at least this exciting
>>>detial, is fiction.

>>>Clear skies,

>>>Bob Young

>>Let me put this Collaroy saga into context.

>>I learnt of the events over Collaroy of Friday, March 23rd, on
>>Saturday, March 24th, via Peter Khoury, who had received a call
>>from one of the witnesses. This witness had called a local

>>investigators number. That investigator was not available, but
>>the person taking the call made some garble mention to the
>>witness of the suggestion that the UFO had been in trouble and
>>that no doubt it had escape pods and there would be a rescue!
>>The witness didn't seem impressed with that, but tried to
>>contact the UFO Network hotline. Unfortunately there were
>>technical problems apparently at that time. Peter Khoury was
>>called.

><snip>

>>Because of the questionable nature of the Darwin part of this
>>saga I did not focus too strongly on it in my enquiries with the
>>Department of Defence. As Moira & Bryan seem to have a more
>>direct account of this aspect, perhaps it would be more
>>appropriate for them to advise us why we should take that aspect
>>more seriously. Wing Commander Geoff Patchett, Public Affairs
>>Coordinator - Air Force (RAAF), further advised me on March 1st,
>>"I am not sure what was going on last weekend but I am certain
>>it didn't involve us!" In conclusion, something clearly happened
>>over Collaroy on Friday, February 23rd. Maybe we might get to
>>the bottom of it? As for the more extraordinary alleged Darwin
>>RAAF attempted UFO intercept lets see if it grows and gains any
>>credibility. At this stage I would treat it as an unconfirmed
>>"rumour", pending further enquiries and supported detail from
>>Bryan Dickeson and Moira McGhee.

>Hiya Bill, hi All,

>Thanks for taking the time to explain your involvement in
>this and for sharing the details of what you've learned so
>far.

>I myself was upset to read that the military of any nation was
>"firing bullets" at a "UFO". It turns out that the 'source' for
>the military component of the report may have been an old bitty
>that was "out of sorts" (I assume that "out of sorts" is polite
>Aussie code for, the old lady was "hammered.")

>Good! I said I'd rather that it was all a result of week-end
>drinking and group of 1200 cc Harley Davidson Hogs. Better that,
>than "the military fired on a UFO."

>I think that it would be wise for all concerned to hold off
>publishing/announcing _any_ UFO reports (at least) until it can
>be established that the details that are being released have
>some grounding in reality. It just doesn't pay to be "trigger
>happy" about reporting (internationally) the details of cases
>that are still in the process of being confirmed. (Diane!) ;)

I agree with you John, but when half a thread is posted on
AUFORN list then it is also a good idea to post the whole thread
as it unfolds which I did that same day.

I did this in the best interest of the people involved as I have
some international UFO list managers receiving our mail before
you get to see it. If I hadn't done this, I would have been shot
a dawn for letting it go by.

Now if some of the information is and or was found to be B.S.
well this is what I would have posted out without prejudice but
I see Bill has been keeping you all informed - thanks Bill :>)

The First post had it all - the good the bad and the ugly. I do
confess, yes I did pull the trigger :>) only after the bullet
was fired at our list. That's when Bill stepped in and filled us
in with more details, again thanks Bill. Byran's e-mail was
never posted as an individual e-mail to this list as it was on
ours. As we have no restrictions on our list members they are
free to post wherever. You could say I cut things off at the
pass in the best interest of everyone and did some checking of
my own. The whole story is better than half even if some of it
was out there.

First e-mail

>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:29 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 16:19:10 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:08:10 -0800

<snip>

>Let's try to imagine what it would be for US, Canada, Europe and
>Japan to loose a war, their respective economies and their
>cultures.

>Keep in mind this is the fate of the inferior culture clashing
>with the superior one.

>Do Aliens have any equivalent for cheeseburgers or Coca Cola?

><Gulp>

Hi, Serge, List:

This afternoon I just caught the delightful movie Mars Attacks.

They might not be interested in cheeseburgers.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Leakers - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:31 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 18:21:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:14:48 EST
>Subject: Leakers [was: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception]
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>In recent posts, Dennis Stacy has posed the following question.
>If UFOs are real and there is a government cover-up, then why
>aren't there any leaks? This is a fair question assuming there
>have been no credible leaks. But there have been credible leaks
>- lots of them.

<snip>

>There are many, many such stories. Leonard Stringfield, e.g.,
>wrote of perhaps half a dozen people, most of them military,
>claiming to have been show film footage of alien autopsies
>and/or crash retrievals dating back to the early 1950's.

<snip>

>Most of Stringfield's witnesses remained anonymous.

This, of course, makes them highly credible.

>One famous name who claimed to having been shown an
>alien autopsy while a military pilot was astronaut Ellison
>Onizuka. Stringfield learned of this through an intermediary
>and had the intermediary arrange for an interview after
>Onizuka's Challenger mission. But as Stringfield said, fate
>intervened and Onizuka was killed in the Challenger disaster.

Why am I not surprised?

>But I had in mind a lot of other people whom I consider to be
>very credible, such as the other Cooper, astronaut Gordon
>Cooper, who has often stated UFOs are real and cited his own
>experience, including viewing very clear photographs of one that
>landed at Edwards AFB in 1957 while he was there. I brought this
>incident up with the Edwards' base historian about 2 years ago,
>who knew nothing of it, but basically dismissed Cooper as being
>mentally ill. That's a pretty typical response among the
>"nonbelievers" when the subject of a leaker is brought up.

>Another astronaut who's recently stuck his neck out is Edgar
>Mitchell. Though denying personal knowledge,

Yes, he has said that he has never seen a UFO, himself [yawn]

>spoken to high-level military people who have confirmed UFO
>reality and such things as the Roswell saucer crash also being
>for real.

Even believers in the Mogul explanation have concluded that it
is "for real".

>Maybe we should call Mitchell a "secondhand leaker."

How about just calling this another bit of name dropping to pad
your list. If he doesn't know something, himself, how is he a

leaker. Dave, at this rate, you're a "second or thirdhand leaker", yourself, just for repeating all of this nonsense.

>Another person I consider to be very credible is Gen. Arthur
>Exon with his comments on Roswell being a crashed spaceship and
>knowing of other crash retrievals while he was C/O of Wright
>Patterson.

The changing memories of a 90 year old man, as outlined in recent posts to this list, must be considered most credible.

>Or Sen. Barry Goldwater many times telling the story
>of being chewed out by Gen. Curtis LeMay when he asked to see
>the so-called Blue Room holding alien artifacts at W-P.

LeMay was known to chew out a lot of people. Maybe he thought the question was silly.

> Dr. Eric Walker, fingered by Sarbacher as being involved, when
>initially interviewed confirmed his involvement and knowing of
>the secret UFO study group. Later Walker started playing games
>with investigators, and finally just ducked the questions.
>Walker might be called a "careless leaker" who was initially
>caught unprepared, but who later "got smart" and started
>backpedaling.

You need to get your feet on the floor. Dr. Walker was clearly "playing games" from the very beginning. Anyone who reads the transcript of his supposed phone conversations in T. Scott Smith's book can only conclude that he was making fun of the caller's flying saucer interest. Man, don't you guys have any sense of humor? Even when somebody's putting you on you take it for real proof of the Cover-up.

>Another person I consider to be a "coy leaker" was Cpt. Edward
>Ruppelt, first director of Project Blue Book, who gave us an
>insider's view of the Air Force investigations of the
>phenomenon. Several times he slyly referred to the "other
>group", i.e., at least one highly secretive group also carrying
>out UFO investigations out of the public eye. There were other
>revelations, such as many of the scientists and technicians at
>Los Alamos believing the green fireball phenomenon represented
>alien probes fired into our atmosphere by orbiting spacecraft.
>This was in 1952. Ruppelt was also the first to publicly reveal
>Project Sign's Top Secret Estimate of the Situation, which came
>to the conclusion that UFO's were interplanetary and which Gen.
>Vandenberg ordered destroyed.

He publishes this in a book which had each and every line approved by the Air Force and you call him a leaker?

Oh, I forgot, you called him a "coy leaker" and a "sly leaker".

>There was Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, the CIA's first director,
>who wrote Congress in 1960: "It is time for the truth to be
>brought out... Behind the scenes, high-ranking Air Force
>officers are soberly concerned about the UFOs. But through
>official secrecy and ridicule, many citizens are led to believe
>the unknown flying objects are nonsense..." In 1962 after a
>Congressional investigation into UFO's was killed, Hillenkoetter
>wrote a letter to Donald Keyhoe of NICAP: "I know the UFOs are
>not U.S. or Soviet devices. All we can do now is wait for some
>action by the UFOs."

Another "coy leaker"?

David, can you point to one single thing in the above paragraph that represents a "leak" by Hillenkoetter. That nothing of the sort is there suggests that Hillenkoetter may have been a believer - after all there were many - but that he apparently had nothing much of substance to leak.

>Or how about physicist Dr. Paul Santorini, Greece's top
>scientist, Manhattan Project scientist, who publicly declared
>that he was forced to cease his investigation into the European
>ghost rockets back in 1946/1947 by the U.S. military? Later
>Santorini told researchers [such as Raymond Fowler] that secrecy
>was invoked because officials were afraid to admit of a superior
>technology against which we have "no possibility of defense."
>Santorini was a "leaker."

Yeh, V-2 class Ballistic missiles. We still have "no possibility of defense", unless you count Bush's Faith-Based Missile Defense.

Can you explain how all of these people escaped prosecution for leaking the secret of the millennium? Have any of these people ever been prosecuted?

If not, why not? What does this say about the importance of these supposed UFO secrets being leaked?

Or is the U.S. Government only "coy" in its defense of top secrets?

Or, is it only you who are being coy? Or is it sly?

<snip>

>But back to the leakers. We could keep adding to the list above.
>As a group, I'm sure we could create a top 50 or top 100 leakers
>list.

David, why don't you really contribute something to the discussion by listing 100 top leakers who have been prosecuted by the United States Government for breaking security to reveal the classified secrets of the Flying Saucers?

Don't be coy, David. Give us a list.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary

From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:37:30 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 18:41:40 -0500
Subject: Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary

CCCRN NEWS
The E-News Service of the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

March 5, 2001

CIRCLE PHENOMENA IN CANADA SUMMARY REPORT 2000

By Paul Anderson
Director
Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

March, 2001

Web version of this report with correlating images:
<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada/summary00.html>

Overview

As in previous years, in the summer and fall of 2000, a number of crop circles, those circular or geometric areas in flattened field crops (or in some cases in grass, ice or snow, etc.) were reported in Canada, predominately again in the western and central regions. While this summary focuses on the "standard" crop formations reported (primarily wheat and barley in Canada), it also includes such additional, possibly related reports as a matter of record (for this year including grass and ice rings).

Eleven formations were reported in total to CCCRN (formerly CPR-Canada until March 1, 2001) for 2000, including seven in Saskatchewan, two in Ontario, one in Manitoba and one in Quebec. This was down from twenty five in 1999 and fourteen in 1998. While this was less than may have been anticipated, it is important to keep in mind that the numbers for any given year can vary for a number of reasons such as growing conditions (earlier or later growing season than normal), ruined crops (ie. wind damage) or farmers being able and / or willing to report formations (knowing who to report them to is important; we know from experience that a number of formations are not always reported to anyone when initially found, either because the farmer didn't know who to contact or didn't realize what they had may be significant, older farmers in particular who are often not familiar with the phenomenon to begin with). In some cases, we have learned of formations sometimes several months or even longer after they had actually occurred. For example, the farmer who discovered the dumbbell formation at Moosomin in 2000 reported then that he had also found another single circle in the same field the year before in 1999, but did not know who to report it to at the time, and as it was only about ten feet in diameter, didn't think too much of it (similar to the Grenfell, Saskatchewan circle in 2000). Other farmers have given similar accounts over the past few years, including one at Alameda, Saskatchewan, who, we eventually learned in July 2000, had between twenty and twenty five rings in his pasture field in 1999. Cases like this reaffirm our opinion that probably a

significant number of formations, mainly single circles or small groups of circles, never get reported at all, and therefore remain uninvestigated, and may be more common than we think.

Also in 2000, the overall complexity was down from 1999 (only simple circles or basic geometric forms being found), which again may be disappointing to many, however the quality in most cases (in terms of lay patterns, lack of visible damage to the crop, etc.) was just as good as previous years, and again, significant physical anomalies were found in some formations (the classic blown nodes and other abnormalities, including seed heads from inside the Moosomin, Saskatchewan formation which were twisted and deformed, almost having the appearance of "corkscrews"). Where possible, samples were again collected for the BLT Research Team (Dr. W. C. Levengood), which has led the way in the scientific study and laboratory analysis of plant and soil samples from crop formations over the past decade and with whom CCCRN has collaborated for the past several years now.

The 2000 Season - Summary and Highlights

The first report for 2000 was a set of five small doughnut-shaped rings averaging about 15 feet in diameter in a pasture field at Ashern, Manitoba, north of Winnipeg, found in mid-June by bird watchers. They were reported on CBC radio and a confirming report was received from Chris Rutkowski, Ufology Research of Manitoba. They appeared to be "old-style" UGMs (Unidentified Ground Markings), consisting of a darkening of the vegetation, not crop circles in the classic sense.

On June 19, a similar set of rings was discovered in a wild grass field (farmer's name withheld by request) at Willmar, Saskatchewan, south of Regina, reported by CCCRN field research assistant Beata Van Berkomp and local reporter Dawn-Marie Barker. Five rings again, averaging about 25 - 27 feet in diameter. They were dark green in colour, similar to Ashern, and the grass was stunted in growth, not flattened as in typical crop circles. Three of the rings had an opening in them, making them more like horseshoes in shape. Another oblong shape about 30 feet long and 6 feet wide, and other isolated lines and "grapeshot" circles were nearby. Possibly fungus rings, although the shapes formed and sizes were interesting. It was learned that another farmer had found a similar set of rings in the nearby area, exactly 25 years ago to the day.

The first circle in a regular crop field was found August 9 at Grenfell, Saskatchewan by farmer Lloyd Arthur while combining his wheat field, and reported by local reporter Jamie Gibson from The Grenfell Sun newspaper. Formation was a small single circle, about 10 feet in diameter, in mature wheat. The lay pattern was radial, with the wheat stalks flattened out from the centre to the outside edges, similar to that seen in the large seven-circle Edmonton, Alberta #2 formation from 1999. No tracks were reported found in or around the circle, and the centre region was initially described as darkened or singed appearing. CCCRN Saskatchewan coordinator Dennis Eklund was able to visit the site on August 27 and do a general survey, although the formation had already been swathed over and was generally messy and uneven in appearance by that time. The only abnormalities found were a few swollen nodes. Media coverage included The Grenfell Sun newspaper.

On August 10, a set of three large circles was found in a combination barley / oats field at Oro-Medonte Township, Ontario, near Orillia. Discovered by farmer Garnet Horne, and initially reported by CCCRN field research assistant June Mewhort. Ground investigations conducted by CCCRN Ontario coordinator Drew Gauley, CCCRN field research assistant Mike Bird, June Mewhort and former Canadian MUFON director Henry McKay. The largest circle was about 70 feet in diameter, the second 50 feet and the smallest 30 feet. Mr. Horne was both excited and somewhat unnerved by the formation, never having seen any before, and reporting that the circles had not been there the previous night, but were there by early morning, with no footprints or other tracks being found. All circles were flattened counter-clockwise. Mr. Horne also reported that his two dogs initially refused to go in or near the circles, something which has been reported before. Around a thousand visitors came to see the circles in the next ten days or so after they were found..Media coverage included The Ottawa

Citizen, The Calgary Sun and The Orillia Packet & Times newspapers.

The next crop formation reported was again in Saskatchewan, this time at Moosomin. Found August 20 by a local cropduster, and reported by Nancy Talbott of the BLT Research Team, the formation was a large basic 'dumbbell' type pattern in wheat, similar to early 80s formations in England and Europe. Approximately 250 feet in length, it was one of the largest formations to date in Canada, despite its general simplicity. Again, no footprints or pathways initially found. Ground studies were conducted by CCCRN Saskatchewan coordinator Dennis Eklund. The larger circle had two layers of flattened crop, counter-clockwise on top and clockwise underneath. The smaller circle was one layer, counter-clockwise. The crop in the connecting pathway was flattened in two opposite directions, running from each circle and meeting in the center of the pathway, where a tuft of crop pointed toward the outside edge of the pathway. As with Oro-Medonte, the farmer (name withheld by request) reported that peoples' dogs refused to go near or in the formation, and acted very agitated. Inside the formation, seed heads on many of the stalks were found to be significantly deformed, twisted and curled, almost like "corkscrews". Plants outside the formation were normal. Media coverage included The World-Spectator, The Leader Post and The Western Producer newspapers.

On August 24, farmer Randy Ellis discovered a single circle while combining his wheat field at Hazlet, Saskatchewan, near Swift Current, and reported it that afternoon to CCCRN. Circle was in durum wheat, about 22 feet in diameter with a tight clockwise spiral lay. Again, no damage or entry pathways found, and the circle is in a field with no tramlines (as most are in Canada and the US), and well into the field, not visible from any roads. Randy's wife Heather reported that she felt unusually light-headed inside the circle, like she was feeling some kind of energy (another fairly common occurrence). Unfortunately this formation was not able to be investigated on the ground by CCCRN.. Media coverage included the local CBC television news affiliate CJFB in Swift Current and The Western Producer newspaper.

On September 6, CCCRN Saskatchewan coordinator Dennis Eklund was surprised to hear of another circle just on the outskirts of his hometown of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan on the local news. He and field research assistant Beata Van Berkom were soon able to get to the location of the formation, a ringed circle about 43 feet in diameter in oats. First noticed by passing motorists on a nearby road and shown on local news. The farmer was elderly and not too interested in any publicity, but the neighboring farmers assisted in the investigation. The counterclockwise central circle had a tuft of standing crop in the center, and was surrounded by the outside ring, also counterclockwise. Various anomalies were associated with this circle, including Dennis' (manually operated) camera failing to work properly inside the formation after the first few shots on the first day of the ground investigation. Later, the photographs taken inside the formation didn't turn out at all, while ones taken outside were normal. The nodes on the oat stalks inside the formation were shrunken and dehydrated-looking, often leaving only a dark ring indented into the stalk. Nearby were areas of "randomly downed crop", flattened in irregular patterns, including a large 350 foot roughly circular area surrounding a nearby clump of trees about 200 yards north of the ringed circle and meandering "pathways" going through the crop, about 3 - 4 inches wide. The plants in these areas also had the same kind of node deformities as in the ringed circle. Media coverage included local CFUC television news.

Around the same time, a second "formation" was found in another field about a mile from the first Saskatoon location, consisting of more random patches of flattened crop (wheat in this case) and other "long straight lines" which made sharp turns in the field, generally following the other patches. This field had already been swathed by farmer before these could be studied on the ground, but the farmer did make records of them. Similar patterns of downed crop were also found and investigated by CCCRN field research assistant Judy Arndt in the Edmonton, Alberta area in 2000. Being more random and widespread in the region, these were not categorized as formations per se, but a report from Judy on these will be available soon as a comparison

study. These were the only type of crop "formations" reported in Alberta in 2000. It was interesting to note that within these areas of "lodging", many blown nodes were also found..

The last known crop formation for 2000 was found at Viscount, Saskatchewan, just east of Saskatoon, on September 12, where circles have been found before in previous years. Two simple circles close to each other in a wheat field, very similar to a pair of circles in the same area in 1999. Circles were about 45 feet and 43 feet in diameter respectively, and approximately 100 feet apart. Discovered by farmer Don Solmes while combining, in a remote part of the field, about a mile or so from the nearest road or path. Both circles had a tight, counterclockwise swirl and were in near-perfect condition when found. Due to their remote location, it is unlikely anybody would have ever seen them apart from the farmer, if he had not reported them to CCCRN. Ground studies conducted by CCCRN Saskatchewan coordinator Dennis Eklund. In the larger circle, compass reading deviations of 3 - 4 degrees were seen, increasing as one moved toward the centre. Also in this circle, many blown and expanded nodes were seen, all being the second node from the bottom of the stalk. The smaller circle had noticeably stretched, but not blown nodes..

The final reports for 2000 were a departure again from the usual crop circles, in this case two "ice rings", one at Lac Pelletier, Quebec found November 19 and the second at Delta, Ontario, found December 2. Similar ice rings have been reported in Canada and elsewhere before, such as at Alonquin Park, Ontario in 1997 and Wells Gray Park, BC in the mid-1970s although not in nearly the numbers as the crop formations. The Delta ring was found about 7:00 am in the morning, after a cold night of -14 c. Reported by CCCRN Ontario coordinator Drew Gauley. Joan LaForty, the property owner, stated that the ring was not there the previous night. The ring was approximately 15 feet in diameter and 3 inches wide, and was a perfect circle etched into the thin ice of the small pond behind their barn; the ice was reportedly too thin for anyone to walk on. Media coverage included an article in The Mural newspaper. The second ring was found on Lac Pelletier, a small lake in the Laurentian Mountains of Quebec. Report received from UK crop circle researcher Francine Blake, who learned of the formation while on a visit to eastern Canada. Basically similar to the Delta ring, although not as much is known about this formation unfortunately. A series of circles and rings was reported on the same lake in 1999..

Conclusions

While in some respects 2000 may have seemed a bit of a disappointment compared to 1999 in particular, the phenomenon did continue to make its appearance in Canada, following the same general trends that it has for the past decade or so, with formations that are basically simpler in form than many in the UK and Europe, but still producing a wealth of data, including good physical evidence that can be followed up on and studied further. Work toward this end continues, in particular with the BLT Research Team. The reports of other phenomena such as the ice rings should continue to be investigated as well, even while they may not have any relation to the crop circles; at this point it is too early to tell..

Additional Notes

A print version of this summary, with additional data, diagrams, photos, maps and newsclippings will be published shortly. Proceeds help support further research projects. An archive of full reports and images is available on the CCCRN web site. This report may be reprinted, as long as copyright credits are provided.

For Further Information

CANADIAN CROP CIRCLE RESEARCH NETWORK

Main Office:
Suite 202 - 325 East 14th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5T 2M9

Canada
Tel / Fax (office): 604.731.8522
Tel (cell): 604.727.1454
E-Mail: psa@direct.ca
Web: <http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

Provincial Branch Contacts:
<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada/contacts.html>

Reporting Hotline:
604.731.8522

Credits / Acknowledgements

Dennis Eklund (CCCRN Saskatchewan), Beata Van Berkom (CCCRN Saskatchewan),
Drew Gauley (CCCRN Ontario), Mike Bird (CCCRN Ontario, TSPC) June Mewhort
(CCCRN Ontario), Judy Arndt (CCCRN Alberta, Crop Circle Quest), Chris Rutkowski
(Ufology Research of Manitoba), Henry McKay, Nancy Talbott (BLT Research Team),
Francine Blake (CCCS-UK), Marshall McLeod (The World-Spectator), Kevin Weedmark
(The World-Spectator), Julie Langpeter (The Orillia Packet & Times), Cathie Whittaker
(The Mural), Jamie Gibson (The Grenfell Sun), Dawn-Marie Barker, Ian Sletten

© Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, 2001

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 23:49:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 21:26:51 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 16:30:09 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:09:17 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

<snip>

>Hi John,

>The problem is that the baked soil doesn't have a label saying
>"Made in Zeta Reticuli 2" (or wherever) nor does it have a space
>trajectory pointing to Zeta Reticuli's coordinates. This seems
>to be what skeptics want but pro-ETHers object that aliens
>wouldn't write in English and use earth-based coordinate
>systems, and even hyperbolic orbits curve and would not likely
>point straight to the source.

Hi Brad,

I agree. And it's a shame really. It's why I firmly believe that
until/unless this phenomenon (whatever it may be) intentionally
makes its presence common knowledge, the argument over its
existence will rage on unabated.

And, even if the skies filled with UFOs, and "Grey aliens"
walked our streets, there are folks that would insist that they
are midget actors inside costumes, and that the whole thing is
an elaborate Hollywood stunt! <LOL>

Regards,

John Velez

PS- Brad, I haven't forgotten that I owe you single frame
captures. I'm having problems with the A/V capture on my mac. I
can record from video but the second I try to save the file my
mac crashes. It's been frustrating. If there are any 'mac users'
on the List that can help me figure out what's wrong, I'd
appreciate the advice. Contact me 'off-List.'

Brad, the second I'm able to make the single frames for you, you
will have them. Sorry for delay. I'll get my 'confuser' working
properly asap. JV ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Leakers - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 23:27:09 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 21:31:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Stacy

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:14:48 EST
>Subject: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>In recent posts, Dennis Stacy has posed the following question.
>If UFOs are real and there is a government cover-up, then why
>aren't there any leaks? This is a fair question assuming there
>have been no credible leaks. But there have been credible leaks
>- lots of them.

<snip>

>When I challenged Dennis on the many leakers, of course his
>refrain was "What leakers?" I knew Dennis would inevitably bring
>up someone like Bill Cooper, the least credible "leaker" anybody
>could think of. And of course he did. That's Dennis' typical way
>of doing business: ignore the best stuff and pretend the worst
>stuff is all there is to any of this.

David,

And the above is pretty much typical of your modus operandi, namely doing what you accuse me of doing. Why reference only Cooper? Why not address the status of the other "leakers" I mentioned? Since you seem to have forgotten their names, let me refresh your memory. The others were Philip Corso, the Mother of All Leakers, Bob Lazar, who claimed to have helped reverse engineer a UFO while assigned to Area 51, and Robert Dean, who claims to have seen alien autopsy pictures and everything else while a master sergeant in Europe with NATO.

Now, again, your opinion of the credibility of the above, please. Kooks, liars, or credible leakers -- as you seem to think those are the only choices. You answer the questions I ask -- not ones you put in my mouth -- and I'll do you the courtesy of trying to answer yours.

And while I'm at it, why didn't you cite my original post -- as you did that of three other posters in your post? Maybe because you didn't want to deal with what I actually said, as opposed to your version of what I said.

So, for the record, here's a quote from my original post:

"Yes, but that doesn't necessarily make it my logic system. UFOs could still be real, and that wouldn't necessarily imply that we must have alien bodies on ice somewhere. My point was, simply, that if we indeed have all this stuff under tight wraps, then it's possible to imagine the release of something that would be so incontrovertible as to render moot what anyone thought of the leaker. To my knowledge that hasn't happened yet -- for any number of reasons that might apply. Your argument is one, and the possibility that we don't actually have any bodies or crash debris to divulge is another."

It should be clear (except, apparently, to David Rudiak) that I'm referring to the leaking of actual evidence here, not to claims of having seen this or that way back when. If the above leaves any doubt as to what I'm referring to, the paragraph that followed it should have removed same. It was as follows:

"Moreover, your basic assumptions apply only to the theoretical stuff in our vaults. Who or what is there to guarantee that other countries/leaders wouldn't behave differently? Might not a cash-strapped Montenegro, to think of but one example, auction off a recovered crashed disk and bodies to the highest bidder?"

Note that David never addresses the issue of a leaker providing actual evidence, but instead launches into a recitation of people who have nothing else to offer other than their claims of having seen something, which isn't the same thing.

The example I gave was of Daniel Ellsberg, who didn't claim that he had seen the Pentagon Papers -- but handed over his copy of same to the NY Times. This is not a matter of semantics, but a fundamental distinction that David seems either unwilling or unable to make.

By way of example, consider the recent French COMETA report. David would no doubt consider that another high-insider "leak" redolent of the ET nature of UFOs. But if one looks closely at the report, its most glaring weakness becomes self-evident: it doesn't contain any incontrovertible, "inside" evidence at all, even though some of its authors are inarguably high-ranking officials in the French military and intelligence sector. But whatever their thoughts or recommendations, it's obvious from an objective reading of the report that they don't know anymore than your average, well-read civilian ufologist in this country does. That does not qualify as much of a leak in my book, although David is perfectly free to disagree -- and I predict will.

So, one more time: David is talking about anecdotal claims. I'm talking about the leaking of actual, physical evidence and wondering why it hasn't happened to date, which seems a perfectly reasonable thing to do.

Unless, of course, like David, you think a US UFO conspiracy cover up is running the world. But maybe I shouldn't put words in David's mouth.

<mucho snippo from Dave's original post. No response at this time per the above.>

Dennis Stacy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Operations Of Air Defense Fighters - McCoy

From: **Gt McCoy** <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:31:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 21:53:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Operations Of Air Defense Fighters - McCoy

Hello, all, EBK and everyone else,
except the weasel who E-mail
'Bombed' my wife's Rose List

Ah, the recent posting about an F-86D - called "Dogs"
affectionately - with a UFO over England, had me puzzled. One,
the supposed "pilot" mentioned ah, firing codes. The Ol' Dawg
was a point and shoot interceptor, the Dog Saber, a brute force
weapon. It was to get up close to the Russki Bomber and fire its
Missiles - not miles away. The rocket pack was not guided.

When a Navy Drone (F6F Hellcat) escaped from China Lake, back in
the 50's, the Airforce sent the latest and best fighters
(F-86D's) to shoot it down. Six of them tried the missiles went
wild. The Hellcat ran out of gas over the Mojave Desert, while
the citizens of various towns in the area got rained on by the
rockets from the F86D's.

Back then - (I have a great source on this subject, a USAF Major
Ret. who was a radar/weapons officer in F-94's and F-89's) - the
term "Go to Gate" wasn't something used by ground control and,
if the target isn't right there, i.e., within a few hundred feet
- not yards, you aren't going to hit it. Sidewinders were not
yet operational. Nor Sparrows.

The Brits were not as trusting, in missile tech. The Hawker
Hunter possessed a 30mm gun pack that would reduce its opponent
to fine dust. I digress, however.....

Here is my problem with the saga of the F-86D driver,
One, what is the Target? Two, why is he flailing around
in the cockpit? Flashlight, codes, ground control. These
guys were the elite fighter pilots of the Cold War, and if
you were on duty and had to identify an "enemy" aircraft,
I do believe that there was a certian description that was
allowed by the Pilot to identify or shoot the intruder down.

GT McCoy

- Tired of dealing with E-Mail "Bombs" and really would like to
have a Hawker Hunter to deal with this weasel (none of us is
involved)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

The Watchdog - 03-05-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 04:36:04 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 21:56:42 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-05-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind."
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

NEWS
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/news.html>

~ UFOWATCHDOG.COM Demands Apology For False Accusations
~ Skeptics Launch Radio Show
~ Canadian UFO Sightings Increase
~ UFO Clue In Balloon Flight Flop

COMING SOON

UFOWATCHDOG.COM interviews former Air Force AFOSI agent Richard Doty!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 14:01:55 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 21:58:58 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:45:33 -0000

>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>What I have said before and will say again is this: There are no
>doubt other intelligent life forms in the universe -- just not
>as many as most ufologists think, and, for that matter, not even
>as many as most mainsteam scientists thought just a few years
>ago.

>Deep space travel may well one day be a relatively safe and
>"affordable" (in terms of energy expense & so on) commodity.
>It's possible that we may have been visited and are still being
>visited. It is not possible, in my humble opinion, that Planet
>Earth is a pit stop on the Galactic Autobahn. (re: Hynek's
>"embarrassment of riches.") Sorry, that's just the kind of guy I
>am.

>>Bruce & List,

>>This entire posting by Bruce is very well stated, and I can only
>>add "ditto". Dennis still is arguing (deducing) from theory that
>>ET UFOs can't be.

>>Dick

>Again, where have I said that ET UFOs *can't* be? Citations,
>please.

Dennis,

I have emptied my "Trash Can" so can't cite the specific posts.
Fairly recently you made an elaborate statement about our
knowledge of cosmology and physical science, and said or implied
that it made ET visits unlikely. That's an argument from theory.
Also, no ufologist in his/her right mind (or thinking clearly)
suggests that everything reported as a UFO is an ET spaceship.
After screening, the hardcore UFO reports are not a large whole
number.

>I'm doing nothing more than positing a hypothesis, just as you
>are. What's more, I have just as much evidence in my favor as
>you do, which, yes, includes the absence of incontrovertible UFO
>evidence.

Absence of incontrovertible UFO evidence is not evidence that
UFOs are absent (or something like that). How much
"incontrovertible evidence" is there for most cosmological

theory? And yours is not a hypothesis about UFO data, it's a denial that there is totally convincing data. I can't dispute that, but the evidence is ample and strongly suggestive in support of an ET interpretation of the UFO data.

>Since both of you have such a hard time ingesting the
>hypothesis, let me summarize it one more time: We have been
>visited by physical, intelligent beings from another solar
>system a lot fewer times than most ufologists believe.

>The theory includes a number of corollaries, but let's not bore
>everyone on what would otherwise be a perfectly pleasant
>Saturday night on Planet Earth.

Here you seem to be saying that we have, in fact, been visited
(if not as often as some people think). Unless you're kidding,
of course. Sometimes I'm not sure about that. So what is the
evidence you cite in support of? Confusedly yours, Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Parmantier

From: **François Parmantier** <parcol@club-internet.fr>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 15:52:28 +0100
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:00:52 -0500
Subject: Re: The Earth As A Sphere? - Parmantier

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Earth As A Sphere?
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 16:49:25 -0000

>Hi List,

>I recently came across this painting :

><http://www.museexpo.com/english/marmottan/marmo3.html>

>It was painted by Sano Di Pietro who lived from 1406 -1481

>It depicts the earth as a sphere. What immediately struck alarm
>bells was that although the Greeks postulated that the earth was
>a sphere, it wasn't until Copernicus in the 1500's who
>resurrected this idea.

>Did Pietro have access to Greek texts ? Any one any thoughts ?

>Matt

Hi Matt,

What we usually think and believe about the Middle Age is far away from the truth. A this time, people knew that the earth was scientifically a sphere. There are numerous writings and art works that show the earth as a sphere. The most famous is "Le Livre du Tresor" written in 1266 by Brunetto Latini from Florence (Italy). This book was a sort of encyclopedia read in all europe and written in french because it was at this time the universal language. It is clearly said in this book that the earth is a sphere and that you walk all around. It is also said that, if you could dig the earth from the top to the bottom ans then throw a big stone in it, then this big stone would fall to the center and remain at this point without going to the opposite side of our planet. The effects of gravity were already known and described before Newton (I can provide details and references to the people intersted in).

The ideas and theories about ignorance and darkness of the Middle Age have been created during the Renaissance and were still common 20 years ago. There is a big misunderstanding about the Middle Age. In fact, people had at this time a dual way of thinking. One is the natural and pre scientific way coming from the Greeks. They knew that the earth was a sphere and other scientific facts and laws, BUT were not very much interested in. They preferred the other way of thinking, the symbolist attitude. In this attitude, earth is not a sphere but a square as a symbol of matter and physical life, in opposition to the sky, represented as a sphere because of it is the place of eternal life. To me, this intellectual duality is the key for understanding this civilisation beyond myths and false knowledge.

François Parmantier

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [parcol](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 5](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:06:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:07:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Labels And Communication
>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000

This is a very interesting and worthwhile effort... can only lead to clarity.

>I would like to see discussion of what you (each of us) means
>when we label someone as being (in relation to the UFO
>subject)
>a:

>(1) skeptic

Unfortunately, we're going to have to scuttle the history of philosophy here, and accept the current meaning -- a skeptic is someone who says UFOs aren't anything alien or otherwise unknown. (Or however anyone wants to phrase it.) That's because there's an organized skeptics' movement, like a skeptics' political party -- it's got organizations, like CSICOP, and publications, like The Skeptical Inquirer -- and this movement has appropriated the term. Of course, they've gone beyond UFOs. Skeptics, as defined here, argue against all sorts of phenomena, like ESP, bigfoot, astrology, and much more. Exactly the relation between all these things they oppose would be an interesting study. (Why don't we see any "skeptics" saying, "Well, UFOs are nonsense, of course, but the ESP evidence looks pretty good to me"?)

For me, a true skeptic would be someone who looked critically at all points of view -- the proverbial person from Missouri, whose attitude would be "Show me!" This person would challenge all points of view on the UFO spectrum, probing for weak logic, uninvestigated evidence, poor science, and all the other flaws that can afflict all sides of this argument. Such a person would probably be denounced by unimaginative people from both camps, since he or she would look like a skeptic to believers, and like a believer to skeptics. Marcello Truzzi might fit this definition. Of course, the best ufologists come closest to fitting it than most skeptics, since ufologists actually criticize each other, in ways I haven't seen skeptics do.

>(2) believer

Many times, in writing about UFOs, I've found myself saying things like "Skeptics argue...but believers reply..." That's because the widespread use of "skeptic" (see above) requires a word with the opposite meaning -- someone who does believe UFOs are alien or otherwise anomalous. "Believer," though, is a godawful word. It pretty strongly suggests someone who simply believes, without any real evidence, and maybe without any personal need for any. Someone who "believes" (in this sense) in a religion is behaving appropriately; someone who "believes" in UFOs isn't much help in serious discussion. I'd prefer to limit the term "believer" to credulous types who believe in UFOs almost as an article of faith. But then what will we call the

many reasonable people who line up on the opposite side of the organized skeptical view? I wish we had another term.

>(3) debunker

Someone who's a very strong skeptic -- who doesn't just believe UFO reports don't represent anything anomalous, but also mounts a militant campaign to demonstrate that, seeking out UFO reports in order to demolish them. Typically behaves as if the conclusion came before the evidence or reasoning.

This, anyway, is how this term is used in our field. At least one well-known skeptic, Robert Schaefer, proudly uses the term to describe himself. It's even part of his e-mail address. Of course, a wider meaning is possible -- someone who's out to debunk any kind of nonsense, including skeptical nonsense. But the word hasn't been used that way.

>(4) scoffer

I don't think this term is widely used, though I respect the attempts I've seen to substitute it for "debunker." Certainly it's more vividly descriptive. It's hard to legislate language, though, and I doubt this term will circulate much.

There are scoffers among believers, too. I've seen people on this List who react with utter scorn when anyone questions their favorite conspiracy theories, for instance.

>(5) apologist

At last a word with a meaning outside ufology! An apologist is someone who supports a discredited position without quite adopting it -- "He says he's not a Nazi, but by arguing that German life was in many ways better under Hitler, he became an apologist for the Nazis." In ufology, I guess someone might become an apologist for George Adamski or Billy Meier.

>(6) advocate

A very straightforward word, which simply means someone who actively supports a point of view. Dick Hall is an advocate of sensible UFO discussion. The connotations of this word are completely positive. Advocates usually are seen as reasonable people who aren't angry, shrill, credulous, or unreasonable.

>(7) choose your own label

I like Jan Aldrich's -- "critical thinker." We need much more of that.

Would also be good to have a name for people who know the difference between what they believe and what they can prove. As in: "I think abductions are probably real, but I sure as hell don't know that's true." (My position.)

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Deschamps

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 11:35:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 04:22:03 -0500
Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Deschamps

>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:30:11 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 13:32:11 -0500
>>Subject: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Previously, Michel wrote:

>>While waiting for my bus to go to work on Wednesday, at around
>>1:50 p.m., in Sudbury, Ontario, a U-Haul truck went by and on
>>its side, I noticed a scene depicting Area 51 with a stealth
>>fighter-type aircraft lifting off its surface, and the word
>>'Tonopah' (if I remember correctly) written vertically near the
>>back end. Ever neat!

>>I'd seen the 'Roswell' one on the Internet before, but not this
>>one.

>>Never thought I'd see that around here....this far up north! It
>>was cool. Wish I had a picture.

>Hi, Michel!

>What difference would it make? You claim to have genuine,
>no-doubt-about-it shots of a flying saucer. Yet, despite such
>claims, you have yet to share such ground breaking photos with
>the list! Why should this be any different? I bring this up
>because you continually berate anyone that casts a skeptical eye
>toward UFO reports, all the while hoarding the very proof that
>convinced you, 100%, that flying saucers are real. Why should I
>even believe that the U-haul you mention exists, at all? What
>difference would a picture make if you have no intention of
>sharing it?

>More to the point, why share a shot of a UFO painted on the side
>of a U-haul truck and not share a picture or video of a real
>flying saucer you claim to have in your possession?

Roger,

I should have stipulated that... yes, I do have video of two
separate sightings -- one daytime, one night time -- that are
seconds in duration. But by themselves, they are not
no-doubt-about-it shots of a flying saucer. But they do
compliment my other visual sightings, meaning that as a whole, I
have enough evidence (to me, at least) that what I saw was
not from here.

I should also add that this is now 2001, not 1930, nor 1947,
1950. I mean, a majority of Earthlings know about ball
lightning, sprites, flares, satellites, meteors, bolides,
fireballs, comets, jets and their vapour trails, weather
balloons, rockets, model airplanes, as well as man-made
aircraft, civilian and military, excluding secret military
developments, of course.

We know how these things behave, reacted, whatever. Eyewitness or not, people aren't as ignorant today as we were back in those days when some of the things I mentioned above were new to us, amazed us, mystified us. We have come a long way from those days when we didn't know too much about anything, whether it'd be natural phenomena or by-products of man's ingenuity.

At least, I can say I know what the difference is between the behaviour of these things and that of a true UFO.

It's true that a lot of people are reporting UFOs that eventually turn out to be IFOs (Identified Flying Objects) I can't explain why some people are still mistaking the planets Venus or Jupiter for a UFO. Since when does Venus or Jupiter perform zig-zags, fly in fighter formation, streak across the sky at incredible speeds then stop on a dime, or blink off and on like an aircraft beacon? The answer is: Never!

Despite these on-going reports, I still believe that the number of true sightings far outweighs the IFO reports and that the larger percentage of people can make a distinction between the known and the unknown and have seen real objects, just like I have.

But behaviour is only one criterion. People should have a checklist including sound (or lack of it), colour, shape, size, velocity, altitude, appearance, performance, maneuverability, brilliance, location, direction of movement(s), etc. when trying to identify what they are seeing.

These are the things I look for when noticing something unusual in the sky.

Man-made aircraft manned by pilots -- civilian or military, known or secret -- should not, to my knowledge, be able to fly backwards or go in the opposite direction of travel without turning around completely!

If the American military has such an aircraft -- or hundreds of them -- then God help us!

Times like these. I really hate this means of communication because you can't express the exact feelings or get your message across properly. I always seem to be repeating myself when discussing Common Sense and it sucks!

If some people have no common sense at all, then that's their problem, not mine!

A guy with common sense,

Michel M. Deschamps
UFO Eyewitness/Researcher/Historian

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Young

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 11:46:45 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 04:23:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Young

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 15:49:13 -0500

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Labels And Communication

<snip>

>It is also possible with the obsession that UFOs amount to
>nothing,

Hi, Jan, Dick, List:

Or, that they amount to the ETH

>to miss out on rare phomenona which might occur once a
>year, once in a decade, once in a century, etc., etc.

>I think some very important things about electrical, biological,
>and astronomical phenomena have been missed here. Satellite
>velocity meteors, double dippers, ballooning spiders' unusual
>activities, etc., etc.

This is what provides long-term interest for me.

Labeling someone is a convenient and lazy way to obscure or
ignore an unwelcome message. Everyone comes to this subject with
preconceived notions. Anyone who says that they have not is to
be listened to with raised eyebrows and a large helping of sea
salt.

The Ol' Wrangler,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 12:06:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 04:47:50 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 11:33:47 -0000

>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>I think the problem is that physical evidence cases tend not to
>prove (or even particularly to support) the ETH.

But does it prove anything? That is the question we should
tackle first.

>This may be an inherent problem. After all the universe is made
>up of finite elements and physical properties are probably the
>same on the mythical planet Zog as they are on earth. The
>current argument over Martian microbes shows the difficulty as
>they are very earth like, creating the inevitable dispute as to
>whether they are post fall contamination. So how would we even
>recognise ET evidence?
>UFO physical evidence rarely even hints at an unearthly origin
>and that's the big problem.

Good point.... has been argued for years.

<snip>

>>Ponder this: is there any case which anyone here dares to
>>claim is unexplainable, period. If so, then we can argue over
>>whether or not it represents OI/NHI.

>I've been asked this often and all my experience says that to
>suggest any single case as definitive is courting disaster. I
>have seen way too many promising cases erode with time to do
>that. There are strong cases and less strong cases but not one
>ever that I think we could reasonably argue was without question
>inexplicable.

>It comes down to weight of numbers - that if there are enough
>strong cases with a reasonable likelihood of staying unresolved
>we can have high confidence that there are unexplained phenomena
>at work. But its a value judgement - not a certainty.

Certainly there is the "weight of numbers".... this is similar
to proponents of "micro PK" and other parapsychological
phenomena that appear to occur but only on the "margin" of our
existence (e.g., ganzfield phenomena - direct communication
between brains; the PK experiments at Princeton showing -
perhaps - direct effects of intent on statistics of macrosized
systems where it takes lots of experiments to arrive at any
conclusion). However I am partial to the Skeptical argument
that, if "UFOs are Real" (by which I mean the subset of UFO
reports that involve TRue UFOs (TRUFOS) that indicate the
presence of OI/NHI - Other Intelligences/Non-Human
Intelligence), then there should be at least one case that
"proves it", i.e., demonstrates that unequivocally. The problem

then becomes, what does one accept as proof?

IN my experience the closer you get to proving a case is unexplainable, the higher the "bar" you have to get over is raised. I experienced with the Trent case the same sort of frustration indicated by Jenny in the Ilkley Moore case: The Trent photo case is clearly either the "real thing" or a hoax.... no halfway point is possible (not an unknown bird or an unknown atmospheric phenomenon or Superman).

>The closest I have ever come is with the Ilkley alien affair in >1989 - where an abductee filmed the alien that he says >spacenapped him during a period of missing time. As you know - >especially Bruce as he tried to do enhancement work on the photo >- what we have here is utterly frustrating. But probative - no >way.

But does it prove anything? Yes, it proves that the harder you work to try to prove it can be explained... and fail... the harder you have to work to prove that explanation will continually remain out of reach. There has to be an end _somewhere_..... Either you say, OK, it was real after all, or else (if you can't prove a hoax) you say to the rest of the wrld, "OK I give up. Here's the evidence. Make up your own mind." Problem is the rest of the world generally isn't sufficiently interested to make an informed decision. "Aw, the guy was a magician and fooled the investigator. Big deal. It's a hoax." or "Probably the investigator is in on it or covering up some info. After all, he/she gets some benefit from this being unexplained."

>Firstly, this is a case that surely is either a hoax or >definitive, because this is no misperception or fugue state or >hallucination. Either the witness photographed a four feet six >tall entity during an abduction or he in some way made it up. >Its not even feasible that 'he' was hoaxed. Its as close to an >either/or as I think you can get, because there just don't seem >alternatives to these two options.

>My gut feeling has always been that he had to have made this up. >The case just doesn't sit right and there are nagging problems >with it. But I know that might be at least partly by inherent >caution.

>Peter Hough and myself tried hard to figure out what was the >motive for a hoax (we long supposed the most probable was some >kind of experiment upon Ufologists to gauge reaction) and (Peter >especially) spent a lot of time trying to defrock this case. All >to no avail.

>The witness stands by his story 12 years on. He has never made >capital or appeared in public debating it as he shuns publicity >(but has met several investigators and always been cooperative >with us in doing so). The photo has been analysed numerous times >(eg by Kodak) and its a real photo of 'something; four foot six >tall up a hillside. But there's no way to say that this >something is an alien (rather than a maniken or a child in a >suit). The witness has been interviewed by a clinical >psychologist, who is convinced. But that doesn't mean he isnt a >good liar. What little physical evidence there is (a reversed >polarity compass) has been tested by physicists and whilst >strange it is possible to create this for yourself if you know >how. The witness professes an MIB encounter afterwards, but all >the checks we have made to verify it really happening have >failed. His wife backs him up but its the two of them against no >hard evidence.

>So where do we stand? A case that we cannot prove was a hoax, >where if it was a hoax the motivation was more complex than a >lust to make money or get publicity (although as we know UFO >hoaxes can indeed have complex motives and get out of hand >rapidly backing the witness into a corner after they start as an >innocent jest) (see 'The UFOs that Never Were' - for instance).

>In the end you have a story that acts like a mandala to meditate >over. Which way you interpret it is more likely to depend on >your beliefs. If you think there are no aliens you will soon see >difficulties (there are some internal inconsistencies - although >nothing obviously fatal to possible reality so far as I can >see). You will then assume it is a hoax that just hasn't been >exposed yet and whose motivation is non standard.

>But if instead you believe in aliens you will likely regard this as a
>powerful case because the data more or less holds together and no skeptic
>has ever cracked it (or indeed - ironically but for Peter and myself as
>first hand investigators into it - has ever really tried).>

>But despite a wealth of data - probably more than you are ever
>going to get for a UFO case - this is still only describable as
>being indeterminate. It isnt anything like proof of the ETH and
>by all expectations it should be.

>Based on that I wonder what case ever could become so.

Regardless of whether or not ET is involved the first question is Was the Creature Real and Unexplainable? And, as you have alluded to above, the answer to this question depends upon what one requires for proof. Eventually you realize that there are those people for whom No level of proof would be sufficient short of personal experience while perfectly sober and in the presence of other credible, sober people... and the experience would have to be repeatable under controllable conditions (not just a one-time chance occurrence) and , preferably, recorded on video, radar, photography, etc. Then there are those who would be willing to accept a statement by a recognized authority if backed up by several other prominent authorities (Stanton Friedman has often referred to the "Pope and Walter Cronkite" as people who would be believed if they made a joint statement about UFO reality. Of course, Walter Cronkite - former CBS news anchorman- is long gone from the scene.... so maybe Dan Rather or a ouncterpart in Britain or som other country would do).

The bottom line is: here is information about a UFO sighting or information about many UFO sightings... What Are You Going To Do About It? Is it going to affect you life in some way or do you ignore it?

Apparently most people ignore it. SO far as I know the Ilkley Moore case (and the Trent case and numerous others) has had a negligible impact on civilization even though, IMHO, it SHOULD have had an impact in our rethinking of humanity's place in th universe. Why no impact? The "Self-Cover Up" (no one really wants to know that OI/NHI are doing things which we have no control over and even no knowledge of) which keeps the bulk of the population from taking this seriously.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 12:25:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 04:49:55 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:42:50 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>let's consider Arnold and the
>>pelicans: Arnold's clear description of the objects he saw
>>indicated that they reflected the sun very brightly (or were
>>light sources themselves). This one characteristic by itself is
>>sufficient to rule out (gulp) _pelicans_ (regardless of the
>>comments by ornithologists). Similarly, the speed measured by
>>Arnold is enough to rule out jet aircraft of the day and also
>>meteors.

>>True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft... but they
>>prove _something_ about the objects (according to Arnold they
>>appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces, speeds
>>beyond anything we had achieved). One thing they prove to me is
>>that OI/NHI were involved (Other Intelligences/Non-Human
>>Intelligences). In other words, these weren't "creations" of
>>"dumb" (unintelligent) nature but rather manufactured objects...
>>but we didn't manufacture them.

>Bruce, List:

>I'm afraid that this revealing analysis helps explain a lot
>about how you manage to reach your pro-ET conclusions about
>cases as disparate as Arnold's and Ed Walter's pixs. The
>witness says that he thinks he saw something reflect the Sun
>brightly, and that it was fast.

Gee, did the witness say he "thinks" he saw something reflect
the Sun brightly, and that it was fast? Or did he say he _saw_
something reflect the sun brightly? I don't recall Arnold
saying "I think I saw....." Now, Arnold said, "I saw."

Your interjection of "he thinks" really is an indication that
you suggest that maybe Arnold didn't see what he said he saw.
That would be an interpretation by you of the available
information, _not_ an interpretation by the witness.

>These opinions, alone, prove [I'm using your word, here] that
>what was seen were created by non-human intelligences.

>Wheee --

>Clear, cloudless, pelican-free skies to you, Dr.

>Bob Young

Yes, and more careful reading to you: Note the sentence

I wrote:

>>True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft... but they
>>prove something about the objects (according to Arnold they
>>appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces, speeds
>>beyond anything we had achieved)<

Note Arnold didn't say "I think I saw"... he said "I saw..." and gave descriptions which reject known natural or manmade phenomena while at the same time suggesting (his interpretation of what he said) structured objects. He thought these objects were man-made (new type of fast aircraft). My conclusion is that they weren't man made.... made by "someone else."

And you can keep the pelicans, thank you.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 17:59:53 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:15:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 12:42:44 -0600

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 13:25:00 -0000

Hi Jerry,

It seemed particularly apt that, having returned from a 600 mile round-trip to interview a key witness to the Lakenheath incident on Sunday evening, I find your most recent posting. The retired RAF pilot I visited was in fact the very one quoted in the accepted literature as having made a "visual contact" with the UFO tracked by Lakenheath GCA in 1956 and subsequently was quoted as saying "Roger...I've got my guns locked on him" before the UFO looped behind the Venom to begin a tail-chase. A more down-to-earth, unimaginative and sincere witness could not have been found - complete with his log-book entry as proof that he participated in the single "scramble" of his entire 8-year career on the Battle Response Flight of the RAF's front line defence against the East.

This pilot had not seen his navigator of that night for ten years, he has had no contact with the RAF Controller who ordered him into the air 45 years ago and did not know of his infamy within the world of UFOlogy. "Other than my aircrew colleagues, you are the first person who has ever contacted me about this event since 1956," he told me.

What this man said will form part of UFOIN's report on this case, but I only wish Jerome Clark and Brad Sparks could have been present when, after the interview was over, I gave into the pilot's demands and allowed him to read some of what had been written about his 'role', including James McDonald's article in FSR and Sparks/Thayer's take from 1980. If only they could have witnessed the look of utter bemusement and incredulity etched upon his face - followed by the comment "How do these people get away with writing this stuff?" To be polite, he said, the published accounts of what happened were "exaggerated beyond belief...nonsense to put it mildly."

And yet, in the face of such first-hand evidence, Jerry Clark persists with the following:

>It seems to me that we won't get anywhere productive in a
>discussion of the Lakenheath case unless you and your associates
>either start sharing your information on other than a selected
>basis with fellow Lakenheath experts (e.g., Brad Sparks) or
>decide to publish your conclusions so that the rest of us have a
>chance to weigh their merits.

Now I don't wish this to turn into yet another round of name-calling and ad hominem, but I'm sorry Jerry your statement is nothing but humbug and hypocrisy, pure and simple.

Jerry is well aware of the fact that this is not my personal project but a joint investigation involving four of the most experienced UFO investigators in the British Isles. Whatever your personal prejudices are against myself and Andy Roberts, Jenny and Paul Fuller's credentials as researchers - both in terms of length of time served and published - are impeccable to say the least.

As such, our responsibility is to our team, and to our group and to the many witnesses, organisations and individuals such as the retired RAF pilot I visited on Sunday, and who have agreed to help in our research - agreed on the understanding that we disseminate their information responsibly. They have spoken to me because they have first satisfied themselves of my credentials, a level of trust that has taken hard work to establish and which I will not compromise and cheapen simply in response to impatient demands for publication.

I'm sorry my friend, but your opinion of who is a "Lakenheath expert" and who you personally would prefer to be involved are irrelevant in this context. These witnesses are speaking to us by their own choice, and your opinions mean nothing to them. There is no way in this world that we, as a team, are going to compromise the integrity of our work and the trust placed upon us by our sources by turning over our original work for dissemination on an Internet newsgroup.

I'm utterly amazed and astounded that you feel this is even a remotely reasonable request. This is the same Jerry Clark who less than 18 months ago was in receipt of an article of mine on the Howden Moor UFO case, which was earmarked for first publication in IUR. In the meantime, I received a request from a European UFOlogist to place my full and comprehensive 20,000 word report on the case on his Internet newsgroup, a request which I reluctantly felt obliged to agree to. Despite the fact that the IUR article was an abridged summary of the Internet version, Jerry was not amused in that he felt IUR's publication had been compromised by premature Internet publication.

My dictionary defines hypocrisy as "the assumption or postulation of moral standards to which one's own behaviour does not conform."

Any right-thinking scholar as Jerry claims to be would be aware of the fact that in the real world, the authors of an original piece of research reserve the right of original publication in the place and time of their choice. Given the amount of time, effort and yes, money, that has been expended on our investigation why on earth should we be brow-beaten into premature publication of our results, and thereby sign away our copyright, moral rights and the trust invested in us by our informants - simply to please your "Lakenheath expert."

I'm sorry Jerry, but your argument is a straw man and does even stand up to even the most cursory examination.

As for:

>I have known Brad for more than two decades and regard him as
>among the most skilled, principled, intelligent, and
>critical-minded investigators in the history of ufology, in
>every way the antithesis of the true believer or the TB's mirror
>image, the fanatic debunker. Your attempt to characterize him as
>some kind of foolish partisan could hardly be more misguided and
>less justified.

How conveniently that you have forgotten precisely what precipitated this tiresome exchange on UpDates in the first place. As endless repetition seems to be the name of the game, let me refresh your memory of the first posting (dated 14 February 2001) from the keyboard of the man you describe as a "skilled, principled, intelligent and critical minded investigator" (a purely objective description of course, given Sparks substantial contribution to your Encyclopedia):

>>Certain UK debunkers have found
>>official RAF documentation on the case which they think destroys
>>the case, which they have been sitting on for a long time, and
>>they won't release the material until they can do maximum

>>damage. They have been working with one of the RAF radar
>>controllers who had come forward in 1978 to try to "turn him"
>>against the USAF radar controller who had come forward ten years
>>earlier to the Condon Committee. They claim the RAF man's
>>testimony discredits the USAF man's account.

We'll gloss over the fact that Sparks subsequently went on to admit to another List member that he had dismissed vital contradictory evidence as being tainted by "jealousy", this was hardly the actions of someone who expected us to be co-operative! It was, in fact, a classic example of the sort of "chest-thumping" and bluster that you are so keen to lecture us about when you see it emanate from someone you don't like, for example, Andy Roberts. Hypocrisy again - but note, Jerry you did not rush in to take your friend Sparks to task in this instance. That speaks volumes in itself.

In response to Brad Spark's ad hominems I posted the following on 17 February. Repetition again, but it seems Jerry either does not read the posts he responds to, or simply prefers to ignore what is inconvenient for his arguments:

>>Oxford English Dictionary, 9th Edition, debunk: "expose
>>the falseness of (a claim etc)." The claims debunked are
>>the "accepted" version of the Lakenheath case - copied,
>>recycled and distorted through endless re-telling
>>in an endless stream of books and magazine articles.
>>Note the "accepted" version - not the fact that something
>>happened - because something most certainly did!

Despite such clarity, Jerry and Brad persist in their attempts to undermine the whole basis of our work by the false implication that we are driven by "ideological axe-grinding" not by the pursuit of truth - a baseless accusation in advance of publication even if it wasn't as insulting to the intelligence as it clearly is.

And on the subject of insults to the intelligence I come to this little ditty:

>On top of that, Brad's technical qualifications in aviation
>technology (at which he works professionally) and related
>matters far exceed any of yours, and these of course are crucial
>to any understanding of what really happened at Lakenheath.

As an example of a gross and patronising put down this takes some beating, but then who am I to talk?

Humour aside, how do Brad's 'technical qualifications' make him any more qualified to comment upon the Lakenheath case than our own technical advisors, who include not only an ex Marconi Radar Systems engineer with sixty years experience but also a ex-RAF Air Radar expert whose technical expertise is such that he is used as an "Expert Witness" in both criminal and civil courts, identifying and interpreting and enhancing images from time lapse security video tapes.

Add to the century of experience these two alone bring to our project, which to put it mildly puts anything Brad Sparks might offer in the shade, they also have the advantage of complete ignorance of the UFO literature, and no axe to grind either way as Sparks most certainly does. They will perform their analysis based upon the original - non-UFO materials - for example the RAF and USAF documents, the radar system specifications and the interview transcripts with the aircrew - removed from any contamination by the imaginings and wish-fulfilment of UFO believers.

Technical matters aside, whilst knowledge of aircraft and radar systems play a part in the analysis of this case they are certainly not as centrally important as you would make them out to be. This is another mistake Sparks makes which undermines his contribution - too much attention to technical details at the expense of the wider picture, and the acknowledgement of human error and the tricks played by memory and confabulation in the creation of the Lakenheath myth.

A large proportion of the Lakenheath evidence is based upon the sifting and comparison of testimony, memory and original documents - in summary, the analysis of texts and evidence - an area of expertise that even the dimmest of intellects would

associate with historians and journalists, not technicians and engineers

An "aviation expert" is no more qualified to make a judgement upon the value of witness testimony and the significance of documents in this field than an ornithologist, as Jerry Clark should be well aware given his background. I alone (not even considering the considerable input of my colleagues, Jenny trained in science and Paul as a geographer and statistician) have ten years experience as a journalist specialising in media law, court and crime reporting not to mention the familiarity of historical methodology I have developed as a result of spending eight years studying towards a doctorate in Cultural Tradition.

All of this, in Jerry's assessment is inconsequential in the light of Brad Sparks's "technical qualifications" which "far exceed anything of yours". I think not.

So yet another straw man goes up in flames.

>You would do your own case a world of good by working with him
>rather than treating him as a perceived enemy.

When Sparks contacted me privately I asked him to specify what specific aspects of the Lakenheath case he felt were challenging to science, or currently unexplainable. He dodged the question and instead expected us to simply turn over our hard-earned original material to him for his "expert" scrutiny, with the implicit assumption that only he was qualified to make comment on this case and further that any reassessment of the time-line or interpretation must be wrong or flawed, simply because he says so. And yet you expect us to take him seriously as a "skilled, pincipled and intelligent" expert!

As I've explained above, under no circumstances will we respond to someone who refuses to acknowledge that alternative interpretations and new evidence are even relevant. If Brad is prepared to reassess his attitude, put his antipathy and prejudices towards us behind him and approach us again privately then maybe we can do business, if he has anything new to contribute.

But we are not prepared to tolerate being brow-beaten into prematurely publishing our hard-won discoveries simply to satisfy someone else's agenda. As I've pointed out before, and will do so again, this is our material and we reserve the right to publish when, where and how we like.

This has been a long posting, but these points had to be made, both personally and on behalf of my colleagues. I am not prepared to waste any further time repeating the very clear points I have made again, so you can take it from me that this exchange is at an end.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 11:54:17 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:17:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch

>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:47:13 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 23:58:58 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 11:40:59 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>>Larry, it has nothing to do with 'file size.' They sent full
>>color pictures back (in glorious detail) from Jupiter, Saturn,
>>Neptune, Uranus, all of which are billions of miles farther
>>out/away from us than Mars is. They managed to capture excellent
>>RGB signals from the outer solar system. Why would a body as
>>close as Mars is to us (practically on top of us in comparison
>>to the distances were talking about to the outer solar system)
>>suddenly present problems?

>That's a good question. You could write to JPL and ask them, but
>I doubt you'll get a good answer.

>>That impossible worm-like thingy that we've been discussing
>>could be an electric blue with bright yellow streaks for all we
>>know. What I would really like to know is, What is the ground
>>level resolution of those "glass worm" pix. Does anybody know?
>>I'm dying to know how big those things really are.

>The image information is at:

>http://www.msss.com/moc_gallery/ab1_m04/images/M0400291.html

>The image width is 3.5 kilometers, so the "tubes" are are
>roughly 200 meters wide and about 2 kilometers long. That would
>be one humungous worm! Personally, I don't think the possibility
>can be ruled out that these are subsurface lava tubes that have
>been exposed by fractures and erosion of the rock above them.
>Maybe they have a shiny appearance because the molten rock fused
>into a glassy substance as it cooled. I don't know why lava
>tubes would have these bright "rib" features, but then I don't
>know very much about lava tube formation. Perhaps we'll
>eventually find a geologist who's brave enough to venture a more
>informed opinion than mine.

Hello John and Lan:

Unless I'm mistaken, the pictures of the outer planets were in
low resolution, i.e. the smallest visible features were
relatively large, kilometers in size perhaps, and more
importantly, there were fewer of them. This reduces "bandwidth"
or rate of information being transmitted.

The Mars Surveyor is sending back many many pix, most of which
are at higher resolution, making much smaller features
discernible.

Nevertheless, the distance is indeed much less, and I would love
to see color photos of any greenish hillside!

I have misplaced the URLs for the best "worm-tube" shots, and don't recall the attendant "ball". Can you please resend those? As I recall, the "tubes" were very odd.

Again, my ISP is 2 to 3 days late with emails so excuse the delays!

Best

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 16:31:56 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:20:24 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:51:37 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Isn't the issue simply this: ETH proponents argue that proof of
>Non-Terrestriality = proof of ETH because ETH tops the
>plausibility of possible non-terrestrial explanations? (See
>Dick's list). But skeptics deny that this is a good reason
>because (a) they deny that unexplainable UFO cases are
>sufficient proof of non-terrestriality and (b) they claim that
>ETH is not necessarily the most plausible of the non-terrestrial
>explanations.

Hi, Brad, Everyone,

This is a pretty good statement of the issue.

>Skeptics seem to want more a Proof of UFO Reality
>rather than ETH Origin and they want it in the form of a massive
>alien intrusion into human affairs (space war, invasion, mass
>destruction, mass public landings, alien addressing UN, etc.) or
>a "Made in Zeta Reticuli" type information left in an openly
>investigated crashed saucer.

No, just one little, itty, bitty alien artifact or message,
acceptable to the scientific world-at-large.

Clear skies,

Bob Young
The Ol' Wrangler

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Evans

From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 15:29:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:21:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Evans

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:51:47 -0800
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Hatch
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Larry wrote:

>Points well taken! Back on Earth, they could play games with the
>levels of blue-red-green in differing proportions to get more
>than four pseudo-colors.

>Regardless, even by a factor of four, color multiplies the
>amount of info that must be sent back to Earth, again a
>bottleneck.

>I don't know how powerful the transmitter is, I suppose we could
>browse that up. Whatever the power, it has to come from some
>supply which is probably heavy and definitely finite .. and it
>has to reliably transmit the data back to Earth from Mars.

>In short, the scientists must pick and choose what they want to
>image, at which resolution, color vs B&W, and weigh all this
>against the possible benefits of the images.

Hi, Larry, all...

Actually the use of a black and white camera with color filters is both practical as well as functional. Not only will it give superior results at higher resolutions than a dedicated color camera, they can choose when they want color or not. That way, the data stream can be simple black and white until they see something that they want in color. Then, when they do shoot in color, they don't have to give up resolution. The best of both worlds.

Regarding the "bottle neck"; actually getting the information for a single color picture would be no different than receiving three single black and white pictures in a row because, in fact, that's what the color shot would be made of. Therefore, there really isn't a "bottle neck" to speak of. But the number of transmissions would increase from one to three. Typically, pictures using RGB also have a 4th luminance (b&w) signal, but this is not absolutely necessary since the best looking of the RGB signals can be used as the "key" for establishing the black levels. Technicolor used to do this all the time when printing separation matrixes for motion picture release prints.

An interesting site that explains all this is:

<http://www.widescreenmuseum.com/oldcolor/index.htm/>

If that doesn't work, then just try:

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

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton

From: David Bolton <David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:53:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:23:06 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Bolton

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 17:05:04 -0800

>Yes, I agree it might fracture in this manner, but would it melt
>as Dennis describes...

Dennis describes it melting like styrofoam sheet..

>and how would the symbols be engraved in the I beam,...

Have a look at the styrofoam packaging your video recorder arrived in. What strange alien technology do you think was employed to emboss "TOP" and "THIS WAY UP" on the surface?

>Why didn't it bend when held in a manner that might
>cause bending if it were Styrofoam?

Perhaps it was held by an actor?

: -)

--

David G Bolton
<David@Bolton.SOL.co.uk>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

The Lakenheath Fiasco

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:43:30 -0500
Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco

Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO partisans (pro and con)?

Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish, irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean ALL of you!

On the other side of the Pond there have been constant "leaks", insinuations, and strong hints that those of us who take the case seriously will be proven wrong, before actual production of a report that everyone can examine.

To you I say, shut up and produce the report.

On this side of the pond there has been constant prejudice of what the report will contain and how cogent it will be, and insulting remarks about the integrity of the British investigators.

To you I say, shut up and let them produce the report so we can all evaluate it.

Based on my close relationship with James McDonald, however, I feel obliged to say that Jim never "exaggerated" anything in his life. He was the most intelligent, credentialed, thorough, and aware scientist I have ever known.

That is the main reason why I am eager to see the UFOIN report. He may have been mistaken, but they need to demonstrate that convincingly. I have no other vested interest in the case and am quite prepared to accept that it is not what it appeared to be.

But let the scientific process proceed without all this "spin doctoring."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 17:31:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 05:48:29 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report - Velez

>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 13:04:44 +1100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report

>Hello everyone :>)

>I just got in wow a debate is going on poor.... Bill Chalker.

<snip>

>I agree with you John, but when half a thread is posted on
>AUFORN list then it is also a good idea to post the whole thread
>as it unfolds which I did that same day.

>I did this in the best interest of the people involved as I have
>some international UFO list managers receiving our mail before
>you get to see it. If I hadn't done this, I would have been shot
>a dawn for letting it go by.

>Now if some of the information is and or was found to be B.S.
>well this is what I would have posted out without prejudice but
>I see Bill has been keeping you all informed - thanks Bill :>)

>The First post had it all - the good the bad and the ugly. I do
>confess, yes I did pull the trigger :>) only after the bullet
>was fired at our list. That's when Bill stepped in and filled us
>in with more details, again thanks Bill. Byran's e-mail was
>never posted as an individual e-mail to this list as it was on
>ours. As we have no restrictions on our list members they are
>free to post wherever. You could say I cut things of at the
>pass in the best interest of everyone and did some checking of
>my own. The whole story is better than half even if some of it
>was out there.

<snip>

>Bye for now my hard hats on again :>) heading for the bunker
>LOL!

Hiya Diane,

No need to "run for a bunker." No "bombs" are falling, and,
- apparently) - no bullets are being fired!"<LOL>

I like you and I've always enjoyed your posts. I am grateful for
all the OZ info you have posted in the past (that we may never
have seen over here on this side of the Rock.) As my wife will
testify, I am "Mr. Impulsive" so I won't be throwing too many
stones at you myself. "People who live in glass houses" and all
that. :)

Bill did a bang-up job of getting in there quickly and talking
to as many people as he could. His update to us was timely and
appreciated. You "owe him one". Take him out for Roo-burgers &
beer! ;)

As for you "cowgirl", (itchy finger on the trigger) keep up the
good work, (mostly) and _don't fire_ until you see the whites of

their eyes! <LOL>Warm regards from the frozen North, <-(G-D
Canadians!)

John Velez ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 16:57:53 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 06:50:21 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:13:23 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>I think his insights and the depth of his observations are
>>brilliant. I would love to have another metallurgist take a look
>>at the debris but I doubt any would be willing unless I paid
>>them.

>Hello, Ed, all...

>Note that Ed first complains that no "experts" will stop and
>look AA seriously, ignoring that fact that yours truly works in
>film, video and special effects for a living. Oh, sure, I'm not
>on the level of Francis Ford Coppola or Stan Winston, but I've
>been in this business for over 25 years. I certainly know as
>much about film, video production and special effects as the
>metallurgist does about metal. More to the point, I can actually
>look at the video, itself, to form an opinion; it's my medium.
>On the other hand, the metallurgist has never held the debris in
>his hands; he has no idea if it's metal or not! But my opinions
>don't count because I don't believe in AA.

Roger,

Your opinions do count. That's why I sent you the first copy of the AA CDs and the Flatland. Why do you think I gave you the CDs, no strings attached? I want you to view the footage and hear what you have to say about it. Then we'll all be on common ground and if you find something that proves that the AA is a hoax, or fraud, or fake, so be it. We think our evidence and our narrative is so strong that you won't be able to punch holes in it and will eventually agree that we should take another look at the evidence for the legitimacy of the AA. I think you'll at least put it in your gray file and not call it a bunch of crap.

You still won't open the CDs and take a look for yourself. That's what has been so frustrating about this discussion. I can tell by the way you and Robert, and Bob discuss the AA that none of you have spent much time looking at the footage in a critical fashion. Why?

I think proving that the AA is authentic would change the face of Ufology. M. Dennis' report and Neil's article could be just the beginning. If others find fault, then it's their responsibility to at least look at the footage before they pass judgment.

I don't have a video I can send you nor does Neil. You're perfectly capable of opening the CDs if you want to do so. Neil has given you plenty of advice on our options.

>Further proof of this exists in his line about the
>metallurgist, "I think his insights and the depth of his
>observations are brilliant." Why are they brilliant?

It's because of the way he went about investigating the footage. He worked with Theresa Carlson and both were skeptical then and

still are. He and Theresa spent long hours examining the footage. The one thing on which they both agree is that the AA is a work of art and extremely elaborate for a hoax.

>views support that of Ed, never mind the fact that a
>metallurgist can't tell if something is metal or not by looking
>at images only. Never mind the fact that no tests or analysis
>can be performed by looking at video tape, only. Just how
>"serious" can a metallurgist look at video tape to determine the
>metallic properties of the objects displayed within?

For all the reasons Dennis explained. If you don't agree with his reasoning then tell us why. You'll have to view the footage to continue this discussion.

>The irony here is that Ed prefers the opinion of an expert
>metallurgist about metal he doesn't even have access to over
>the opinion of an expert videographer about video that he does
>have access to. In the end, Ed wants other experts to look at
>AA, but only if they look at it "seriously".

>What defines "seriously"? Agreeing that AA is real, it would
>seem.

I don't understand this response. Are you the videographer? To what video do you have access. Roger, I get the impression that you've never watched the real Santilli AA. Am I wrong about that? Why won't you open your CDs. Then you can tell us what you see. Of course I'm going to take the word of a trained metal worker who has spent hundreds of hours viewing the debris over a videographer who has spent little or no time trying to unravel this mystery.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

String Of Pearls?

From: **Greg St. Pierre** <GregJenn95@email.msn.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:11:17 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 06:55:51 -0500
Subject: String Of Pearls?

Hello list,

Has anyone heard of any so-called "string of pearls" type sightings since the events over Mexico City in the early nineties?

I find these displays to be among the more interesting (and eerie) available, and wonder if any effort has been made to catalog and/or correlate patterns.

Thanks for any info.

Greg St. Pierre

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 18:09:22 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 06:58:50 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Strickland

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 14:45:33 -0000

>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>Which makes me wonder: do the aliens have a preferential
>abduction night? Would be funny if it turned out that they were
>just weekend binging. (Not funny ha, ha, of course, but funny as
>in curious.)

Dennis & List,

Thursdays nights, bi-weekly for several months, until I told them they'd have to change their schedule for visits. After each abduction I was getting throat infections every 2 weeks that were bad enough to have to go to the doctor the next day (get my throat swabbed with iodine and a shot of erythromycin), which also coincided with missing a scheduled bi-weekly French test. Of course, my parents thought it was the French tests that were causing the throat infections (what other deduction was there? alien abduction?)

So, Thursday nights were not my favorite day of the week; I would have preferred being able to study for the French test. During the summer, they showed up anytime, even during the daytime, usually between 12 noon and 3:00 pm, but they prefer 3:10 am.

<snip>

>Since both of you have such a hard time ingesting the
>hypothesis, let me summarize it one more time: We have been
>visited by physical, intelligent beings from another solar
>system a lot fewer times than most ufologists believe.

Ah, Dennis, how many is "a lot fewer times"? Every couple of months for 10+ years is a lot (I think), and I'm just one abductee.

I wish I could introduce you to an astronomer who is fairly well known in his field. He's also an abductee. Maybe when he retires he'll make himself known (in about 15 years). We've waited for 50 years for the government to fess up, what's another 15? Yeah, I know. I'd like it to happen in my lifetime too, but it doesn't look good.

Sue

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 19:53:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:00:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Fleming

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 03:58:49 -0500
>Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 07:48:41 -0500
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: 2-26-01 - Velez

>I'm no geologist but, wouldn't exposed 'lava tubes' be solid?
>Filled with the cooled lava that once flowed through them. These
>things are transparent Lan. Careful scrutiny reveals the ground
>is visible under and behind them.

There have been proposals to use lunar lava tubes to house moon bases, so at least some of them must be hollow. The "worm" does look like it might be transparent, but I haven't been able to see any unambiguous indication of that, such as a gully that clearly is partly inside and partly outside of the structure. There are some bright streaks that seem to extend from the surrounding terrain to positions beneath the object, but they might be extending to positions on top of the object as well. It's hard to tell with a single two-dimensional image.

I agree that the "sphere thingy," as you put it, is pretty strange, although I believe that experts in geology would more formally classify it as a "whatchacallit." Precise technical language is very important!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Leakers - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 20:01:08 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:03:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Fleming

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:31 EST
>Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 18:21:40 -0500
>Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>David, why don't you really contribute something to the
>discussion by listing 100 top leakers who have been prosecuted
>by the United States Government for breaking security to reveal
>the classified secrets of the Flying Saucers?

Don't you think that it would kind of give the game away if
someone who came forward to say that the government was keeping
ET visitations a highly classified secret were to be prosecuted
for doing it?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 19:09:42 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:05:37 -0500
Subject: Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary

>From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
>Subject: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary Report 2000
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:37:30 -0800
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>Conclusions

<Giant circular snip>

>While in some respects 2000 may have seemed a bit of a
>disappointment compared to 1999 in particular, the phenomenon
>did continue to make its appearance in Canada, following the
>same general trends that it has for the past decade or so, with
>formations that are basically simpler in form than many in the
>UK and Europe, but still producing a wealth of data, including
>good physical evidence that can be followed up on and studied
>further. Work toward this end continues, in particular with the
>BLT Research Team. The reports of other phenomena such as the
>ice rings should continue to be investigated as well, even while
>they may not have any relation to the crop circles; at this
>point it is too early to tell..

List,

While I wouldn't wish foot and mouth disease on any country, I must admit that I look forward to the forthcoming English crop circle season with something resembling creepy expectation. Will the usual crop of complex formations appear on schedule, or won't they? And if not, why not? Will it be because humans stayed home in obedience of strict proscriptions against tromping through the countryside, or because the aliens or other superintelligent forces have simply decided to obey mundane terrestrial laws?

I guess time will tell...

Bets, anyone?

Dennis

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:12:25 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:51:37 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

<snip>

>Hi Dennis,

>Isn't the issue simply this: ETH proponents argue that proof of
>Non-Terrestriality = proof of ETH because ETH tops the
>plausibility of possible non-terrestrial explanations? (See
>Dick's list). But skeptics deny that this is a good reason
>because (a) they deny that unexplainable UFO cases are
>sufficient proof of non-terrestriality and (b) they claim that
>ETH is not necessarily the most plausible of the non-terrestrial
>explanations. Skeptics seem to want more a Proof of UFO Reality
>rather than ETH Origin and they want it in the form of a massive
>alien intrusion into human affairs (space war, invasion, mass
>destruction, mass public landings, alien addressing UN, etc.) or
>a "Made in Zeta Reticuli" type information left in an openly
>investigated crashed saucer.

Hi, Brad,

My following remarks are not directed at you personally, I'm just using your post as an opportunity to respond in general.

What I'm saying shouldn't be very hard to grasp. I'm not saying it's above counterargument or anything of the sort -- I just wish that such arguments would be based on what I actually said, not on emotionally-larded interpretations of same.

So let me reiterate: I am not calling for evidence on the basis of "massive alien intrusion," although I see no particular reason why, if ET is indeed here and in great numbers, that wouldn't be just as likely a scenario as the one most ufologists propose -- which, I guess, is something less (but why?).

Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s, 60s or 70s. The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The evidence should be there, pure and simple.

If UFOs and abductions were as pandemic as ufology claims, science wouldn't need ufology to lead it to the Promised Land -- it would already be there.

State such an obvious observation, however, and ufology hauls

out its hackneyed cliches: cover up, ridicule of witnesses, etc., etc., as if MJ-12 were overseeing every scientific observation outpost not just in this country, but in the entire world.

Ufology's holy grail is the education of science and scientists as to the "truth" of ET visitation (along with a snippet of cultural criticism for their errant "ways").

"They just won't look at our evidence!" is ufology's favorite, trumpeted refrain, never mind that most ufologists pay scant attention to science's own evidence -- or lack thereof, which counts for just as much in the overall scheme of things, and maybe more.

No, today's scientists must be close-minded or manipulated by the government's UFO cover up program to remain so ignorant of our "evidence" -- never mind that countless thousands of them worldwide are engaged in day-to-day activities that would routinely reveal the reality of ET visitation if such were the case.

For some odd, unfathomable reason, a lot of ufologists out there still seem to think that all scientific instrumentation has to first pass through an MJ-12 cover up filter before it reaches the scientists involved in the actual instrumentation. Or, more sinisterly, afterwards.

This is an absolutely ridiculous assumption in this day and age, and it can't be put any more politely. Anyone who thinks otherwise is living in a fantasy world of paranoia and what could be.

Ufology's complaint is that science routinely ignores its evidence. My complaint is that ufology routinely ignores the evidence of science -- or lack thereof. If we can't listen to them, then why should they listen to us? The most striking case in point is ufology's own routine ridiculing of the SETI project -- yeah, as if we collectively knew better.

It's been my (hardly original) position that if you stand outside the fray, you will easily observe that both dueling parties, more often than not, are equally guilty of the crimes of which they accuse the other party of having committed first.

The recent Sturrock Panel should have been indicative of the current situation. Overlook the pro-UFO spin and the answer was obvious: there is very little scientists can actually do with the presented UFO evidence (presumably some of the best). Ergo, there is very little more they can do in the future in the absence of more convincing, credible evidence.

In other words, there's a world of difference between a Power Point presentation and the thing itself. Only the foolhardy confuse the two. (And notice that I didn't mention David Rudiak's name here.)

So what does ufology want science to do with this stuff? And what difference would it conceivably make if some prominent scientist came out with a statement in your favor? Would the Earth move, the Moon stop in orbit? He or she would still have to produce physical, as opposed, say, to anecdotal and statistical evidence to prove their case, wouldn't they?

And ufology would say, "Oh, physical evidence, why didn't you say that in the first place? So that's what you've been talking about all along? Uh, well, I don't have any at the moment, but what about this?"

Or is that just my weird, slightly sketical imagination?

Dennis Stacy

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

UFO Website Redesign

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:07:48 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:19:01 -0500
Subject: UFO Website Redesign

List,

I've broken my UFO website into four sections:

- 1.) UFOs (general)
- 2.) Crash Retrievals (and misc. paranoia...)
- 3.) Alien Abductions (whatever this term means)
- 4.) Assorted Strangeness

If I'm leaving out a reference to a good site, let me know and I'll file it accordingly.

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/ufos.html>

--Mac Tonnies

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 23:38:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:34:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 14:01:55 -0000

<snip>

>Dennis,

>I have emptied my "Trash Can" so can't cite the specific posts.
>Fairly recently you made an elaborate statement about our
>knowledge of cosmology and physical science, and said or implied
>that it made ET visits unlikely. That's an argument from theory.

Dick,

Then you agree that I said ET visits were unlikely, not "can't be," as you stated in your previous post? Thanks for the clarification. And your own position is a theory from argument?

>Also, no ufologist in his/her right mind (or thinking clearly)
>suggests that everything reported as a UFO is an ET spaceship.
>After screening, the hardcore UFO reports are not a large whole
>number.

I never said that they did. The questions remains, are any? And what is the evidence of same?

<snip>

>Absence of incontrovertible UFO evidence is not evidence that
>UFOs are absent (or something like that). How much
>"incontrovertible evidence" is there for most cosmological
>theory? And yours is not a hypothesis about UFO data, it's a
>denial that there is totally convincing data. I can't dispute
>that, but the evidence is ample and strongly suggestive in
>support of an ET interpretation of the UFO data.

Well, you've confused me. Is there a distinction between UFO data and simple data as such? Moreover, you act as if cosmological theory in toto was something absolutely devoid of evidence, incontrovertible or otherwise, let alone on a par with all that overwhelming UFO as ET evidence. Since you seem to have missed the larger point, let me put it this way:

Ufologists such as yourself claim (imply, suggest, insinuate, whatever) that some UFOs represent visitation by a higher intelligence, and that, to date, science refuses to address your best evidence and claims because of, well, whatever reasons ufologists think that they won't.

My point is that the world isn't wired that way today -- and I'm somewhat appalled by people who continue to think that it is.

Science is, every day and in almost every way, engaged in intense observation and instrumentation of the world around us, near and far. And the best ufologists can do is to say, look at our evidence, which still, to this day, consists largely of anecdotal testimony, with which there is nothing science can

actually _do_.

As an example of which, one need look no further than the Sturrock Panel. In short, how many more Sturrock Panels would you like? Three? Four? Or however many it takes until you get it "right"?

Meanwhile, science churns along, just never quite detecting those UFOs on its own that ufologists are always reminding us are everywhere. Am I the only one who finds this curious?

<snip>

>Here you seem to be saying that we have, in fact, been visited >(if not as often as some people think). Unless you're kidding, >of course. Sometimes I'm not sure about that. So what is the >evidence you cite in support of? Confusedly yours, Dick

I'm confused, too. In support of what?

Hell, you were the one who designated Maccabee's last rambling, ill-reasoned and ill-spelled post as, what was it, "well presented," when it was nothing of the sort? My foot, and you used to be an editor?

Excuse me while I silently and profusely curse MS Outlook Express. Believe me, they did not recover this crap from Roswell. If they did, on the other hand, we have nothing to worry about.

Dennis Stacy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian]

From: **Ted Toal** <ttoal@jps.net>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:38:43 -0500
Subject: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian]

>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: Hoagland's "Tunnel"
>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

>The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of
>many.

>Whatever the "tunnel" is, it's enormous: a seemingly translucent
>cylindrical formation resting in a gouge in the Martian surface,
>giving the impression of a subterranean "pipe."

The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg. lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

a bit to the left of the first image in the area image at:

http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/areas/c_45n015.htm

And in that second image it is a lot easier to see the valley, especially if you rotate the image 180 deg. and place light at your upper left.

Ted Toal

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Leakers - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 00:27:34 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 07:33:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:31 EST
>Subject: Re: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:14:48 EST
>>Subject: Leakers [was: 1957 F-86D UFO Radar Interception]
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>In recent posts, Dennis Stacy has posed the following question.
>>If UFOs are real and there is a government cover-up, then why
>>aren't there any leaks? This is a fair question assuming there
>>have been no credible leaks. But there have been credible leaks
>>- lots of them.

><snip>

>Can you explain how all of these people escaped prosecution for
>leaking the secret of the millennium? Have any of these people
>ever been prosecuted?

>If not, why not? What does this say about the importance of
>these supposed UFO secrets being leaked?

>Or is the U.S. Government only "coy" in its defense of top
>secrets?

>Or, is it only you who are being coy? Or is it sly?

><snip>

>>But back to the leakers. We could keep adding to the list above.
>>As a group, I'm sure we could create a top 50 or top 100 leakers
>>list.

>David, why don't you really contribute something to the
>discussion by listing 100 top leakers who have been prosecuted
>by the United States Government for breaking security to reveal
>the classified secrets of the Flying Saucers?

>Don't be coy, David. Give us a list.

>Clear skies,

>Bob Young

Bob,

You remind me of the government when they get caught out in a scandal due to the actions of a whistle-blower - all puffed up in outrage that someone would dare break confidentiality, while ignoring the crime they have just been exposed for - shifting the focus away from the real meat. Whe the hell is a "coy leaker" anyway?

BTW the answer to your question about why none have been prosecuted is simple - do that and it's an open admission to the people that the government is deeply involved in the

investigation of the phenomenon. You can't prosecute on something you've been denying doing for 50 years, can you?

I've got some whistle-blowers up here that I protect because they are afraid of retribution. Most of them are from the old school and believe that they are in danger if they go public.

Maybe if you got out of your chair there buddy and got out and started kicking over the traces you might be surprised at what you found.

Whether all of Dave's leakers below are in the know, is not the question-doubless some of them are and there's likely many more out there that would share if the thought they had half a chance of being taken seriously. Calling them names doesn't help make the field less muddy, it just reinforces the debunkers position by default.

The skies aren't as clear as you'd like to think.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Bruni

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 13:14:42 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 08:53:51 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Bruni

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists
>about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO
>partisans (pro and con)?

Hi Richard

I don't think you are alone. I only came in to answer comments about my research made by Dave Clarke. Since then, the man has continued using the Lakenheath thread to debunk my Rendlesham research and make personal attacks. One has to decide whether to hang in to defend oneself against distortions or jump out and trust people to make their own decision. I decided to do the latter.

<snip>

>On the other side of the Pond there have been constant "leaks",
>insinuations, and strong hints that those of us who take the
>case seriously will be proven wrong, before actual production of
>a report that everyone can examine.

I have to say that I have not done any research on the Lakenheath case but I do have some comments.....

A few days ago I had a conversation with an old friend of mine, a former Air Ministry man and respected author of such books as the autobiography of Winston Churchill. Anyway, the Lakenheath case came up.

He explained that the Blue Book was a nonsense because it was written so long after the fact. Now we know that, but what I was not aware of was that many of these cases, including the Lakenheath case, were written not only from official reports but from witness memory - years later.

I think this is what the group investigating the case are working from. And being an American, the witness would certainly use American language.

From witnessing a BBC TV special that Jenny Randles did, the team also has access to the RAF witnesses and access to the RAF log book. They aim to prove, as they have stated several times, that there was no cat and mouse chase.

In the TV interview with Jenny, the RAF crew claim they were scrambled at 2am (we are then shown the log) after receiving a call from the Americans who had something on their radar tubes.

Apparently, the Americans were very excited and said it was unusual. The crew were up (in separate aircraft) for 55 minutes, over land - not sea, which was unusual. They said it was impossible to close in because the object was stationary. They overshot it, it flew down, they tried again.....

In the TV footage, Jenny is also seen reading from official Air Force reports in the public Records Office:

" ...another report of an unusual object on Lakenheath radar, which at first moved at a speed of two to four thousand knots and then remained stationary at a high altitude. No visual contact was made with the Venom sent to intercept it and other radars failed to pick it up."

The TV interview has to tell us that the crew witnessed something. So in my humble opinion the case is not exactly going to crash, as we are being lead to believe. Surely the witnesses have not changed their minds since that interview was given!

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 08:44:16 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 08:56:37 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

>Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s,
>60s or 70s.

>The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have
>never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are
>now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence
>relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of
>anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I
>mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The
>evidence should be there, pure and simple.

This makes a lot of sense.

So now let's get specific. Which instruments, exactly what would they show (if UFOs were here), and where's the data, so we can see if the instruments do show anything? It would be wonderful to have comments from people who really know about this stuff.

Dennis (hi, Dennis), last time you mentioned something like this, or anyway at one point when you mentioned it, you talked about satellite photos, which you said might show UFOs in flight. I asked then if they showed our own aircraft (which presumably they would, if they'd show UFOs), and as I remember, you didn't know. I don't know either. This is why we need experts to take over the discussion here. I'm eager to know what they say.

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 08:25:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:36:43 -0500
Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Evans

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 11:35:18 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic! - Deschamps

>>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 09:30:11 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: U-Haul Truck With Area 51 Graphic!
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, I had written of Michel's regret of no U-haul photos:

>>What difference would it make? You claim to have genuine, >>no-doubt-about-it shots of a flying saucer. Yet, despite such >>claims, you have yet to share such ground breaking photos with >>the list! Why should this be any different? I bring this up >>because you continually berate anyone that casts a skeptical eye >>toward UFO reports, all the while hoarding the very proof that >>convinced you, 100%, that flying saucers are real. Why should I >>even believe that the U-haul you mention exists, at all? What >>difference would a picture make if you have no intention of >>sharing it?

>>More to the point, why share a shot of a UFO painted on the side >>of a U-haul truck and not share a picture or video of a real >>flying saucer you claim to have in your possession?

Michel replied:

>I should have stipulated that... yes, I do have video of two >separate sightings -- one daytime, one night time -- that are >seconds in duration. But by themselves, they are not >no-doubt-about-it shots of a flying saucer. But they do >compliment my other visual sightings, meaning that as a whole, I >have enough evidence (to me, at least) that what I saw was >not from here.

<snip>

>Times like these. I really hate this means of communication >because you can't express the exact feelings or get your message >across properly. I always seem to be repeating myself when >discussing Common Sense and it sucks!

>If some people have no common sense at all, then that's their >problem, not mine!

>A guy with common sense,

Hi, Michel, all.

Sorry, but this is all nonsense. You blame others because they either don't understand you or they don't have common sense enough to know that flying saucers are real. In the end, you did email me pictures of the Uhaul truck in question. What was conspicuously missing, however, were shots of real flying saucers that you claimed to have. Your above clarification notwithstanding, I'm not going to let you off the hook quite so

easy. It has been you that has consistently berated others about not believing or, as shown above, not having enough "common sense" to know the truth about ET life, etc. It was you that claimed to know that flying saucers are real. It was you that claimed to be convinced of this because of what you recorded with your camcorder.

For the record, let's look at exactly what you wrote:

>Frankly, I don't care that much since I've had so many
>sightings; I am kind of casual about it because I know Flying
>saucers are real.

>If you've never seen anything, you can't know for sure. But
>believe me, if you ever do see something, you won't be able to
>deny it to yourself... eventually.

>It took me a long while to accept what I had seen, and each
>time, I had a hard time believing what my eyes saw or what my
>camcorder captured on tape.

I don't think there's anything vague about what you've written. You've had so many sightings that you know flying saucers are real. Others that haven't had sightings like yours will never know or understand. What convinced you flying saucers are real was images you captured on video tape. Therefore, these images must look like flying saucers and not abstract blobs of light in the night sky that could be anything.

No sir, you know flying saucers are real. In fact you are so confident you are "casual about it". Again, so that you aren't misunderstood, your very first line was:

>Frankly, I don't care that much since I've had so many
>sightings; I am kind of casual about it because I know Flying
>saucers are real.

Your long-winded post about how no one understands or has no common sense is pretty insulting in the face of this previous declaration on your part. You claimed to have shots of flyig saucers, then you do an about face and admit you don't.

Ultimately you had written:

>For those people who know me, my credibility is never
>questioned.

I think we know you pretty well, now.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 06:29:59 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:39:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies

>From: Ted Toal <ttoal@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01...]
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800

Good call. I'll reference this in my site. This is the first feature I've seen that detracts from an "exotic" explanation for the "tunnel"--although I don't think it explains everything (i.e. glassy texture).

>The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look >at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did >on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually >just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular >intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be >common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg. >lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada - Kelly

From: Christopher Kelly <tophar@pacific.net.au>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 02:02:00 +1100
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:42:07 -0500
Subject: Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada - Kelly

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary Report 2000
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 19:09:42 -0600

>>From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
>>Subject: CCCRN News: Circle Phenomena in Canada Summary Report 2000
>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:37:30 -0800
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>Conclusions

><Giant circular snip>

>>While in some respects 2000 may have seemed a bit of a
>>disappointment compared to 1999 in particular, the phenomenon
>>did continue to make its appearance in Canada, following the
>>same general trends that it has for the past decade or so, with
>>formations that are basically simpler in form than many in the
>>UK and Europe, but still producing a wealth of data, including
>>good physical evidence that can be followed up on and studied
>>further. Work toward this end continues, in particular with the
>>BLT Research Team. The reports of other phenomena such as the
>>ice rings should continue to be investigated as well, even while
>>they may not have any relation to the crop circles; at this
>>point it is too early to tell..

>List,

>While I wouldn't wish foot and mouth disease on any country, I
>must admit that I look forward to the forthcoming English crop
>circle season with something resembling creepy expectation. Will
>the usual crop of complex formations appear on schedule, or
>won't they? And if not, why not? Will it be because humans
>stayed home in obedience of strict proscriptions against tromping
>through the countryside, or because the aliens or other
>superintelligent forces have simply decided to obey mundane
>terrestrial laws?

>I guess time will tell...

>Bets, anyone?

Hi All,

I will put up \$1 for some of that action Dennis, :-)

I can see how some of the smaller Crop Circles could be done,
But I cannot see a couple of locals doing the much more complex
Circles in one night. Some of the Circles I have seen are so
complex even a computer controlled laser beam equipped machine
would be flat out getting the job done in the few hours of a
English night.

I still think that some of these Circles as coursed by Solar
flare burst of Magnetic fields hitting mineral ect in the ground
which in turn course strange things to happen to the crops,
giving us the wonder patterns we see.

Large Solar fares are due over the next 6 months.

But then there is this Aust style of Crop Circle, which I believe goes against all the rules. I would like to see those so called people that make these Crop Circles make one like this one 70km West of Pukatja in South Australia. You need to be in space to see our Crop Circles. I still think that this image has a Egyptian feel to it. Don't ask me why, I just see a Egyptian style to the image.

<http://www.geocities.com/TheTropics/Bay/3925/map.jpg>

But I, like Dennis will be watching very closely to see if an Crop Circles do appear during the Quarantine period. Very good observation on Dennis's part and one worth keeping in mind. It's little observations like this, that can make all the differences when looking into abnormalities like Crop Circles which in turn answer questions instead of asking more question.

Cheers Chris.

PS:- I only called the South Australia image a crop circle as this is what it was called when I found it under the heading of Crop Circles.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 09:44:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:45:48 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>ALL of you!

I presume I am included in the sentence with the capital letters
and the exclamation point. For the record:

I stand by every concern I have expressed. My concerns were and
are legitimate, and they have to do with the integrity of the
investigation, about which real questions were raised by the
extraordinary posturing, boasts, and taunts of some of those
involved in the British side of the investigation. In my
judgment, one would have to be deaf, dumb, and blind not to
wonder what lies behind such behavior.

You may recall, Dick, that before the Condon report ever
appeared, you and NICAP were outspokenly anxious about what its
conclusions would be, based on pre-report public statements --
almost wholly dismissive -- made by Condon and Low.

You may further recall that NICAP withdrew its co-operation with
the Condon Committee before the report was published, because
you thought Condon spokesmen had made all too apparent their
lack of any sort of objectivity. You and NICAP were rightly
concerned about Condon's objectivity, and you ought to be
concerned about objectivity in this instance, without going
after those who behave exactly as you have behaved.

Disappointedly,

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:56:29 -0500
Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

Hello List Members,

Every now and again I'll come up with something that just makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those days.

I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C. Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

To this end, I went to:

<http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a gaseous cloud emanating from it.

Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred magnification and see for yourself.

Cheers,

Dave (Furry)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 11:48:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:58:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Aldrich

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 11:46:45 EST
>UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Young

>>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication
>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 15:49:13 -0500

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Labels And Communication

<snip>

>>It is also possible with the obsession that UFOs amount to
>>nothing,

>Hi, Jan, Dick, List:

>Or, that they amount to the ETH

>>to miss out on rare phomenona which might occur once a
>>year, once in a decade, once in a century, etc., etc.

>>I think some very important things about electrical, biological,
>>and astronomical phenomena have been missed here. Satellite
>>velocity meteors, double dippers, ballooning spiders' unusual
>>activities, etc., etc.

>This is what provides long-term interest for me.

>Labeling someone is a convenient and lazy way to obscure or
>ignore an unwelcome message. Everyone comes to this>subject with
>preconceived notions. Anyone who says that they have not is to
>be listened to with raised eyebrows and a large helping of sea
salt.

>The Ol' Wrangler,

>Bob Young

Unfortunately, this answer is typical of a lot of the behavior on this list: fixate on one small part or fine point of a message, snip everything else and carry on from there. I have admit my guilt here also, however, I usually try to answer or comment on most points someone brings up. There are ideological gulfs in this field. To say there is not is either incredibly naive or demonstrates most superficial consideration of the field. Most of Ufology is about beliefs--one way or another. Beliefs shape the behavior and reasoning of many here.

Murray Bott suggested we look for natural or man-made phenomena which might cause stalled engines or other reported UFO electro-magnetic effects. If these things happened in the "real"

world, then they are not magical, mystical UFO-land properties. Murray did find a case of aircraft engine stalling related to RF energy. We found several more, caused by lightning strikes, etc. Phil Klass stuck his nose in here, lots of ridicule and fun and games. He especially thought stopping of engines improbable and the re-starting of engines impossible. When confronted with examples of how car engines can be stalled, Klass pleaded he had was too busy to read the answers. He wasn't too busy to send on more and more questions and requests. There was a company that made a device that would stop a car, unfortunately it would also destroy the engine. However, the process was demonstrated, all that was now required was engineering to refine it. The engineering might be uneconomical, but that is not the point. As to a car engine restarts, improbably but not impossible, as anyone who has ever experienced "dieseling" with a gasoline engine can attest.

Wrangling pure and simple. Evasion, obfuscations, misdirection, everything but addressing the issue originated with the disputant.

Why not debunker? Because there is, in the end, nothing wrong with the word, despite its ufological connotation. Ufology has some interesting nuggets hidden among skeptical and believer bunk. In its noise to signal ratio noise keeps climbing. There needs to be a good debunking here. And btw there are skeptical legends, just like there are believer legends. Just as we are assaulted with the most idiotic claims possible, we are also assaulted by explanations which have no relationship to how things behavior in the physical universe.

I have considered a term for you, Bob, but it is not "Wrangler."

All disrespect accepted and returned in kind.

Jan Aldrich

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 12:01:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 12:01:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 17:59:53 -0000

>It seemed particularly apt that, having returned from a 600 mile
>round-trip to interview a key witness to the Lakenheath incident
>on Sunday evening, I find your most recent posting. The retired
>RAF pilot I visited was in fact the very one quoted in the
>accepted literature as having made a "visual contact" with the
>UFO tracked by Lakenheath GCA in 1956 and subsequently was
>quoted as saying "Roger...I've got my guns locked on him" before
>the UFO looped behind the Venom to begin a tail-chase. A more
>down-to-earth, unimaginative and sincere witness could not have
>been found - complete with his log-book entry as proof that he
>participated in the single "scramble" of his entire 8-year
>career on the Battle Response Flight of the RAF's front line
>defence against the East.

>This pilot had not seen his navigator of that night for ten
>years, he has had no contact with the RAF Controller who ordered
>him into the air 45 years ago and did not know of his infamy
>within the world of UFology. "Other than my aircrew colleagues,
>you are the first person who has ever contacted me about this
>event since 1956," he told me.

Hi Dave,

A couple of times now I've noted you referring to the Venom
pilot's infamy or being infamous. That word denotes one of bad
reputation and doing evil so to speak. At least that's the way
they see it in the Oxford dictionary. Maybe you might want to
find another word here to describe the man's personal history.
"...a day that will live in infamy..." FDR's reference to the
attack on Pearl Harbour springs to mind. I don't think anyone
has ever attached evil intent to the pilot performing his
mission, whatever that might have been.

As well, I don't have a copy of the Condon report on this case
but, if I remember correctly they tagged it as an 'unknown'. Did
they not contact the pilot at the time or refer to documents to
make their assessment. Perhaps the pilot was still on active
duty in 1967 and unable to be interviewed.

Regards,

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 16:42:41 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 12:03:49 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 23:38:59 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 14:01:55 -0000

><snip>

>>Dennis,

>>I have emptied my "Trash Can" so can't cite the specific posts.
>>Fairly recently you made an elaborate statement about our
>>knowledge of cosmology and physical science, and said or implied
>>that it made ET visits unlikely. That's an argument from theory.

>Dick,

>Then you agree that I said ET visits were unlikely, not "can't
>be," as you stated in your previous post? Thanks for the
>clarification. And your own position is a theory from argument?

I was only using shorthand language, but let's face it: you pretty much tend to argue that it "can't be" because of lack of independent scientific support and because it doesn't--to you--fit with scientific theory. My position is a theory based on facts or empirical data. It is not, as you seem to think, deduced from a belief in aliens.

>>Also, no ufologist in his/her right mind (or thinking clearly)
>>suggests that everything reported as a UFO is an ET spaceship.
>>After screening, the hardcore UFO reports are not a large whole
>>number.

>I never said that they did. The questions remains, are any? And
>what is the evidence of same?

Are any evidence of ET? Cumulatively, that is a very reasonable hypothesis. You seem not to understand what an hypothesis is. In my opinion, based on a lot of investigation and analysis (amply documented in my writings) it is the best working guess for explaining the overall data.

>>Absence of incontrovertible UFO evidence is not evidence that
>>UFOs are absent (or something like that). How much
>>"incontrovertible evidence" is there for most cosmological
>>theory? And yours is not a hypothesis about UFO data, it's a
>>denial that there is totally convincing data. I can't dispute
>>that, but the evidence is ample and strongly suggestive in
>>support of an ET interpretation of the UFO data.

>Well, you've confused me. Is there a distinction between UFO
>data and simple data as such? Moreover, you act as if
>cosmological theory in toto was something absolutely devoid of
>evidence, incontrovertible or otherwise, let alone on a par with
>all that overwhelming UFO as ET evidence. Since you seem to have

>missed the larger point, let me put it this way:

>Ufologists such as yourself claim (imply, suggest, insinuate,
>whatever) that some UFOs represent visitation by a higher
>intelligence, and that, to date, science refuses to address your
>best evidence and claims because of, well, whatever reasons
>ufologists think that they won't.

Scientific "data" per se does not and cannot disprove UFOs, if that's what you mean. Cosmological theory IS pretty devoid of data, other than observational data (and we all know how fallible human observation is, right?)

I would say that science has yet to address our evidence in any meaningful way, and there are numerous sociological reasons why they fail to do so, including the scorn heaped on those who dare to try by their colleagues.

>My point is that the world isn't wired that way today -- and I'm
>somewhat appalled by people who continue to think that it is.

>Science is, every day and in almost every way, engaged in
>intense observation and instrumentation of the world around us,
>near and far. And the best ufologists can do is to say, look at
>our evidence, which still, to this day, consists largely of
>anecdotal testimony, with which there is nothing science can
>actually do.

When you read The UFO Evidence: II you will find a strong counter-argument to this statement. There is a lot science could and should do if they ever wake up to the evidence. Further, UFO history contains many examples of scientists detecting things with instruments and their own eyeballs and then being ridiculed or laughed into silence. I daresay there is a lot of "hidden" scientific evidence thanks to the sociology of science/scientists.

>As an example of which, one need look no further than the
>Sturrock Panel. In short, how many more Sturrock Panels would
>you like? Three? Four? Or however many it takes until you get it
>"right"?

The Sturrock Panel contained a bunch of ultraconservative scientists who, much as I suggested above, were roundly ridiculed by their colleagues and began backtracking from a simple statement to the effect that there were some things worth investigating in the UFO phenomenon. Q.E.D.

>Meanwhile, science churns along, just never quite detecting
>those UFOs on its own that ufologists are always reminding us
>are everywhere. Am I the only one who finds this curious?

I find it a curious statement on your part. Just ask the scientists who have tried to get UFO articles published in mainline science journals and you may get some feel for the damage that has been done by the ridicule factor.

>Hell, you were the one who designated Maccabee's last rambling,
>ill-reasoned and ill-spelled post as, what was it, "well
>presented," when it was nothing of the sort? My foot, and you
>used to be an editor?

What Bruce said was sensible and logical (which, of course, means that I agreed with it). Anyone makes a few typos. I thought it was well reasoned.

Regards,

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

The Paradox Of Ufology

From: **Matt Hurley** <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 14:45:44 -0500
Subject: The Paradox Of Ufology

Hi List,

Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after porn ?

It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

Just a thought

Matt

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:07:34 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 14:50:27 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark
>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:45:48 -0500

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 09:44:44 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>>ALL of you!

>I presume I am included in the sentence with the capital letters
>and the exclamation point. For the record:

>I stand by every concern I have expressed. My concerns were and
>are legitimate, and they have to do with the integrity of the
>investigation, about which real questions were raised by the
>extraordinary posturing, boasts, and taunts of some of those
>involved in the British side of the investigation. In my
>judgment, one would have to be deaf, dumb, and blind not to
>>wonder what lies behind such behavior.

>You may recall, Dick, that before the Condon report ever
>appeared, you and NICAP were outspokenly anxious about what its
>conclusions would be, based on pre-report public statements --
>almost wholly dismissive -- made by Condon and Low.

>You may further recall that NICAP withdrew its co-operation with
>the Condon Committee before the report was published, because
>you thought Condon spokesmen had made all too apparent their
>lack of any sort of objectivity. You and NICAP were rightly
>concerned about Condon's objectivity, and you ought to be
>concerned about objectivity in this instance, without going
>after those who behave exactly as you have behaved.

>Disappointedly,

>Jerry Clark

Jerry,

I specifically did not name any names because I respect people
on both sides of the argument. Note that I did not say that I
disagreed with your concerns and criticisms (in fact, they may
well prove to be correct), only that the rhetoric - everyone's
- has been excessive on both sides.

Your depiction of NICAP's pre-judgment of the Condon report is entirely accurate, and we were strongly criticized for what we said at the time. As you note, we proved to be correct. However, there was a lot more at stake in that instance; namely, the entire future of scientific attention to UFOs. Here we are faced with re-investigation of one case, which you think is compromised by their handling of it. You go so far as to question their integrity, which I do not. They can be honestly mistaken.

I agree with your concerns to the extent that their remarks do tend to make them look non-objective. But you have made your point and I don't see what is to be gained by going on and on about it and questioning their integrity. That's why all were included in my comments. I am skeptical of how much they will "demolish" the case, but we will all be loaded for bear when the report is issued and, if there are flaws or inaccuracies in it, we certainly will find them.

It is somewhat ironic that I find myself defending the "scientific process" here, though, because that is the argument that was used against us at NICAP by Members of Congress and others. They said we had to let the process work through before criticizing. Still, I repeat that there is comparatively little at stake here and I feel confident that truth will out. No doubt this will provide an outstanding example of thorough peer review!

Regards,

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:40:07 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>Hello List Members,

>Every now and again I'll come up with something that just
>makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those
>days.

>I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C.
>Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

>To this end, I went to:

><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

>and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer
>with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most
>notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass
>worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside
>the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a
>gaseous cloud emanating from it.

>Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred
>magnification and see for yourself.

>Dave (Furry)

Hi Dave, hi All,

Last week when I posted about the "worm" I described it as a
"giant sperm". I mentioned the "trail" behind the sphere as if
it had "rolled" into the position it now occupies. Now Furry is
calling attention to it as if it had never been mentioned. It's
like a comedy sketch, one guy comes up with a scheme or
something and the guy standing next to him goes, "Hey I've got
an idea" and then repeats what the first guy just said! <LOL>

Furry, what can I say, "great minds think alike!" ;) Ok, so now
that somebody else has noticed this feature, what do you make of
it?

As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
flat terrain. Those are clearly tubular structures and it
appears to "contain" within it a really large spherical object
of some kind. All of a sudden people are analyzing the pictures
as if they were looking at flat ground (sand dunes) and
completely ignoring the fact that the structure is a transparent
pipe/tube of some kind. What's up with that? Either folks have
downloaded the wrong images to study or they are blind. There is
no third way about it.

I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or

a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images! Period.

Regards,

John Velez,

I may be crazy but at least my glasses work! <LOL>

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:25:56 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:43:19 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hale

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists
>about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO
>partisans (pro and con)?

>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>ALL of you!

I was wondering, who first brought this to light on UpDates? And
for what purpose, if debate wasn't the main one?

Cordially,

Roy..

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: String Of Pearls?

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:26:00 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:46:39 -0500
Subject: Re: String Of Pearls?

>From: Greg St. Pierre <GregJenn95@email.msn.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: String Of Pearls?
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:11:17 -0800

>Hello list,

>Has anyone heard of any so-called "string of pearls" type
>sightings since the events over Mexico City in the early
>nineties?

>I find these displays to be among the more interesting (and
>eerie) available, and wonder if any effort has been made to
>catalog and/or correlate patterns.

>Thanks for any info.

>Greg St. Pierre

Hi Greg,

Very interesting post. I had the occasion to speak to a chap who was working on the summer harvest, about three years back.

I can recall being told of an event which took place at a field at about 11:30pm. After sitting back for a break the chap and his fellow harvesters, were treated to a display of "dancing blue pearl-shaped lights, which were beautiful to look at." They seemed to effortlessly dance above the unharvested wheat, for about 7 minutes. It was a lovely Summer evening, and they enjoyed the light show, and had no explanation for the entire event?

The chap remarked that they seemed to dance between each other and were a very intense blue? But I can remember the chap, referring to them as "dancing pearls".

Regards,

Roy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: String Of Pearls?

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:04:38 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:38:53 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clarke

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 13:14:42 -0000

>I have to say that I have not done any research on the
>Lakenheath case but I do have some comments.....

>A few days ago I had a conversation with an old friend of mine,
>a former Air Ministry man and respected author of such books as
>the autobiography of Winston Churchill. Anyway, the Lakenheath
>case came up.

>He explained that the Blue Book was a nonsense because it was
>written so long after the fact. Now we know that, but what I was
>not aware of was that many of these cases, including the
>Lakenheath case, were written not only from official reports but
>from witness memory - years later.

>I think this is what the group investigating the case are
>working from. And being an American, the witness would certainly
>use American language.

> From witnessing a BBC TV special that Jenny Randles did, the
>team also has access to the RAF witnesses and access to the RAF
>log book. They aim to prove, as they have stated several times,
>that there was no cat and mouse chase.

>In the TV interview with Jenny, the RAF crew claim they were
>scrambled at 2am (we are then shown the log) after receiving a
>call from the Americans who had something on their radar tubes.

>Apparently, the Americans were very excited and said it was
>unusual. The crew were up (in separate aircraft) for 55 minutes,
>over land - not sea, which was unusual. They said it was
>impossible to close in because the object was stationary. They
>overshot it, it flew down, they tried again.....

>The TV interview has to tell us that the crew witnessed
>something. So in my humble opinion the case is not exactly going
>to crash, as we are being lead to believe. Surely the witnesses
>have not changed their minds since that interview was given!

Hi Georgina,

For once I find myself agreeing with virtually everything you
say.

But the one mistake is that "the case is not exactly going to
crash as we are being lead to believe."

I'll copy, for one more time, my post of 17 February. Please try
to read it this time!

>>Oxford English Dictionary, 9th Edition, debunk: "expose
>>the falseness of (a claim etc)." The claims debunked are
>>the "accepted" version of the Lakenheath case - copied,
>>recycled and distorted through endless re-telling
>>in an endless stream of books and magazine articles.

>>Note the "accepted" version - not the fact that _something_
>>happened - because _something_ most certainly did!

Note: "because something certainly did!"

The aircrews have not changed their minds since 1996; as Jenny explained you saw probably less than a minute of TV footage of what they had to say - today we have probably over three hours of detailed transcripts, plus we have traced other participants and have RAF documentary evidence released to us by the MOD.

Best wishes

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:09:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:40:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Clarke

>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 12:01:46 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 17:59:53 -0000

>>This pilot had not seen his navigator of that night for ten
>>years, he has had no contact with the RAF Controller who ordered
>>him into the air 45 years ago and did not know of his infamy
>>within the world of UFology. "Other than my aircrew colleagues,
>>you are the first person who has ever contacted me about this
>>event since 1956," he told me.

>Hi Dave,

>A couple of times now I've noted you referring to the Venom
>pilot's infamy or being infamous. That word denotes one of bad
>reputation and doing evil so to speak. At least that's they way
>they see it in the Oxford dictionary. Maybe you might want to
>find another word here to describe the man's personal history.
>"...a day that will live in infamy..." FDR's reference to the
>attack on Pearl Harbour springs to mind. I don't think anyone
>has ever attached evil intent to the pilot performing his
>mission, whatever that might have been.

Hi Don,

You're right - infamous was the wrong word. But I had been doing
a lot of travelling the day before and my head was hurting.

>As well, I don't have a copy of the Condon report on this case
>but, if I remember correctly they tagged it as an 'unknown'. Did
>they not contact the pilot at the time or refer to documents to
>make their assessment. Perhaps the pilot was still on active
>duty in 1967 and unable to be interviewed.

In short the report arrived very late during the Condon study,
and the only information the US team had to work from was the
USAF Controllers 12 year old memories and the Blue Book records
on the case.

There is no evidence that the Condon team made any effort to
contact the RAF or British Ministry of Defence for access to
their file on the Lakenheath case.

Therefore the classification of "unknown" is hardly very
reliable, as it was based upon what can only be described as a
half-hearted, truncated investigation which only had access to
half the data!

Hope this helps.

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:54:50 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:43:51 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 12:25:21 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 09:42:50 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Gee, did the witness say he "thinks" he saw something reflect
>the Sun brightly, and that it was fast? Or did he say he saw
>something reflect the sun brightly? I don't recall Arnold
>saying "I think I saw....." Now, Arnold said, "I saw."

>Your interjection of "he thinks" really is an indication that
>you suggest that maybe Arnold didn't see what he said he saw.
>That would be an interpretation by you of the available
>information, not an interpretation by the witness. ==

Oh, I don't have any doubt that Arnold thought that he saw something. But, since he was only human, he just might have been mistaken about something.

I am not willing, though, to substitute Arnold's belief, no matter how sincerely held, into proof of the ETH. Apparently you are.

My reason for bringing this up is not to reopen the issue of Mr. Arnold as a witness, but to comment on your statement that just because a man, 53 years ago, believed that his attention had been drawn to a bright flash in the sky and that he believed that what he saw was moving fast, you consider this enough evidence to prove that an alien craft of was flying around.

I'm not willing to accept such an astounding conclusion based upon some guy's beliefs a half century ago, or yours now.

Nothing personal. I'm a skeptic, you see.

Clear skies,

Bob Young
The Ol' Wrangler

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 6](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:05:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:47:40 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:07:34 -0000

>>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";
>>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark
>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 11:45:48 -0500

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Clark
>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 09:44:44 -0600

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

Dick,

>Your depiction of NICAP's pre-judgment of the Condon report is
>entirely accurate, and we were strongly criticized for what we
>said at the time. As you note, we proved to be correct. However,
>there was a lot more at stake in that instance; namely, the
>entire future of scientific attention to UFOs. Here we are faced
>with re-investigation of one case, which you think is
>compromised by their handling of it. You go so far as to
>question their integrity, which I do not. They can be honestly
>mistaken.

You are, of course, entirely right. I am sure that the
investigators are honest and well-intentioned, and if I implied
otherwise, I apologize. The reality is, however, that all of us
have biases, including those of us who possess integrity. What
all of us need to do is to be sensitive to those biases and to
act accordingly. My concern was, and is, that there was a fair
degree of insensitivity in evidence in some of the postings from
that quarter.

I hope this will be the last I have to say on this overworked
subject. I look forward to reading the report when it is
available. I am sure it will be extremely interesting and, if
we're lucky, a genuine contribution to our understanding.

Jerry Clark

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Leakers - Young

From: Bpb Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:11:11 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 09:16:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 20:01:08 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:31 EST
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 18:21:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>Don't you think that it would kind of give the game away if
>someone who came forward to say that the government was keeping
>ET visitations a highly classified secret were to be prosecuted
>for doing it?

Hi, Lan:

It sure would show that something was probably being leaked.
Under your theory, the most important military and defense
secrets would never be protected by prosecutions because this
would give the game away. Only minor infractions would be
prosecuted.

This is a problem with "perfect" conspiracy theories, if there
is no evidence for them, this in itself can be proof of the
conspiracy.

It's pretty windy and cold outside, right now. Think I'll just
go downstairs and have a snort of bourbon and think about this
until supper.

Clear skies,

Ol' Grandad

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:13:41 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 09:22:59 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sparks

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:51:37 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

><snip>

>>Hi Dennis,

>>Isn't the issue simply this: ETH proponents argue that proof of
>>Non-Terrestriality = proof of ETH because ETH tops the
>>plausibility of possible non-terrestrial explanations? (See
>>Dick's list). But skeptics deny that this is a good reason
>>because (a) they deny that unexplainable UFO cases are
>>sufficient proof of non-terrestriality and (b) they claim that
>>ETH is not necessarily the most plausible of the non-terrestrial
>>explanations. Skeptics seem to want more a Proof of UFO Reality
>>rather than ETH Origin and they want it in the form of a massive
>>alien intrusion into human affairs (space war, invasion, mass
>>destruction, mass public landings, alien addressing UN, etc.) or
>>a "Made in Zeta Reticuli" type information left in an openly
>>investigated crashed saucer.

>Hi, Brad,

>My following remarks are not directed at you personally, I'm
>just using your post as an opportunity to respond in general.

Hi Dennis,

Thanks for your post. I appreciate who your audience is in making your remarks and I am not taking it personally, just as I'd said in my own remarks (which were snipped). I personally reject the ETH in any case so criticism of ETH is not criticism of a position I advocate. But I do believe the ETH should get a fair hearing.

And for that reason -- ETH getting a fair hearing -- I must point out that you snipped off a crucially important question I posed: What is the model of behavior or activity expected for ET UFO's? Your responses to my posting seem to tacitly assume some model of alien behavior against which the UFO phenomenon is constantly being tested and found to fall short. But we need to know what is this model or hypothesis of ET behavior, its MO, its operational pattern, its strategic posture? I am going to go through your posting and point out this implicit model and

ask what it is each time.

This is not an issue that is going to be or needs to be settled in one email exchange, as the past months of this thread have already shown. This doesn't have to be like the "trial of the UFO" Robertson Panel which the AF cleverly manipulated and trapped the CIA into hosting on a hurried rush-to-judgment schedule, with predictable AF-desired outcome.

>What I'm saying shouldn't be very hard to grasp. I'm not saying >it's above counterargument or anything of the sort -- I just >wish that such arguments would be based on what I actually said, >not on emotionally-larded interpretations of same.

It would help if both sides would watch how much they snip out of the arguments.

>So let me reiterate: I am not calling for evidence on the >basis of "massive alien intrusion," although I see no particular >reason why, if ET is indeed here and in great numbers, that >wouldn't be just as likely a scenario as the one most ufologists >propose -- which, I guess, is something less (but why?).

Well, what kind of UFO evidence are you calling for?

And see, here you seem to have some model of ET behavior in mind, a "scenario" of ET activity. What is that scenario? I'm not trying to put you on the spot nor do I expect an instant answer but just the start of a dialogue on what I consider to be the crucial issue. This is what we should be discussing and refining. The scenarios of ET activity. Forget all the personal he-said-she-said argument. Let's get down to specific models of alien activity and discuss the UFO evidence in relation to them. I already proposed a way to deal with this methodologically speaking. See my posts on UFO UpDates:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/dec/m05-008.shtml>

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/dec/m07-009.shtml>

>Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s, 60s or 70s. >The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have >never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are >now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence >relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of >anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I >mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The >evidence should be there, pure and simple.

What kinds of scientific instrument "surveys and monitoring" are you talking about? Is this the observatory fallacy which imagines that telescopes monitor 100% of the sky 24/7?

The Condon Report has already dealt with the severe limitations of such scientific instruments and the built-in filtering that pays attention only to the phenomena under investigation and which ignores UFO's (CR pp. 761-804). Instead of reinventing the wheel we should examine the literature on this subject.

And despite the filtering bias against investigating UFO's caught on scientific instruments they are still caught and investigated. The Condon Committee has already uncovered one instance where the UFO (or "UBO") was caught on a scientific instrument predating the Condon Project, an airglow scanning photometer at Mt. Haleakala Observatory, Hawaii, Feb 11-12, 1966, which had been ignored by the scientists operating the system (CR pp. 762, 777-781). I recall Vallee's diaries tell of an incident at Paris Observatory in 1961 where French astronomers deliberately destroyed a data tape recording a UFO that had been registered during satellite tracking observations -- an event that IIRC so shook up Vallee that it turned him towards his historic role in the history of the UFO. Hynek reports that in Aug 1968 at the annual meeting of the American Astronomical Society, convened in Victoria, B.C., UFO's were reported outside but not one single astronomer of the several hundred in attendance would go outside to investigate. (UFO Exp. ch. 1) Robert M. L. Baker testified to the House Science & Astronautics Subcommittee in 1968 that NORAD radar systems routinely discarded Uncorrelated Targets (UCT's) that didn't match known ballistic / orbital trajectories and therefore could

be discarding UFO event records.

This is all well established UFO history available in well known UFO books (except Baker's House testimony is well known from numerous quotes by McDonald, Friedman, Hynek, et al.). Has anything changed and if so what and how?

>If UFOs and abductions were as pandemic as ufology claims,
>science wouldn't need ufology to lead it to the Promised Land --
>it would already be there.

>State such an obvious observation, however, and ufology hauls
>out its hackneyed cliches: cover up, ridicule of witnesses,
>etc., etc., as if MJ-12 were overseeing every scientific
>observation outpost not just in this country, but in the entire
>world.

>Ufology's holy grail is the education of science and scientists
>as to the "truth" of ET visitation (along with a snippet of
>cultural criticism for their errant "ways").

>"They just won't look at our evidence!" is ufology's favorite,
>trumpeted refrain, never mind that most ufologists pay scant
>attention to science's own evidence -- or lack thereof, which
>counts for just as much in the overall scheme of things, and
>maybe more.

I am sympathetic to what you are saying about tiresome Ufological cliches but please engage with Ufology's strongest not weakest arguments here -- as I cited above well-established facts about scientific "filtering" to ignore direct UFO observations on instruments etc. It stands to reason that if scientists are too narrowly focused on their own research to pay attention to UFO's tracked in their instruments available at first-hand then they won't pay attention to hearsay second-hand, third-hand, nth-hand, from others (Ufologists) trying to attract their attention to the UFO subject. This is the stronger argument than the weak government coverup argument and it is one taken straight out of the Condon Report (CR p. 762) -- the "mouth of the enemy" so to speak insofar as UFO's and ETH are concerned.

The ridicule factor may be cliched but it has a basis going back as far as Hynek's 1952 complaint about it to the Optical Society of America and published in JOSA (1953).

>No, today's scientists must be close-minded or manipulated by
>the government's UFO cover up program to remain so ignorant of
>our "evidence" -- never mind that countless thousands of them
>worldwide are engaged in day-to-day activities that would
>routinely reveal the reality of ET visitation if such were the
>case.

Well what are these "day-to-day activities" by "countless thousands" of scientists that should be "routinely" revealing ET visitation? This seems to presuppose a pattern of UFO activity that would be routinely detected -- what is that pattern? The Condon Committee's analysis indicates that existing scientific observation systems would not likely pick up or pay attention to UFOs unless a program was devised to specially focus upon doing so (CR pp. 761-804).

>For some odd, unfathomable reason, a lot of ufologists out there
>still seem to think that all scientific instrumentation has to
>first pass through an MJ-12 cover up filter before it reaches
>the scientists involved in the actual instrumentation. Or, more
>sinisterly, afterwards.

>This is an absolutely ridiculous assumption in this day and age,
>and it can't be put any more politely. Anyone who thinks
>otherwise is living in a fantasy world of paranoia and what
>could be.

>Ufology's complaint is that science routinely ignores its
>evidence.

This is not the same as the MJ-12/coverup argument -- so which is the main Ufological complaint? See my earlier comments.

>My complaint is that ufology routinely ignores the
>evidence of science -- or lack thereof. If we can't listen to

>them, then why should they listen to us? The most striking case
>in point is ufology's own routine ridiculing of the SETI project
>-- yeah, as if we collectively knew better.

>It's been my (hardly original) position that if you stand
>outside the fray, you will easily observe that both dueling
>parties, more often than not, are equally guilty of the crimes
>of which they accuse the other party of having committed first.

>The recent Sturrock Panel should have been indicative of the
>current situation. Overlook the pro-UFO spin and the answer was
>obvious: there is very little scientists can actually do with
>the presented UFO evidence (presumably some of the best). Ergo,
>there is very little more they can do in the future
>in the absence of more convincing, credible evidence.

>In other words, there's a world of difference between a Power
>Point presentation and the thing itself. Only the foolhardy
>confuse the two. (And notice that I didn't mention David
>Rudiak's name here.)

>So what does ufology want science to do with this stuff? And
>what difference would it conceivably make if some prominent
>scientist came out with a statement in your favor? Would the
>Earth move, the Moon stop in orbit? He or she would still have
>to produce physical, as opposed, say, to anecdotal and
>statistical evidence to prove their case, wouldn't they?

What does Ufology want Science to do? How about mount a
full-scale scientific investigation like it does of whale
movements, algae blooms, auroras, and interstellar dust? How
about a minimum of 100 James McDonald equivalents working
full-time like they do on other subjects? UFO's have never had
that concentrated effort in its entire history for more than a
total of say 6 months-1 year in FTE's (full-time equivalents) of
100 McDonalds. Despite the 54+ year history. Hey, I'd gladly
take 10 McDonalds working full-time on UFO's if 100 is too many
or someone digs out actual figures and shows there are only,
say, 10 astronomers studying interstellar dust worldwide, etc.
My numbers are very rough but the point remains valid. The UFO
phenomenon has never gotten a fair hearing in terms of
full-scale scientific investigation, 6 months' worth in 54 years
is not adequate.

>And ufology would say, "Oh, physical evidence, why didn't you
>say that in the first place? So that's what you've been
>talking about all along? Uh, well, I don't have any at the
>moment, but what about this?"

>Or is that just my weird, slightly sketical imagination?

>Dennis Stacy

I've seen the evasive tactics you're talking about, the
bait-and-switch. That's why I am trying to focus on objectively
screening the best scientific UFO evidence for presentation
sometime in the not-too-distant future, hopefully.

Regards,

Brad

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:21:37 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 09:24:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Young

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 06:29:59 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tones <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Ted Toal <ttoal@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01...]
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800

>>The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look
>>at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did
>>on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually
>>just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular
>>intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be
>>common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg.
>>lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

>>http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

Mac, Ted, List:

This is similar to the classic problem of viewing crater on the Moon. When the light is seen coming from the upper left they look "normal". When the light comes from the right they often look like mounds, instead. This is why the convention for photo atlases of the Moon is to have the light from the left. Try rotating any decently shadowed crater image and you can notice this.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - The Paradox Of Ufology

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 20:27:09 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 09:26:23 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - The Paradox Of Ufology

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>Hi List,

>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>porn ?

>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>Just a thought

Matt,

Thanks for your observation. I hope it has more to do with something other than a shared obscenity of content. The majority (probably large majority) of UFO sites contain strong evidence of uncritical thinking and include mounds of garbage, unfortunately. I fear that more often than not they contain sociological data about human beings rather than serious or useful information about the UFO phenomenon.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Leakers - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:52:58 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 09:30:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Sparks

>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 20:01:08 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 22:44:31 EST
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 18:21:40 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>>David, why don't you really contribute something to the
>>discussion by listing 100 top leakers who have been prosecuted
>>by the United States Government for breaking security to reveal
>>the classified secrets of the Flying Saucers?

>Don't you think that it would kind of give the game away if
>someone who came forward to say that the government was keeping
>ET visitations a highly classified secret were to be prosecuted
>for doing it?

Hi,

With all due respect here, recently it has been reported in the press (Wash Post Feb. 17) "the only government official ever convicted of leaking classified information to the media" was Samuel Morison then of NISC, for leaking three spy satellite photos, and who was just pardoned by the outgoing President Clinton. (The case against Daniel Ellsberg was dismissed in 1973 because of government misconduct in breaking into his psychiatrist's office.)

To this I must add that in UFO history, one person was nearly prosecuted for leaking comments to the press with allegedly classified information about instrumented tracking data that would reveal speed-size-altitude data on UFOs that had been obtained at White Sands in 1950, and that was Dr. Anthony O. Mirarchi of USAF Cambridge Research Labs. Mirarchi was subjected to a vicious and uncalled-for AFOSI investigation and attempted referral to the FBI and Justice Dept for prosecution in 1951-3, a two-year-long persecution that was not stopped until Gen Garland called a halt to it.

His crime was in speaking out to the press in Feb 1951 to rebut the Urner Liddel Skyhooks-cause-all-UFOs nonsense and he stumbled out something that was highly sensitive and hit a raw nerve and had been majorly covered up and lied about -- the existence of UFO tracking data.

As I documented in my article "Ruppelt's Coverups" in the Sign Historical Group's UFO History Workshop Proceedings for 1999 (before I found out about Mirarchi), the whole series of White Sands cinetheodolite trackings of UFOs on repeated occasions had been seriously covered up and lied about repeatedly by the AF.

So by my tally, leaks of covered up UFO data seem to rank as comparable in importance to any other category of allegedly classified data, especially if merely leaking comments to the

Re: Leakers - Sparks

press as Mirarchi did and not copies of classified documents or photos (as in the Morison and Ellsberg cases) can result in a fierce effort to prosecute.

Regards,

Brad

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 16:11:46 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:08:18 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 08:44:16 -0500

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

>>Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s,
>>60s or 70s.

>>The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have
>>never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are
>>now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence
>>relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of
>>anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I
>>mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The
>>evidence should be there, pure and simple.

>This makes a lot of sense.

>So now let's get specific. Which instruments, exactly what would
>they show (if UFOs were here), and where's the data, so we can
>see if the instruments do show anything? It would be wonderful
>to have comments from people who really know about this stuff.

>Dennis (hi, Dennis), last time you mentioned something like
>this, or anyway at one point when you mentioned it, you talked
>about satellite photos, which you said might show UFOs in
>flight. I asked then if they showed our own aircraft (which
>presumably they would, if they'd show UFOs), and as I remember,
>you didn't know. I don't know either. This is why we need
>experts to take over the discussion here. I'm eager to know what
>they say.

Greg,

Here's a recent example of what I'm talking about. This was also
posted on UFO UpDates in the last week or so, but I don't have
the heading for it. Anyway, I trust it's specific enough:

<http://www.spacer.com/news/comet-01a.html>

Here are a few excerpts for the hyperlink challenged:

"Frank reports that he obtained pictures of nine small comets
among 1,500 images made between October 1998 and May 1999 using
the Iowa Robotic Observatory (IRO) located near Sonoita, Ariz.

"In addition, he says that the possibility of the images being
due to 'noise,' or electronic interference, on the telescope's
video screens was eliminated by operating the telescope in such
a manner as to ensure that real objects were recorded in the
images."

[...]

"Robert A. Hoffman, senior scientist at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md. and project scientist for both the Dynamics Explorer 1 and the Polar spacecraft missions, says that because satellite-based imagery related to the small comet theory has been interpreted in different ways, ground-based imagery is a good alternative.

"Due to the controversy surrounding the interpretation of the images from space-borne detectors taken primarily in ultraviolet wavelengths, ground-based visible observations with sufficient signal-to-noise appear to be the most practical approach to obtaining clear evidence regarding the existence of these objects. I hope more such studies will be performed," Hoffman says.

"Frank, a UI faculty member since 1964, has been an experimenter, co-investigator, or principal investigator for instruments on forty-two spacecraft. His instruments include those used to observe the Earth's auroras, as well as those used to measure energetic charged particles and thin, electrically charged gases called plasmas."

Dick Hall should note that Frank's small comet hypothesis is extremely controversial within astronomical circles. Does he really think Frank would shy away from UFO evidence if he found same?

I might add that all sorts of stuff similar to the above is going on daily around the globe, even as we speak.

You can also find the original article on The Anomalist web site at:

<http://www.anomalist.com>

Dennis Stacy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Evans

From: Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 16:24:17 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:10:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Evans

>From: Ted Toal <ttoal@jps.net>
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800
>Subject: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: Hoagland's "Tunnel"
>>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

Previously, Ted wrote:

>The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look
>at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did
>on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually
>just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular
>intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be
>common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg.
>lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

>http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

Hi, Ted!

Yes, I see what you mean in that photo. By looking at the surrounding craters, the direction of the light and shadows does indicate a valley. However, look at this photo:

<http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

Here the shadows are different. In fact, the shadows are different on both sides of the photo. On the left the light appears to be coming from the southwest as indicated by the ridges in the terrain just west of the "worm". However, on the right, the light appears to be coming from the north as indicated by the lit southern rims of the craters to the east of the "worm". Therefore, the question is, "Which light is the key light?" If the light is coming from the north, then the central feature in question is not a valley, but a tube-like structure. If, on the other hand, the light is coming from the southwest, then you are correct about it being a valley with depressions.

Do we know for a fact where the sun was for this shot?

Roger Evans

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 16:43:21 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:12:05 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Evans

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000
>Subject: The Paradox Of Ufology
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Matt wrote:

>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>porn ?

>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

Hi, Matt!

Actually, this isn't surprising. I imagine UFOs have been around as long as the world's oldest profession. The funny thing is that things don't change much after thousands of years. I'm sure many young men out there still find sex to be just a big a mystery as UFOs. In my youth, it often seemed that one might stand a better chance of being abducted by aliens than getting a date for Saturday night.

Hey! Maybe we can fund UFO research by starting UFO/porn sites! We'd never have to worry about funding again! I'd explore some of the obvious play on words that come to mind for naming these prospective sites, but EBK runs a clean ship, here. ;)

In space, no one can hear you moan....

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/06/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:58:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:15:07 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/06/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 6, 2001

**"ABOMINABLE" ESPIONAGE REPORTING
**U.S. DIPLOMATIC CABLE ON OPERATION CONDOR
**OVERT ACTION AGAINST MILOSEVIC
**NEW ADVISORY GROUP ON NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL

"ABOMINABLE" ESPIONAGE REPORTING The New York Times' disclosure on Sunday that the FBI and NSA had dug a tunnel beneath the Soviet embassy in Washington in the 1980s intrigued many readers.

But Plato Cacheris, the attorney for accused spy Robert Hansen, was not among them. He criticized the timing of the story and especially the accusation by unnamed officials that it was his client who had betrayed the tunnel's existence to the Soviets.

"I think it's abominable," Mr. Cacheris told reporters on Monday, according to a Reuters report. "You should be skeptical about that." But skepticism has been sparse.

Mr. Cacheris' complaint highlights the unresolved conflicts among the interests of journalists who are pursuing hot stories, counterintelligence officials who are hunting down foreign spies, and suspected spies who are seeking a fair trial.

"The wild card that no one could control was the New York Times," wrote Col. Stuart Herrington in the book *Traitors Among Us*, his compelling memoir of Cold War counterintelligence. He recalled a 1988 leak to Times reporter Jeff Gerth concerning one of the Army's most sensitive counterintelligence investigations that threatened to derail the whole case.

"With the security of the investigation hinging on the patriotism, fidelity, and discretion of the New York Times," Col. Herrington wrote sarcastically, "we had no choice but to wrap up the case, one way or another, ready or not." In fact, as it turned out, Mr. Gerth and the Times refrained from disclosing the case until a foreign news outlet reported it first.

On the other hand, the Times' treatment of the Wen Ho Lee case demonstrated the damage that a particular kind of aggressive journalism can do both to the interests of the accused, in that case Dr. Lee, and of the government. The Times uncritically reported allegations portraying Dr. Lee as a spy for China, thereby ruining his life in certain respects. Publication of the initial Times story about the case also forced the government's preliminary investigation of the matter to a premature conclusion, before the meaning of Dr. Lee's activities could be firmly established, or other suspects identified. But little or nothing has been learned, it seems, from the overenthusiastic reporting of the Wen Ho Lee investigation. Anonymous sources with undisclosed interests proliferate.

On the third hand, Mr. Cacheris probably overreacted to the

Soviet Embassy tunnel story, as reported by James Risen with Lowell Bergman in the March 4 New York Times.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/03/04/national/04SPY.html>

Mr. Cacheris will have every opportunity in court to challenge its relevance to Mr. Hanssen's case, so his interests are largely preserved. And as an intelligence operation, the tunnel is defunct, so no harm to intelligence can come from its disclosure. Besides, it's a great story.

Meanwhile, in a notable bit of self-restraint, the Washington Post posted the recent FBI affidavit and complaint against espionage suspect Robert Hanssen on its web site, but blacked out his home street address and social security number.

U.S. DIPLOMATIC CABLE ON OPERATION CONDOR

A newly declassified 1978 diplomatic cable "reveals that the United States facilitated communications among South American intelligence chiefs who were working together to eliminate left-wing opposition groups in their countries as part of a covert program known as Operation Condor," according to an analysis by the National Security Archive.

The cable was first reported in the New York Times on March 6. The National Security Archive has posted the declassified cable, from Ambassador Robert E. White, with related documentary materials here:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010306/>

OVERT ACTION AGAINST MILOSEVIC

Many of the pitfalls of Cold War covert action were successfully averted in the remarkably transparent U.S. campaign to depose Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic.

"From the end of the war in Kosovo until last October, when the Serbian people stormed parliament and booted out Milosevic, the Central Intelligence Agency seems to have spent its time, of all things, centralizing intelligence. That's ... one major reason why the operation to remove Milosevic worked so well," writes Nicholas Thompson in the March issue of Washington Monthly. See:

<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0103.thompson.html>

NEW ADVISORY GROUP ON NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL

The Defense Department has established a new private sector Advisory Committee for the End-to-End Review of the U.S. Nuclear Command and Control System. The command and control of nuclear weapons is perhaps the most sensitive topic in the U.S. government.

"This advisory committee will provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense ... regarding the full range of U.S. Nuclear Command and Control System (NCSS) policies, responsibilities, functions, management structures and capabilities..." according to a March 6 Notice in the Federal Register.

"The Advisory Committee will consist of a balanced membership of approximately four senior members from the private sector, appointed by the Secretary of Defense," the Federal Register Notice said.

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2001/03/fr030601.html>

For the Pentagon to solicit advice from the private sector on ultra-classified issues of nuclear command and control seems rather extraordinary.

But considering the identities of the newly appointed private sector members, it is not so much of a stretch after all. The members are Gen. (ret.) Brent Scowcroft, chair; Gen. (ret.) Michael Carnes; John Crawford, former vice president of Sandia

National Laboratories; and William Crowell, President and CEO of Cylink, Inc. Assistant Secretary of Defense Art Money and a yet unnamed Energy Department official will also serve.

The Committee is established under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, but all or most of its meetings are expected to be closed and its minutes classified, Pentagon spokesman Lt. Col. Steve Campbell told Secrecy News. The first meeting is scheduled for April 5.

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe
secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:17:16 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:18:05 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Mortellaro

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>>Hello List Members,

>>Every now and again I'll come up with something that just
>>makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those
>>days.

>>I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C.
>>Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

>>To this end, I went to:

>><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

>>and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer
>>with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most
>>notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass
>>worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside
>>the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a
>>gaseous cloud emanating from it.

>>Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred
>>magnification and see for yourself.

>>Dave (Furry)

>Hi Dave, hi All,

<snip>

>As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
>different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
>tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
>how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
>flat terrain. Those are clearly tubular structures and it
>appears to "contain" within it a really large spherical object
>of some kind. All of a sudden people are analyzing the pictures
>as if they were looking at flat ground (sand dunes) and
>completely ignoring the fact that the structure is a transparent
>pipe/tube of some kind. What's up with that? Either folks have
>downloaded the wrong images to study or they are blind. There is
>no third way about it.

>I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
>looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or
>a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures
>with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you
>don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images!
>Period.

Transparent? Yikes, how can you tell?

Did I miss a post or is it simply a very unusual and undefined thingy. What it looks like to us may confuse us into believing that it is what it appears to be. These possibilities may indeed be correct. On the other hand, they may be incorrect. It's good to play guessing games but that's all they are. Until we get there and see for ourselves or get much better images.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 16:25:16 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:24:29 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnies

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
>different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
>tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
>how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
>flat terrain.

I have to concur with John. You can clearly see the "arches"
vanishing as they're viewed through the apparently semi-opaque
"carapace." And the sperm-like object seems to be inside of
the feature, like a ball stuck in a clear plastic tube.

There are other, similar features to be found that aren't as
exotic; I made a link to them on my site (see the bottom of page
13).

One idea is that the ridges are formed by wind depositing
"ripples" in a trough of sand (in this case, the fracture
containing the "worm/tunnel"), like ripples in a cup of coffee.
Something like this might explain the less exotic ones, but it
does nothing to explain a three-dimensional "tube."

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:29:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:46:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Maccabee

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:06:36 -0500

>>(7) choose your own label

>I like Jan Aldrich's -- "critical thinker." We need much more of
>that.

>Would also be good to have a name for people who know the
>difference between what they believe and what they can prove. As
>in: "I think abductions are probably real, but I sure as hell
>don't know that's true." (My position.)

How about "rationalists" vs "irrationalists"... since skeptics
often act irrational when it comes to explaining UFO sightings.
Hahahaha

Note: years ago I discovered the garbage in some UFO
explanations widely disseminated by the "skeptics." At that
point I became **skeptical of the skeptics**

(which is almost as bad as being against motherhood, apple pie,
and, oh yes, Chevrolet)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:43:25 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:48:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Fleming

>From: Ted Toal <ttoal@jps.net>
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800
>updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian

>The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look
>at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did
>on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually
>just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular
>intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be
>common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg.
>lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

>http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

The link you provided shows something very similar to the "worm" image, and something that I think most likely is a series of dunes running through a ravine. It might be argued that this is just another worm (or tunnel or whatever) of the same sort as the first. But in this image, I notice that the regularly spaced and well-defined series of ridges running through the narrower parts of the ravines change into much less regular, less well-defined, and more randomly-oriented shapes exactly at the point where the ravine is the widest.

The reason for this might be that the wind direction is more variable in the wider sections of the ravine, so it's less likely that dunes will form there than in the narrower parts where the direction of the wind is primarily the same direction as the ravine runs. I'm still not sure that these "dunes" are really formed by the wind. If there were rivers running through these ravines at one time, perhaps they were formed by water running over the river beds. I think the biological and engineering explanations can be pretty much ruled out for both images, though.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:50:56 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Fleming

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:54:50 EST
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 12:25:21 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Your interjection of "he thinks" really is an indication that
>>you suggest that maybe Arnold didn't see what he said he saw.
>>That would be an interpretation by you of the available
>>information, not an interpretation by the witness. ==

>Oh, I don't have any doubt that Arnold thought that he saw
>something. But, since he was only human, he just might have been
>mistaken about something.

>I am not willing, though, to substitute Arnold's belief, no
>matter how sincerely held, into proof of the ETH. Apparently you
>are.

>My reason for bringing this up is not to reopen the issue of Mr.
>Arnold as a witness, but to comment on your statement that just
>because a man, 53 years ago, believed that his attention had
>been drawn to a bright flash in the sky and that he believed
>that what he saw was moving fast, you consider this enough
>evidence to prove that an alien craft of was flying around.

>I'm not willing to accept such an astounding conclusion based
>upon some guy's beliefs a half century ago, or yours now.

>Nothing personal. I'm a skeptic, you see.

Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's words into
a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 22:57:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:52:56 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Ledger

>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>Hello List Members,

>Every now and again I'll come up with something that just
>makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those
>days.

>I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C.
>Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

>To this end, I went to:

><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

>and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer
>with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most
>notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass
>worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside
>the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a
>gaseous cloud emanating from it.

>Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred
>magnification and see for yourself.

Hi Dave,

Thanks for putting this up in the fashion you did. This is the most intriguing formation-or what have you-that I've seen on Mars. There is definitely a transparent quality to it.It's certainly not sand dunes.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:58:05 -0500
Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

Hi All,

"Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", my wife said as the Frasier show ended. I must admit that comedy or not, tonight's show was one of the most cleverly written I've ever seen. Almost 'cutesy'.

The gag was; John Glenn is sitting in a sound booth at the radio station and he begins to confess about "all the stuff we saw out there" and, "we couldn't say anything about it because NASA was afraid of a 'War of the Worlds' scenario, and, "I've been an honest man all my life," or "I don't like to be part of anything deceptive"and on and on like that. The 'set-up' in the program was funny/humorous, but the lines and every word that came from Glenn's mouth were loaded for bear. Very powerful stuff even when presented in the context of a comedy show.

Ah, I'm imagining things I'm sure. Maybe this is how conspiracy nuts get started! I'll have to keep a close eye on myself to make sure I don't start listening to "Cooper video's." <LOL>

Very strange segment of Frasier. And, as 'looney' as it may sound to some out there, I think my wife's simple but honest gut level reaction to it was correct. I think (within the context of a comedy routine) we just heard astronaut and Senator John Glenn _confess_ to the American people on a prime time program. ;)

Regards,

John Velez, Just when you thought nothing could blow your mind! :)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:08:35 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:59:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 16:42:41 -0000

<snip>

>I was only using shorthand language, but let's face it: you
>pretty much tend to argue that it "can't be" because of lack of
>independent scientific support and because it doesn't--to
>you--fit with scientific theory. My position is a theory based
>on facts or empirical data. It is not, as you seem to think,
>deduced from a belief in aliens.

Dick,

Yes, you're right. I do expect that if ET visitation(s) were as prevalent as ufologists claim it is, that good old mainstream science would have its own evidence of same by now, and wouldn't need to go begging to ufologists for enlightenment. For specifics, see my response to Greg Sandow on this thread or go to:

<http://www.spacer.com/news/comet-01a.html>

I also reiterate what I said before: if most scientists are remiss for not examining the UFO data in depth, an equal number of ufologists are guilty of the same crime -- they haven't familiarized themselves either with the techniques of traditional science or its most recent findings. (Speaking of which, when do you ever reference the latter in your own UFO writings, as an ameliorating factor, if nothing else?)

I don't think your arguments are based on a belief in aliens. I do, however, think that your approach to the matter is somewhat UFO-centric, rather than the other way around.

Would like to go into that in more detail, but don't have the time right now. Can we continue later?

By the way, your comp copy of The Anomalist 5 is in the mail. Happy reading!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 00:31:54 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 11:09:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment - Ledger

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:09:16 -0000

>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 12:01:46 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Lakenheath Pre-Judgment

>You're right - infamous was the wrong word. But I had been doing
>a lot of travelling the day before and my head was hurting.

>>As well, I don't have a copy of the Condon report on this case
>>but, if I remember correctly they tagged it as an 'unknown'. Did
>>they not contact the pilot at the time or refer to documents to
>>make their assessment. Perhaps the pilot was still on active
>>duty in 1967 and unable to be interviewed.

>In short the report arrived very late during the Condon study,
>and the only information the US team had to work from was the
>USAF Controllers 12 year old memories and the Blue Book records
>on the case.

>There is no evidence that the Condon team made any effort to
>contact the RAF or British Ministry of Defence for access to
>their file on the Lakenheath case.

>Therefore the classification of "unknown" is hardly very
>reliable, as it was based upon what can only be described as a
>half-hearted, truncated investigation which only had access to
>half the data!

Hi Dave,

Thanks for the update. I had a feeling that what you
suggested - "it was based upon what can only be described as a
half-hearted, truncated investigation which only had access to
half the data!" - might have been the case.

This appears true of the Shag Harbour incident [case #34 -
unsolved]. It came in at the end of the Condon study and was not
investigated despite the number and quality of the witnesses and
referred instead to an APRO report. The latter, none-the-less, was
detailed despite its brevity.

Best,

Don

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Cydonian Imperative: 3-6-01 - Unusual White Lines

From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 20:32:56 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 11:11:48 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 3-6-01 - Unusual White Lines

3-6-01

The Cydonian Imperative

Ubiquitous Bright White Lines: What Are They?

by Mac Tonnies

Please see:

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

1.

When the first high-resolution Cydonia images arrived two years ago, one of the first "secondary" features to attract attention was the "Coathanger" (less conservatively known as the "Dolphin"). Located just south of the "Face," this formation is probably most notable for its attendant bright lines (suggestive of a "trailer park" to some due to their uniform size and regularity in spacing).

IMAGE

Note bright columns on underside of mesa and similar, but much more regular, forms beneath dolphin-shaped formation. Various other bright features in this image (such as the apparent "dome") appear to be composed of material similar to that of the lines themselves.

The nature of these lines has yet to be ascertained. While their high albedo suggests they are made of ice (or glass or metal...) there doesn't seem to be a way to explain their alignment unless they were deliberately placed there. The tantalizingly dolphin-like shape of the skinny, shallow mesa directly above has been of equal or greater interest in the online Cydonia community, as it suggests an additional terrestrial likeness gracing the now-frozen Cydonian desert.

Similar, but less regular, bright lines were quickly noted on the south side of an adjacent mesa, adding to the mystery.

2.

As more Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) images of Cydonia became available, the presence of similar anomalous bright lines became increasingly noticeable and inexplicable. After Richard Hoagland identified the much-discussed "glass tunnel" (see previous page) (a feature that prompted scientist/author Sir Arthur C. Clarke to posit the existence of some bizarre form of extant Martian life), The Enterprise Mission unveiled images of bright, closely packed cylinders Hoagland and Mike Bara (of Lunar Anomalies) interpreted as possible "pipes"--built by an ancient Martian civilization for transporting large amounts of water (a la Lowell's intricate "canals").

IMAGE

Bright, columnar features under investigation by The Enterprise

Mission.

As with the bright lines in Cydonia, the surprisingly high albedo of the hypothetical pipes indeed suggests an unusual origin. And while the hypothesis that they are pieces of a megascale engineering project has yet to be confirmed, it also cannot be dismissed out of hand.

3.

When "Mound P" (a feature studied by Hoagland as well as SPSR's Dr. Stanley McDaniel and Dr. Horace Crater) was revealed in 2001 (for the first time since it was originally reimaged in detail in 1998), similar bright, regularly spaced lines suddenly became visible on the Mound's adjacent faceted formation (see image above). Both Mound P and the strange, faceted feature boast intrinsic geometric properties wholly consistent with artificiality, including bisymmetry and apparent structure.

(For additional information on the Cydonian Mounds--and their mathematical implications--click here.)

IMAGE

Mound P shown with its satellite formation, which appears to be unusually faceted. Note the bright lines ascending the slope of its platform.

The lines ascending the faceted structure's "platform" are near-duplicates of those seen on the perimeter of the Main City Pyramid. Dr. Tom Van Flandern has suggested that these may constitute some kind of Martian "rebar" or structural matrix.

If the lines under investigation in Cydonia are a geological phenomenon (such as mineral deposits or abnormally bright dunes), it's unusual that they seem to cluster around landforms already suspected of being artificial (or at least partly artificial) structures. Their mute presence may help tell us something about the civilization that once inhabited Cydonia...assuming, of course, there ever was one.

4.

Further evidence for a non-natural explanation for the anomalous bright lines can be seen lining the elevated defile on top of the enigmatic Cliff, also reimaged in 2001 (discussed in more detail on the previous page). The Cliff's unprecedented morphology, alignment, and proximity to the Face argue powerfully for an artificial origin.

IMAGE

Notice abundant bright lines to left of ruler-straight, elevated defile. Support structure?

Perhaps it should come as no surprise to find masses of bright lines bunched against the defile's western side. The defile's noted structural appearance would tend to confirm Van Flandern's suggestion that we are viewing an intelligently emplaced structural framework.

5.

What can be made of this? Quite possibly, the lines' unusually high albedo can be explained if they are composed of glass--a material found in abundance in Mars' soil in the form of silicates.

Harvesting Martian silicates for architectural purposes is far from being a "fringe" concept. First proposed by Robert Zubrin in his eloquent book "The Case for Mars," the building-with-glass scenario was recently enacted by characters in award-winning science fiction writer and space advocate Ben Bova's "Return to Mars," in which an igloo-like greenhouse is constructed from indigenous Martian glass.

Given that glass is readily available on Mars, and that a technological civilization may have existed there in antiquity, it's also just possible that Hoagland's "glass tunnel" is in fact just that!

Continuing discoveries such as the presence of surprisingly abundant liquid water and a plethora of enigmatic surface features bolster the possibility of a former civilization on the Red Planet. In this context, the glassine (?) bright lines offer us a puzzle of truly exo-archeological magnitude.

-end-

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Furlotte

From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 23:54:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 11:13:37 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Furlotte

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>Furry, what can I say, "great minds think alike!" ;) Ok, so now
>that somebody else has noticed this feature, what do you make of
>it?

Hi John,

Didn't mean to steal your thunder there but if maybe a few more
of us start looking at this thing we might get a handle on what
it is.

>As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
>different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
>tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
>how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
>flat terrain. Those are clearly tubular structures and it
>appears to "contain" within it a really large spherical object
>of some kind. All of a sudden people are analyzing the pictures
>as if they were looking at flat ground (sand dunes) and
>completely ignoring the fact that the structure is a transparent
>pipe/tube of some kind. What's up with that? Either folks have
>downloaded the wrong images to study or they are blind. There is
>no third way about it.

>I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
>looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or
>a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures
>with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you
>don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images!
>Period.

>Regards,

>John Velez,

>I may be crazy but at least my glasses work! <LOL>

I agree with you John, I don't care how you cut it or light it,
you can't get a "glass" effect from sand dunes.

Dave (Furry)

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:01:52 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:15:34 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:10:07 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 23:19:17 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

Kevin,

>>Even without any direct contact with Bond, I believe I would
>>still have arrived at the opinions I hold today.

>Dr. Johnson's testimony is of little importance. The pictures
>are his real contribution.

Agreed.

>>>Since you,
>>>Neil, are siding with him, I will make you the one time good
>>>offer of copying all this material for you so that you can hear
>>>him say the things he denies he said, listen to him claim credit
>>>for writing the July 9 article, and see how I have tried to get

>>Siding?, that gives the wrong impression, I have tried to stay
>>impartial, and it's not my place to wade into differences that I
>>have had no personal involvement with.

>Yes, siding, but only because of the comment about "editing."
>Other than that, it seems that your efforts have been those of
>the objective researcher and not the partisan.

Thank's, I do strive to approach the subject from all angles
even if this does irritate my fellow RPIT'er from time to time.

>>But should you choose to completely set aside Bond's testimony
>>altogether, which is an exercise I've gone through, what does
>>it actually alter in the scheme of things, not a lot really.

>Clearly Dr. Johnson was in General Ramey's office. Clearly he
>took six photographs (and his telling me that he took two, later
>that he really took four, and finally identifying he took all
>six is of little real importance).

Agreed, he clearly did not recall all the details, he describes
it well as "soundbite" memories, just snippets and impressions.

>>It doesn't change the fact the photo's were taken, and what's
>>more it doesn't alter their content.

>Agreed.

<snip>

>>>>Further, we are now finding that

>>>>some of his most disputed information ie the "press conference"
>>>>_is_ receiving independent confirmation from an individual who
>>>>_was_ there reporting the news in FW at the time.

>>>If you have reporters in General Ramey's office, and they are
>>>asking him questions, then you have a press conference whether
>>>it is officially called or not.

>>>We are in an argument over
>>>semantics here that has little real importance in understanding
>>>what happened that night.

>>I guess this boils down really to an argument over scale, I
>>wouldn't say a possible couple of reporters arriving unannounced
>>out at FWAAF would constitute "press conference".

>Semantics, and really unimportant. Reporters were there and
>talked to Ramey and I think we all agree with that.

Semantics possibly and an unimportant detail maybe, but there seems to be no clear evidence in the media record to say so, as far as I'm aware the nearest we get is an AP wire datelined Fort Worth, but as I pointed out this could well have been placed on the AP wire directly from the ST teletype room, they had the facilities to do so and were in contact with FWAAF throughout that evening.

Further, I believe you yourself ran with a similar scenario back in 1990 when you wrote:

"Previous accounts of that evening in the media made it seem that Ramey talked to a number of reporters and answered several questions about the recovery. But Ramey actually held no press conference, thus preventing any serious scrutiny of the military's story. Instead, he talked with one reporter (James Bond Johnson), who also took two pictures which were later sent on the wires later that evening. Other reporters were not allowed on the base."

I'd be interested in what prompted you to reverse this position?.

<snip>

>>>>I think DuBose tended to please everybody.

>>>No, he attempted to tell the truth, as best he could remember
>>>it when not being pushed by someone with an agenda. Billy
>>>Cox, of FLORIDA TODAY reported on these facts a number
>>>of years ago, as did Don Ecker of UFO Magazine (USA).

>>In the end DuBose either said it or he didn't, and I can accept
>>he actually said both statements, and therefore contradicted
>>himself in the process. Does it nullify all his testimony?, or
>>just indicate he had very poor recall of the events. Being
>>shown the photograph's by Shandara doesn't mean to say he
>>positively ID'd the debris either, but merely it might
>>have looked like what he could recall after 40 odd years.

>My point here was that we reject the Shandera interpretation of
>the testimony because we have no reason to accept it as valid
>and Shandera has offered nothing to prove that DuBose actually
>said those things without prompting by him.

>Why do I say that? Billy Cox of 'Florida Today' reported on
>November 24, 1991 that he had interviewed DuBose. The tone of
>that interview agrees with what I have reported in the past, and
>disagrees with what Shandera claims. Additionally, in a letter
>dated September 30, 1991, Cox wrote:

>"I was aware of the recent controversy generated by the
>interview he(DuBose) had with Jaime Shandera, during which he
>stated that the display debris at Fort Worth was genuine UFO
>wreckage and not a weather balloon, as he had previously stated.
>But I chose not to complicate matters by asking him to
>illuminate what he had told Shandera; instead, I simply asked
>him, without pressure, to recall events as he remembered them...
>he seemed especially adamant about his role in the Roswell case.
>While he stated that he didn't think the debris was extra-
>terrestrial in nature (though he had no facts to support his
>opinion), he was insistent that the material that Ramey

>displayed for the press was in fact a weather balloon, and that
>he had personally transferred the real stuff in a lead-lined
>mail pouch to a courier going to Washington... I can only
>conclude that the Shandera interview was the end result of the
>confusion that might occur when someone attempts to press a
>narrow point of view upon a 90 year old man..."

>Don Ecker also had a similar experience. Shandera had attempted
>to arranged for Ecker to interview DuBose. Ecker called DuBose
>and talked to him, again getting my version (or rather the
>version that DuBose told Don Schmitt and Stan Friedman on video
>tape). When Ecker reported that to Shandera, Shandera said to
>wait. Shandera then called DuBose, talked to him and then called
>Ecker back, saying, "Now call him." DuBose then offered the new
>version. Of course, left alone to speak naturally, DuBose said
>that the debris was a weather balloon brought in for the purpose
>of showing reporters wreckage.

>So, my point again, is that we ignore the Shandera version
>because there is good reason to reject it. We have Shandera's
>spin, wanting it to be one thing, and attempting to enforce that
>one thing, when it is really something else.

Kevin, but should we write off Shandera?, I'm afraid I don't
have the Ecker interview but can we look at the above info in
the Cox letter and say, the DuBose affidavitt, which I do have
and I have seen the video testimony. I'm not going to go into
fine detail but merely look at the basic story that DuBose tells
and it's content.

Both give similar details, DuBose receives a call from McMullen
as what they(FWAAF) know about the object recovered at Roswell.
DuBose claims he phones Blanchard and has him send the debris in
a sealed container to him, he informs McMullen of the action.
The plane arrives from Roswell and Al Clark is charged with
taking the "sealed mail pouch" directly on to Washington for
ultimate investigation by AMC at Wright Field.

The problem I have is that this is patently not the Marcel
debris transfer, multiple witnesses state the debris was paper
wrapped or contained in cardboard boxes, not a mail pouch.
Where are Marcel and Payne-Jennings in DuBose's story?, and
where is Ramey asking for a sample of the debris to view?,
further minor detail, witnesses say it was a B29 not a B26
that brought Marcel, Jennings and the debris to Fort Worth.

If DuBose claimed this was the debris all the fuss was about
when it blatantly isn't, why should we think he was any more
"open" about the other details in his accompanying testimony?.

I said in an earlier post I thought DuBose pleased everybody,
I'm sure he did want to help, and I've no proof of this, but I
feel he still felt honour bound to reveal as little as he could
get away with, hence the story he ran with was possibly only
that of the transfer of the Mack Brazell debris samples brought
into town when Mack first reported the find, rather than the
events of the Marcel flight which we have recounted from other
witnesses, and attested to with the FW pictures.

When Shandera first interviewed DuBose and he was questioned
about the photographs he flatly denied any had been taken. But
the photographs were taken and he was on them, his own
"cover story" was now literally seen to be compromised. Did he
come clean?, he had the opportunity here to dismiss the debris
in photographs as "the switch", he didn't, in fact his reply
totally refutes any switch took place and he then goes on to
attests to the debris in the photographs being some of the
debris brought from Roswell.

How can interviews which obviously do not relate to the
coroborated story as given by mutiple witnesses be thought of as
having greater worth than an interview that tracks the known
events?. Granted Shandera did not record these interviews on
tape, more's the pity, but this I feel is not sufficient
objection to have them dismissed, other researchers such as Bill
Moore only kept written records of their interviews yet his
early information is drawn on widely and as far as I, and
other's know, witnesses such as Marcel never claimed he had been
misquoted by Moore, and Marcel had a copy of Moore's book and
had read his contribution.

<snip>

>>>We have a great deal of information that has been spun here. We
>>>have evidence to support my claims including the audio tapes
>>>and letters. If Dr. Johnson wants to believe today that he was
>>>the only reporter there, ever,

>>The fact Bond's story has changed over time I accept and don't
>>have a problem with, it hasn't had an impact on the research
>>I've personally been engaged in. As I've said, set aside Bond's
>>testimony totally and what difference does it make to what we
>>know of events that night?. Most of the information we have to
>>work with comes from sources other than Bond.

>>Bond Johnson's unique contribution to the Roswell story is not
>>his verbal testimony interesting though it is, but the legacy of
>>the photographs he took that afternoon.

>And I would agree with this. His contribution of the
>photographs, along with the printed newspaper stories and other
>documentation is of great importance. His testimony has gotten
>progressively more interesting, but it is in direct conflict
>with what he said originally. There is no way for both versions
>to be correct, and my problem is that I catch the blame for his
>alteration of the facts.

I look forward to the material.

>>>that he saw the real debris, and
>>>Ramey didn't know what it was when he was there, I don't care.

>>I could "selectively" quote DuBose at this point, but I won't, I
>>could selectively quote Marcel but I won't, what I will do
>>though is repeat that quote from Maj Kirton who is giving a
>>statement from Gen Ramey to Reuters, this, some time before
>>5.30pm that afternoon.

>And if you did "selectively" quote either DuBose or Marcel, I
>would be forced to explain why there is justification in
>rejecting those quotes. The reason is simple. They are the
>interpretations of those reporting them and not what the men
>said themselves.

Kevin, Shanders's interview uses literal text quotes, do you
feel these were not said as reported or misinterpreted?, even
if not verbatim they still imply a very different set of
events.

Neil.

```
--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris.      /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs.   1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St.    0
Manchester.       1
M13.9PL. UK.     \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/
```

Radio Callsign G8KOQ
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

```
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
```

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:17:50 -0500
Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

SOURCE: EFE Newsagency (Spain)
DATE: 03/06/2001 23:49:53

LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico, March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60 kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that "fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December 1994, according to local media.

The lights were seen last night over the Popocatepetl and tens of residents from adjacent communities called radio stations to make this known, according to the "Buenos Dias" program broadcast on the ACIR network out of Puebla, 125 kilometers east of Mexico City.

According to reports received by Puebla stations, the alleged sightings could be seen particularly from an area near the volcano, well-known for its accumulations of energy which interfere with the proper operation of compasses.

Eyewitness Guadalupe Carriillo told a local station that the lights "had movement, passed over the volcano, turned around and rotated."

A resident of San Francisco Totimihuacan pointed out that one of the lights remained fixed in the sky while another spun around it. Another person claimed to have captured it all on videotape and made it available to the public.

Popocatepetl, with an elevation of 5,452 meters, is one of the places in Mexico where there is talk of suspicious lights or unidentified flying objects (UFOs), although the number of accounts has increased since it entered its eruptive phase in December 1994.

EFE

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special Thanks to Gloria R. Coluchi

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 01:26:07 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:19:42 -0500
Subject: Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident - Hatch

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident
>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 17:00:01 -0600

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: Toronto List <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Date: Sat, 03 Mar 2001 04:36:43 -0800
>>Subject: 1949 Camp Hood, Texas Incident

><snip>

>>No beer? In West Texas?

>>I find the account entirely credible regardless. I see no
>>men-in-black here, no MJ-12 ruling the world; just some awful
>>beast ruling the roost.

>>Credits and kudos go to Loren and Jan et. al. for finding room
>>for this welcome chuckle, especially Loren.

>>Very best wishes

>>- Larry (single, fat dumb and happy) Hatch.

>Larry,

>I'm always available to set straight any misconceptions about
>the Great Lone Star state!

>To begin with, Camp (now Fort) Hood is outside Killeen in
>Central, not West, Texas. Texas at the time was a predominantly
>Southern Baptist state and great swathes of it were dry, meaning
>no public sales of alcohol. Last time the wife and me were in
>San Angelo, which is in West Texas, it was still dry, although I
>think you could order drinks in restaurants and hotel bars.

>Today, the largest area of contiguous counties in the US still
>dry is to be found in the Panhandle of Texas.

>This could well explain why I haven't personally looked into the
>Levelland case any more than I have.

Hello Dennis!

Yes, I stand corrected on that one. I should have looked on a
map, maybe I was thinking of Fort Bliss (what a name) or
something.

Some other states have a similar affliction.

Around 1985 I was driving West from Missouri into Kansas I
believe. There was a big sign, well lit, warning passers-by "150
(or 250?) Miles of Dry Counties Ahead!" This was atop an equally
well lit up liquor store.

I stopped in just out of curiosity.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 04:18:58 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:21:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Hatch

>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 05:34:19 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies

>Maybe someone can shed some light on these matters:

>1) There are several historical UFO reports involving the
>finding of a jelly-like substance as a result. These are the
>dates of the incidents known to me:

>1718 (East Indies)
>1803 (Silesia)
>1811 (Heidelberg)
>1819 (Massachusetts)
>1846 (New York)
>1958 (Ireland)

>In most cases the objects look like comets falling to earth and
>the jelly is found where the impact crater would normally be
>(but usually isn't).

>Are there any other cases to add to the list? Is there a
>scientific explanation for these events?

>2) In 1655 a businessman mysteriously turned up in Portugal and
>was taken before the Catholic Inquisition. The man claimed he
>had been standing outside his office in Goa, a Portuguese
>territory in India, when he was suddenly taken through the air
>and transported to Portugal. The Inquisition decided he had to
>be a witch, so he was burnt at the stake.

>This tale appears in a UFO book with no bibliographical
>reference. Does anyone know it's origin?

>3) Another teleportation is said to have taken place in
>Selangor, Malaysia, on August 5th 1970. Somebody was transported
>140 miles, but I haven't found a complete or even partial
>report. It could be an interesting story...

>Chris Aubeck

>P.S. I am experimenting with different E-mail addresses to see
>which ones don't mess my postings up, but I will check all my
>addresses regularly.

Hello Chris:

I don't have anything about your list of cases at the top;
either I missed them or passed on them.

I do have the following listings which might pertain
however:

1973/07/01 0200h 27:08E 62:37N 3333 WEU SCN FNL
SUONENJOKI,FINL:1 OBS:BUZZ:BLOB/JELLY GLOWS OVR LAKE:
POSS.FIGURE INSIDE:3+hurs/MST
APRO BULLETIN for November 1979.

1995/10/05 2350h 71:18W 41:10S 3333 SAM ARG RNG
S.CARLOS de BARILOCHE,ARG:SCR ON 15min/VIDEO:PORTS:
SLO SPIN:ODD JELLY HARDENS
U FOOTNOTES: #15 (Press Ctrl-R for reference)

1996/11/03 2000h? 147:24E 42:30S 3332 OCN AUS TSM
KEMPTON,TASMANIA:GRN METEOR NE>>SW:WHT SLIME found
all around the next day. Jellyfish slime?
UFO ROUNDUP. Joseph Trainor Vol.1 #37

I wouldn't take any of these too seriously without some more
study of course.

Best!

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 14:46:47 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:23:25 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:25:56 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>>Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists
>>about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO
>>partisans (pro and con)?

>>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>>ALL of you!

>I was wondering, who first brought this to light on UpDates? And
>for what purpose, if debate wasn't the main one?

Roy,

Finger-pointing and name-calling is not debate. What is being
"debated" here is who is the bigger liar or distorter of
information. I doubt that's the purpose of this List.

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 15:06:50 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:25:54 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:05:27 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 17:07:34 -0000

>Dick,

>>Your depiction of NICAP's pre-judgment of the Condon report is
>>entirely accurate, and we were strongly criticized for what we
>>said at the time. As you note, we proved to be correct. However,
>>there was a lot more at stake in that instance; namely, the
>>entire future of scientific attention to UFOs. Here we are faced
>>with re-investigation of one case, which you think is
>>compromised by their handling of it. You go so far as to
>>question their integrity, which I do not. They can be honestly
>>mistaken.

>You are, of course, entirely right. I am sure that the
>investigators are honest and well-intentioned, and if I implied
>otherwise, I apologize. The reality is, however, that all of us
>have biases, including those of us who possess integrity. What
>all of us need to do is to be sensitive to those biases and to
>act accordingly. My concern was, and is, that there was a fair
>degree of insensitivity in evidence in some of the postings from
>that quarter.

Jerry,

A very graceful statement, with which I agree 100%

>I hope this will be the last I have to say on this overworked
>subject. I look forward to reading the report when it is
>available. I am sure it will be extremely interesting and, if
>we're lucky, a genuine contribution to our understanding.

Let the process proceed! We are all fully alerted to the
report's planned general content, and I certainly have my
benchmarks for evaluating it.

My only bias or preconception in this case is my very high
regard for the work of Jim McDonald, but none of us is right all
the time and he could have overlooked something or not had
complete information. He, too, could have been honestly
mistaken. At the moment I am skeptical about that.

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:04:41 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:27:24 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:13:41 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

Dennis wrote:

>>Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s, 60s or 70s.
>>The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have
>>never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are
>>now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence
>>relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of
>>anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I
>>mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The
>>evidence should be there, pure and simple.

Brad responded:

>What kinds of scientific instrument "surveys and monitoring" are
>you talking about? Is this the observatory fallacy which
>imagines that telescopes monitor 100% of the sky 24/7?

>The Condon Report has already dealt with the severe limitations
>of such scientific instruments and the built-in filtering that
>pays attention only to the phenomena under investigation and
>which ignores UFO's (CR pp. 761-804). Instead of reinventing the
>wheel we should examine the literature on this subject.

Brad, Dennis, List:

Has any UFO proponent ever reviewed the more than 20 years of
photographs taken by the meteor all-sky networks? If so, why
not? These networks recorded moving bright objects down to 4
magnitude (about the limit of visible stars in suburban skies).
At one time these networks patrolled 400,000 square miles of the
Great Plains of the U.S. and Canada.

I would think that this data would be some of the most valuable
data available to investigators. I'm not sure where I say this,
but Hynek checked into this stuff and came up empty.

And what about one "unfiltered" such survey conducted by Condon
investigators with the express purpose of substantiating UFO
sightings - Condon's Case 27, the 1967 Harrisburg UFO Flap? An
all-sky meteor camera took pictures over a 17-day period
including during 100 UFO sightings reported to a phone hotline
at Olmstead Air Force Base. Only two interesting images were
recorded, one was probably a plane and the other a meteor. For
more on this, please see Condon -

<http://www.ncas.org/condon/text/case27.htm>

or my previous post on my investigation -

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/nov/m03-018.shtml>)

<snip>

Brad continued, later:

>The Condon Committee's analysis indicates that existing scientific
>observation systems would not likely pick up or pay attention to
>UFOs unless a program was devised to specially focus upon doing
>so (CR pp. 761-804).

But he conveniently ignored the Committee's effort to create and operated such a system, with negative results.

>For some odd, unfathomable reason, a lot of ufologists out there
>still seem to think that all scientific instrumentation has to
>first pass through an MJ-12 cover up filter before it reaches
>the scientists involved in the actual instrumentation. Or, more
>sinisterly, afterwards.

Which gets me back to the question, why haven't UFO proponents gone after these decades of pictures of the night sky? Are they afraid of what they might not find?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:33:08 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:29:21 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Urology
>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 20:27:09 -0000

>>From: Matt Hurlled <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>To: "UFO Updates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: The Paradox Of Urology
>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Urology is
>>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>>Internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>>porn?

>>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>>Just a thought

>Thanks for your observation. I hope it has more to do with
>something other than a shared obscenity of content. The majority
>(probably large majority) of UFO sites contain strong evidence
>of uncritical thinking and include mounds of garbage,
>unfortunately. I fear that more often than not they contain
>sociological data about human beings rather than serious or
>useful information about the UFO phenomenon.

Hi, Dick, Matt, List:

This brings to mind the tiresome repetition of Nocturnal Light reports, sans times, directions and sometimes even dates, which are so often posted far and wide.

The late Donald Menzel used to talk of Saucer Addicts. I'm afraid that much of what seems to pass for investigative activity is only masturbatory in nature.

Present company excepted, of course!

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Leakers - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:45:14 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:30:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:52:58 EST
>Subject: Re: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>With all due respect here, recently it has been reported in the
>press (Wash Post Feb. 17) "the only government official ever
>convicted of leaking classified information to the media" was
>Samuel Morison then of NISC, for leaking three spy satellite
>photos, and who was just pardoned by the outgoing President
>Clinton. (The case against Daniel Ellsberg was dismissed in 1973
>because of government misconduct in breaking into his
>psychiatrist's office.)

Brad,

Thanks for providing this information. I've been wondering about
this seeming paradox for years. There is one caveat, though, and
that is the legal/constitutional problem of the leak being made
to The Press.

I wonder if there have ever been prosecutions for leaking
classified UFO vs. other data to private individuals? This could
extend to loss of security clearances, jobs or promotions or
demotions. The question being, does the Government ever enforce
secrecy oaths? I'll bet that it does.

>To this I must add that in UFO history, one person was nearly
>prosecuted for leaking comments to the press with allegedly
>classified information about instrumented tracking data that
>would reveal speed-size-altitude data on UFOs that had been
>obtained at White Sands in 1950, and that was Dr. Anthony O.
>Mirarchi of USAF Cambridge Research Labs. Mirarchi was subjected
>to a vicious and uncalled-for AFOSI investigation and attempted
>referral to the FBI and Justice Dept for prosecution in 1951-3,
>a two-year-long persecution that was not stopped until Gen
>Garland called a halt to it.

>His crime was in speaking out to the press in Feb 1951 to rebut
>the Urner Liddel Skyhooks-cause-all-UFOs nonsense and he
>stumbled out something that was highly sensitive and hit a raw
>nerve and had been majorly covered up and lied about -- the
>existence of UFO tracking data.

And also the performance data of the missiles being tracked?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:44:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:32:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Sandow

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 19:29:36 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Would also be good to have a name for people who know the
>>difference between what they believe and what they
>can prove. As
>>in: "I think abductions are probably real, but I
>sure as hell
>>don't know that's true." (My position.)

>How about "rationalists" vs "irrationalists"... since skeptics
>often act irrational when it comes to explaining UFO
>sightings.
>Hahahaha

This would be heaven, for serious debate -- if people were simply known for being rational or irrational (for making sense, or not), whatever their position. Unfortunately, in ufology as elsewhere, people clump together when they share a point of view, accepting nonsense from those who agree with them and getting angry at it when it comes from their opponents.

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:33:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:54:50 EST
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's words into
>a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

Lan:

Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
testimony or not?

Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
ETH, based upon belief or not?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 17:13:20 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:35:41 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 10:59:39 -0500

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:08:35 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 16:42:41 -0000

><snip>

>>I was only using shorthand language, but let's face it: you
>>pretty much tend to argue that it "can't be" because of lack of
>>independent scientific support and because it doesn't--to
>>you--fit with scientific theory. My position is a theory based
>>on facts or empirical data. It is not, as you seem to think,
>>deduced from a belief in aliens.

>Dick,

>Yes, you're right. I do expect that if ET visitation(s) were as
>prevalent as ufologists claim it is, that good old mainstream
>science would have its own evidence of same by now, and wouldn't
>need to go begging to ufologists for enlightenment. For
>specifics, see my response to Greg Sandow on this thread or go
>to:

Dennis, I did read your reply to Greg Sandow. Just how prevalent do "ufologists claim it is" and who are you including in "ufologist?" I already observed that after screening out the junk there are not really that many "TRUFO" reports. You still are overlooking or ignoring the obvious (to most of us) ridicule factor that causes scientists to recoil from any "taint" by the UFO subject (somehow Jill Tarter comes to mind). And the small comet scientist you cited no doubt would be among the recoilers since he already is advocating something unpopular among his colleagues. (Somehow the SETI people come to mind too.) The last courageous scientist I knew was Jim McDonald.

>I also reiterate what I said before: if most scientists are
>remiss for not examining the UFO data in depth, an equal number
>of ufologists are guilty of the same crime -- they haven't
>familiarized themselves either with the techniques of
>traditional science or its most recent findings.

Here you go again! As someone else noted, you always seem to cite the weakest links among ufologists as if their ignorance or weird posturings have some bearing on the central issues. Can we trade one ignorant ufologist for one ignorant scientist? But seriously, just what do you think this argument proves?

>(Speaking of which, when do you ever reference the latter in your
>own UFO writings, as an ameliorating factor, if nothing else?)

I have two responses to this: (1) You need to re-read The UFO Evidence (1964) and other of my writings where various natural phenomena are discussed plus my fairly extensive writings about scientific method; (2) your concept and mine about what in scientific findings is relevant and ought to be cited probably are, I suspect, very different.

>I don't think your arguments are based on a belief in aliens. I
>do, however, think that your approach to the matter is somewhat
>UFO-centric, rather than the other way around.

What is the other way around? "Science-centric?" Are you suggesting that since scientists debunk UFOs I should bow and scrape in their direction? Or because in your view science leaves no room for real UFOs I should stop disputing what I believe to be mistaken science?

>Would like to go into that in more detail, but don't have the
>time right now. Can we continue later?

Please do; I'd be very interested.

>By the way, your comp copy of The Anomalist 5 is in the mail.
>Happy reading!

Good. I look forward to reading it and promise to comment.

Dick

P.S. I noticed that you spelled fantastic as "fantatic" in one of your postings. (:

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 09:23:09 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:37:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Tonnies

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:21:37 EST
>Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>This is similar to the classic problem of viewing crater on the
>Moon. When the light is seen coming from the upper left they
>look "normal". When the light comes from the right they often
>look like mounds, instead. This is why the convention for photo
>atlases of the Moon is to have the light from the left. Try
>rotating any decently shadowed crater image and you can notice
>this.

I'm not sure it is this simple. The bright "arches" appear to conform to what would be expected of actual curving features occluded by a semi-opaque "carapace." The sand dune theory is tempting, but doesn't explain what we are seeing, regardless of lighting angle.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 13:53:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:39:56 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

Ladies & Gents,

Just to make sure that we're all on the same page here, I have posted a temporary webpage (it will be down on 3/ 8) which has the images I have been talking about. Please go to:

<http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/worm/worm.html>

Kindly note that:

1. One of the "arches" goes over the spherical object. Please take careful note of the direction of the "arches." They go 'over' the tube, definitely not 'under' it.
2. The 'worms' are, (unless you only have one eye) three dimensional/tubular structures. Not flat, or 'dune-like' by any stretch of the imagination.
3. The "trail" behind the sphere that both Dave Furlotte and myself have pointed out is clearly visible without further magnification required.

Now that we're all looking at the same image, do you still think you're looking at run of the mill, flat sand dunes and not tube shaped structures?

If so, my wife works for Helen Keller Industries for the Blind. I can get you an appointment with one of their best eye specialists. <LOL>

Enjoy. Damn this is fun! ;)

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 13:37:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:42:44 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:13:41 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

<snip>

>And see, here you seem to have some model of ET behavior in
>mind, a "scenario" of ET activity. What is that scenario? I'm
>not trying to put you on the spot nor do I expect an instant
>answer but just the start of a dialogue on what I consider to be
>the crucial issue. This is what we should be discussing and
>refining. The scenarios of ET activity. Forget all the personal
>he-said-she-said argument. Let's get down to specific models of
>alien activity and discuss the UFO evidence in relation to them.
>I already proposed a way to deal with this methodologically
>speaking. See my posts on UFO UpDates:

><http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/dec/m05-008.shtml>

><http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/dec/m07-009.shtml>

Hi, Brad,

I'll burn some more brain cells on this when I have time. One scenario that I've already mentioned has nothing to do with ET intentions and that's a simple accident that couldn't be covered up. One can think of any number of contingency scenarios: saucer lands in desert outside Socorro and crew can't get the motor started again, saucer crashes in downtown Cincinnati, and so on. I'm not being facetious, either.

Jim Deardorff's model of ET activity and intentions is as good as any, if one is into that sort of thing.

I guess I just don't see the sort of possible productivity gains in such an approach as you do, because it's largely philosophical and speculative. Most people don't realize that you could write an entire book on one simple question: Why do UFOs have lights at all?

After having written such a book, however, you'd be right back where you started, with no particular body of evidence in favor of one argument over another. Or maybe I've simply misread your point about ET behavior?

>>Science today is not the science of the 1940s, 50s, 60s or 70s.
>>The planet, its atmosphere, and near and distant space have
>>never been so surveyed and monitored by instruments as they are
>>now. So when I say science should by now have its own evidence
>>relevant to extraterrestrial visitation, irrespective of
>>anything that might be referred to as ufological evidence, I
>>mean exactly what I say, nothing more, nothing less. The

>>evidence should be there, pure and simple.

>What kinds of scientific instrument "surveys and monitoring" are
>you talking about? Is this the observatory fallacy which
>imagines that telescopes monitor 100% of the sky 24/7?

I hope not! I've already posted one example here a couple of times, but here it is again:

<http://www.spacer.com/news/comet-01a.html>

>The Condon Report has already dealt with the severe limitations
>of such scientific instruments and the built-in filtering that
>pays attention only to the phenomena under investigation and
>which ignores UFO's (CR pp. 761-804). Instead of reinventing the
>wheel we should examine the literature on this subject.

Yes, and like I said, the Condon Report is now, what, 32 years old? The world has changed a lot in 32 years. Another example is the SETI approach itself. Not looking for actual UFOs, of course, but if it ever succeeds the case for UFOs as physical spaceships will obviously be boosted. Interestingly, SETI seems to be one of ufology's favorite whipping boys. I wonder how many ufologists have signed up for SETI at home, which lets you process some of their data packets on your personal PC? I'm guilty, too, but I'm about to sign up -- just for the heckuva it. Why not?

>And despite the filtering bias against investigating UFO's
>caught on scientific instruments they are still caught and
>investigated. The Condon Committee has already uncovered one
>instance where the UFO (or "UBO") was caught on a scientific
>instrument predating the Condon Project, an airglow scanning
>photometer at Mt. Haleakala Observatory, Hawaii, Feb 11-12,
>1966, which had been ignored by the scientists operating the
>system (CR pp. 762, 777-781). I recall Vallee's diaries tell of
>an incident at Paris Observatory in 1961 where French
>astronomers deliberately destroyed a data tape recording a UFO
>that had been registered during satellite tracking observations
>-- an event that IIRC so shook up Vallee that it turned him
>towards his historic role in the history of the UFO. Hynek
>reports that in Aug 1968 at the annual meeting of the American
>Astronomical Society, convened in Victoria, B.C., UFO's were
>reported outside but not one single astronomer of the several
>hundred in attendance would go outside to investigate. (UFO Exp.
>ch. 1) Robert M. L. Baker testified to the House Science &
>Astronautics Subcommittee in 1968 that NORAD radar systems
>routinely discarded uncorrelated targets (UCT's) that didn't
>match known ballistic / orbital trajectories and therefore could
>be discarding UFO event records.

I'm not sure that routinely discarded is the operative description nowadays. A few years back, NORAD let a team of University of Arizona astronomers thumb through some of their data as a means of determining how many large meteorites impact the Earth's atmosphere each year. They published a book about it, but I can't remember the title at the moment.

Besides, if UFOs actually represented alien spacecraft, one would think that NORAD would simply program their parameters into their computers. Seems like UFOs would be worth tracking to me.

<snip>

>I've seen the evasive tactics you're talking about, the
>bait-and-switch. That's why I am trying to focus on objectively
>screening the best scientific UFO evidence for presentation
>sometime in the not-too-distant future, hopefully.

Needless to say, I wish you well in this endeavor!

Dennis

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Leakers - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 13:41:05 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:44:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers - Fleming

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:11:11 EST
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Leakers - Young

>It sure would show that something was probably being leaked.
>Under your theory, the most important military and defense
>secrets would never be protected by prosecutions because this
>would give the game away. Only minor infractions would be
>prosecuted.

Such prosecutions don't give the game away at all. If someone is prosecuted for stealing a secret that has something to do with a nuclear weapon or missile, the prosecutors will say so in the list of charges, but of course won't describe the contents of the stolen documents in detail. That would be giving the game away. But the existence of nuclear weapons and missiles isn't the secret; how to build them is.

If the secret, however, were that the government has been covering up some knowledge of ETs (or anything else, for that matter), the prosecution itself would be proof that the leaker was telling the truth. That would put the prosecutors in something of a bind, don't you think? What do you suppose the published charges could be against someone accused of revealing that the government has classified information about ETs?

>This is a problem with "perfect" conspiracy theories, if there
>is no evidence for them, this in itself can be proof of the
>conspiracy.

You've got it backwards. Your claim seemed to be that the failure of the government to prosecute UFO leakers was evidence that the leakers' allegations were false. The lack of prosecutions tells nothing one way or the other about whether the government has highly classified information on ETs. If someone were prosecuted for such a leak, it would certainly be proof that whatever official brought the case to trial wasn't the sharpest tool in the shed.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:25:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:47:43 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 23:54:37 -0500

>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>>Furry, what can I say, "great minds think alike!" ;) Ok, so now
>>that somebody else has noticed this feature, what do you make of
>>it?

>>Didn't mean to steal your thunder there but if maybe a few more
>>of us start looking at this thing we might get a handle on what
>>it is.

>>As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
>>different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
>>tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
>>how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
>>flat terrain. Those are clearly tubular structures and it
>>appears to "contain" within it a really large spherical object
>>of some kind. All of a sudden people are analyzing the pictures
>>as if they were looking at flat ground (sand dunes) and
>>completely ignoring the fact that the structure is a transparent
>>pipe/tube of some kind. What's up with that? Either folks have
>>downloaded the wrong images to study or they are blind. There is
>>no third way about it.

>>I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
>>looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or
>>a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures
>>with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you
>>don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images!
>>Period.

>>Regards,

>>John Velez,

>>I may be crazy but at least my glasses work! <LOL>

>>I agree with you John, I don't care how you cut it or light it,
>>you can't get a "glass" effect from sand dunes.

Hiya Furry,

I've put up a webpage for a day (I don't want to or intend to
step on anybody's copyrights) so that we can be sure that we're
all discussing the 'same' images. I have a feeling that some
folks are looking at photos of 'other' features on Mars. They're
-tubular- Furry, your eyes aren't deceiving you. I hope that

once everybody has checked out the pix we are talking about, and we have more eyes on them, we may get an idea about what we're seeing here. "Dunes" they ain't. All of those "arches" go up and over the 'tunnel/worm' thingy, not under it. Let's see if some tunes change after everybody has had a chance to check them out carefully.

Step right up, one day only!

<http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/worm/worm.html>

Please post responses to the List.

Regards to all, talk to you on SDI Furry, ;)

John Velez,

"Tubes" says I, not flat dunes!

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Carter, Rose & UFOs?

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:23:32 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:51:35 -0500
Subject: Carter, Rose & UFOs?

Hello List,

Charlie Rose Show, PBS, Tuesday, March 6, 2001: 30-minute interview with Chris Carter, creator of X-Files on Fox Network.

X-Files needs no introduction. They are in their 8th Season, 180+ hours.

During the 30-minute interview of Chris Carter, the following words were never pronounced:

UFO
Flying saucer
Aliens
Extra-Terrestrial
Abduction
Secrecy,
etc.

Mr. Carter, a highly intelligent man, was never asked where he got all his ideas, nor if he believed all this stuff.

There was no mention whatsoever of the show's main trend.

Charlie Rose achieved the tour de force of presenting extracts of scenes from the X-Files without - a first - placing them in context! Of course, Charlie would probably have choked with:

"In this scene, Agent Doggett, Agent Scully's new partner, meets in a restaurant with Skinner - their boss - and Scully. Scully fears she his bearing an extra-terrestrial hybrid child, but doesn't want to tell Dogget. Roll tape....."

Talking to Chris Carter with no mention of UFOs is like interviewing the Pope with no mention of religion or Joe Damato without no mention of sex.

Censorship at its best: this was deliberate avoidance of the subject of UFOs on mainstream serious informative TV.

Aside from being a confounding experience for me, the implications are a little frightening.

Best,

Serge

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

From: Daniel D. Moroff <smoothie7@home.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:05:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:54:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?!

>Hi All,

>"Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", my
>wife said as the Frasier show ended. I must admit that comedy or
>not, tonight's show was one of the most cleverly written I've
>ever seen. Almost 'cutesy'.

>The gag was; John Glenn is sitting in a sound booth at the radio
>station and he begins to confess about "all the stuff we saw out
>there" and, "we couldn't say anything about it because NASA was
>afraid of a 'War of the Worlds' scenario, and, "I've been an
>honest man all my life," or "I don't like to be part of anything
>deceptive"and on and on like that. The 'set-up' in the program
>was funny/humorous, but the lines and every word that came from
>Glenn's mouth were loaded for bear. Very powerful stuff even
>when presented in the context of a comedy show.

>Ah, I'm imagining things I'm sure. Maybe this is how conspiracy
>nuts get started! I'll have to keep a close eye on myself to
>make sure I don't start listening to "Cooper video's." <LOL>

>Very strange segment of Frasier. And, as 'looney' as it may
>sound to some out there, I think my wife's simple but honest gut
>level reaction to it was correct. I think (within the context of
>a comedy routine) we just heard astronaut and Senator John Glenn
>_confess_ to the American people on a prime time program. ;)

Was listening to the Art Bell show last night. His guest was
Richard C. Hoagland.

Mr. Hoagland made much the same point when referring to that
particular show. Perhaps, Errol might just want Richard Hoagland
to come on his show shortly to follow up.

Dan

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:53:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:56:37 -0500
Subject: Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach

I have found the discussions about methodology and communication on this List so stimulating that I have written a short article outlining my ideas for "Conceptualizing UFOs".

It discusses the labeling or name-calling issues, suggests some definitions, indicates the central scientific questions, and proposes broad hypotheses that hopefully everyone could agree on for studying the UFO phenomenon, be they Doubters or Proponents.

Now I'm offering this article free to anyone who wishes to post it on their web site. Of course, you don't have to agree with everything in it and should feel free to add whatever commentary you like. It is intended to encourage discussion, not to present Commandments carved in stone. The only proviso is that you must agree to present the article in full, without any editorial changes.

The article is two U.S. pages, single-spaced in 11-point type. The format is Microsoft Word (6.0 or 7.0, I forget which). I will send it as an e-mail attachment to anyone who requests it and agrees to reproduce it in full.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:14:21 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 17:33:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>testimony or not?

>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>ETH, based upon belief or not?

Bob,

With all due respect, when and where did Bruce Maccabee ever say
that Arnold's testimony alone proves the ETH?

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

UFOs in 1917 and 1904

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 17:18:34 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 17:35:34 -0500
Subject: UFOs in 1917 and 1904

Hello everyone,

Does anyone know about the following items?

1) I came across a report titled "German Fighter Ace Red Baron Shot Down a UFO in 1917." It is obviously fake, but before it gets sucked into the giddy vortex of unufology and popular belief maybe someone can tell me who invented it and when. The report says that 105-year-old Peter Waitzrik watched the Red Baron shoot down a saucer piloted by little bald-headed humanoids.

2) A Romanian case of the year 1904 describes a farmer's encounter with a fiery wheel which descended from the sky. The wheel then became a humanoid entity. I know precious little else about this incident, except that it was published by Lucian Belaga in an article in "Hronicul si Cîntecul Vîrstelor" in 1965. This reference means nothing to me. Can anyone out there fill me in?

Chris Aubeck

C/ Jose del Prado Palacio 3, 1°C,
28030 Madrid.
Tel: 914 390 196

No less in worth the orbs on high Which still the sun doth
glorify, As near and far they ever roam round. They warm
themselves amidst her rays, Despite the changes in their ways;
How could no creatures there be found? How could alone our
planet be, Abode for beast and humanity?

Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-1755)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmberg

From: **Alfred Lehmberg** <Lehmberg@snowhill.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 16:22:08 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 17:39:26 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmberg

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:33:08 EST
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Urology
>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 20:27:09 -0000

>>>From: Matt Hurlled <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>>To: "UFO Updates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>>>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>>>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>>>Internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>>>porn?

>>>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>>>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>>>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>>>Just a thought

>>Thanks for your observation. I hope it has more to do with
>>something other than a shared obscenity of content.

Hey! Anyone think they know what obscenity is? Is it the same stuff that causes prurient thought while having no artistic or educational value, like the US supreme court said? But doesn't that sound like every American TV commercial you've ever seen? Sex is kept dirty in this country. And you know what? So are UFOs.

>>The majority
>>(probably large majority) of UFO sites contain strong evidence
>>of uncritical thinking and include mounds of garbage,
>>unfortunately. I fear that more often than not they contain
>>sociological data about human beings rather than serious or
>>useful information about the UFO phenomenon.

Which is almost the same thing on another level, but you haven't taken into account why they might have less 'useful' or 'serious' information (or how you can feel so comfortable pronouncing on it, BTW). I see a lot of easy smugness in your communication. The sociological data you suggest might be gathered would yield a trove of unsettling information on the mechanics of their ignorance, wouldn't you agree? And coming (no pun intended) number two after porn only means that it is important to a lot of people, reflects theirs thoughts and fears, and accurately paints their justified suspicions. They're interested despite the ridicule so quickly shoveled on it. Be not smug. There's not a whole lot of difference between the ignorance you allude to and the knowledge of anyone else. This kind of talk is just whistling past the graveyards of the aggregate fear.

>Hi, Dick, Matt, List:

>This brings to mind the tiresome repetition of Nocturnal Light
>reports, sans times, directions and sometimes even dates, which
>are so often posted far and wide.

Most of it's fake, Mr. Young. Some of it is not. There's a whole universe of strange actuality in that remaining fraction. I would think that you would be made uncomfortable, and that's why you can't be too blithely smug.

>The late Donald Menzel used to talk of Saucer Addicts.

Aren't most of them college educated? Ever wonder why revolutions almost always start in college?

>I'm
>afraid that much of what seems to pass for investigative
>activity is only masturbatory in nature.

Remember that when you point a finger somewhere else, you point three back at yourself. Or, what brings you to the List?

>Present company excepted, of course!

I ain't lettin' no one off! <g>. When I point a finger it's to see if I can't get somebody to give it a pull! <g>.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

~~Ö~~

EXPLORE Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/witches/237/lehmborg.html>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 00:36:29 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 16:22:08 -0600

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:33:08 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 20:27:09 -0000

>>>>From: Matt Hurler <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>>>To: "UFO Updates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>>>>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>>>>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>>>>Internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>>>>porn?

>>>>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>>>>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>>>>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>>>>Just a thought

>>>Thanks for your observation. I hope it has more to do with
>>>something other than a shared obscenity of content.

>Hey! Anyone think they know what obscenity is? Is it the same
>stuff that causes prurient thought while having no artistic or
>educational value, like the US supreme court said? But doesn't
>_that_ sound like every American TV commercial you've ever seen?
>Sex is _kept_ dirty in this country. And you know what? So are
>UFOs.

>>>The majority
>>>(probably large majority) of UFO sites contain strong evidence
>>>of uncritical thinking and include mounds of garbage,
>>>unfortunately. I fear that more often than not they contain
>>>sociological data about human beings rather than serious or
>>>useful information about the UFO phenomenon.

>Which is almost the same thing on another level, but you haven't
>taken into account _why_ they might have less 'useful' or
>'serious' information (or how you can feel so comfortable
>pronouncing on it, BTW). I see a lot of easy smugness in your
>communication. The sociological data you suggest might be
>gathered would yield a trove of unsettling information on the
>mechanics of their ignorance, wouldn't you agree? And coming (no
>pun intended) number two after porn only means that it is
>important to a _lot_ of people, reflects theirs thoughts and
>fears, and accurately paints their justified suspicions. They're
>interested despite the ridicule so quickly shoveled on it. Be

>not smug. There's not a whole lot of difference between the
>ignorance you allude to and the knowledge of anyone else. This
>kind of talk is just whistling past the graveyards of the
>aggregate fear.

>>This brings to mind the tiresome repetition of Nocturnal Light
>>reports, sans times, directions and sometimes even dates, which
>>are so often posted far and wide.

>Most of it's fake, Mr. Young. Some of it is not. There's a whole
>universe of strange actuality in that remaining fraction. I
>would think that you would be made uncomfortable, and that's why
>you can't be too blithely smug.

>>The late Donald Menzel used to talk of Saucer Addicts.

>Aren't most of them college educated? Ever wonder why
>revolutions almost always start in college?

>>I'm
>>afraid that much of what seems to pass for investigative
>>activity is only masturbatory in nature.

>Remember that when you point a finger somewhere else, you point
>three back at yourself. Or, what brings you to the List?

>>Present company excepted, of course!

Well, aren't we smug! See how easy it is to label people rather than to respond to the substance of their arguments. I was not trying to define obscenity (though both obsession with human genitalia and sex acts, and various violent crimes against humanity might equally qualify). Otherwise, I have no idea what you are talking about.

As for what is "useful" or "serious" information about UFOs, perhaps you should define your terms rather than denigrating my comments, and then we might be able to discuss the issue rationally. My views are amply on record. I feel comfortable in commenting on it (not "pronouncing") because I have a long track record of serious-minded research and investigation. And what is your excuse?

Dick Hall

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 18:16:54 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 00:40:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Velez

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Carter, Rose & UFOs?
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:23:32 -0800

>Charlie Rose Show, PBS, Tuesday, March 6, 2001: 30-minute
>interview with Chris Carter, creator of X-Files on Fox Network.

>X-Files needs no introduction. They are in their 8th Season,
>180+ hours.

>During the 30-minute interview of Chris Carter, the following
>words were never pronounced:

>UFO
>Flying saucer
>Aliens
>Extra-Terrestrial
>Abduction
>Secrecy,
>etc.

>Mr. Carter, a highly intelligent man, was never asked where
>he got all his ideas, nor if he believed all this stuff.

>There was no mention whatsoever of the show's main trend.

>Charlie Rose achieved the tour de force of presenting extracts
>of scenes from the X-Files without - a first - placing them in
>context! Of course, Charlie would probably have choked with:

>"In this scene, Agent Doggett, Agent Scully's new partner, meets
>in a restaurant with Skinner - their boss - and Scully. Scully
>fears she his bearing an extra-terrestrial hybrid child, but
>doesn't want to tell Dogget. Roll tape....."

>Talking to Chris Carter with no mention of UFOs is like
>interviewing the Pope with no mention of religion or Joe Damato
>without no mention of sex.

>Censorship at its best: this was deliberate avoidance of the
>subject of UFOs on mainstream serious informative TV.

>Aside from being a confounding experience for me, the
>implications are a little frightening.

Hiya Serge, hi All,

I don't know why you're so let down or upset Serge. You must have missed Charlie's interview with John Mack when Mack was out promoting the book "Abduction" five years ago. The very first question he asked Mack after introducing him was, " You don't really believe this stuff do you?"

The rest of the interview (from Rose's end) was all down hill from there. Charlie isn't so much of a "skeptic" as he is a "scoffer." (*Thanx for the recent thread Richard! :) It was all Charlie had to do to contain himself from laughing in John

Mack's face. He grinned throughout the interview as if he was dying to crack some jokes. I'm not surprised at the way he handled the Carter interview at all.

I am a die hard Charlie Rose fan. The guy is (bar none) one of the best journalist/interviewers to come down the pike since Edward R. Murrow but, Charlie has his limitations. He is great with 'political' and 'entertainment' world guests because he is really knowledgeable in those areas. Once he steps outside of that familiar arena he rarely does a good interview. I've seen several of those over the years. He's 'human' and has his own prejudices like everybody else. It is a shame that those interviews (Mack, Carter) didn't have more for the 'fans' of the subject however.

Regards,

John Velez
Charlie Rose fan anyway!

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 19:13:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 00:42:47 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 14:54:50 EST
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>>Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's words into
>>a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

>Lan:

>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>testimony or not?

So what? It's up to you to disprove it-not the other way around.
Just sniping away, Bob, proves or disproves nothing.

>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>ETH, based upon belief or not?

Non of my business-nor yours really.

>Clear skies,
>Bob Young

Not over Nova Scotia. It's been overcast for two months.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 7](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! - ebk

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:38:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:38:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! - ebk

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?!

>Hi All,

>"Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", my
>wife said as the Frasier show ended. I must admit that comedy or
>not, tonight's show was one of the most cleverly written I've
>ever seen. Almost 'cutesy'.

An edited transcript:

Astronaut Senator John Glenn guesting on 'Frasier' sits at mic.
in Frasier's radio studio awaiting Roz who's producing the space
documentary special he's narrating. Glenn chides himself for
falling for a Frasier 'catch-Roz'. Roz is confronting Frasier in
her control room behind glass in background]

Glenn: [To himself & microphone] It's my nature to be honest,
and, you know...

Back in those glory days I was very uncomfortable when
they asked us to say things that I didn't want to say and
deny other things...

[Cut to Roz & Frasier Glenn now other side of glass audio monitor
muted - they hassle - cut back to studio]

Glenn: Some people ask, you know, "were you alone out there?" We
never gave the real answer and yet, we've seen things out
there, strange things.

...But we know what we saw out there and we couldn't...
We couldn't really say anything and... And the bosses
were scared of this.

They were afraid of "war of the worlds" type stuff and...
And about panic in the streets and so we had to keep
quiet. And now we only see these things in our... Well,
in our nightmares or... Or maybe in the, in the movies
and some of them are pretty close to being the truth.

[Cut to Roz & Frasier - Glenn other side of glass still talking,
using finger& thumb on forehead to describe one-eyed alien -
studio monitor still muted - R & F hug make up - Glenn comes
into control room]

Glenn: Uh... Look, uh, about what I just said out there - can we
just keep that between us?

Roz: [Turning to audio cassette machine in rack and popping tape]

Oh! Of course, senator.

Glenn: Good. Well... Oh, wait. You were recording all that?

Roz: Yeah, but that's okay. We've got plenty of tape.

Glenn: I'm going to need that tape. [Takes cassette, heads back into studio]

Roz: Whenever you're ready, Senator.....

>Very strange segment of Frasier. And, as 'looney' as it may
>sound to some out there, I think my wife's simple but honest gut
>level reaction to it was correct. I think (within the context of
>a comedy routine) we just heard astronaut and Senator John Glenn
>_confess_ to the American people on a prime time program. ;)

Glenn was having himself a good time his visual descriptions
through the glass spoke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 19:28:27 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 09:25:52 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Young

>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 13:53:56 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>Just to make sure that we're all on the same page here, I have
>posted a temporary webpage (it will be down on 3/ 8) which has
>the images I have been talking about. Please go to:

><http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/worm/worm.html>

>Kindly note that:

>1. One of the "arches" goes over the spherical object. Please
>take careful note of the direction of the "arches." They go
>over' the tube, definitely not 'under' it.

John, List:

I think that the "spherical object" is a crater. The bright spot (if one sees a sphere it could be a specular reflection) could be bright material (sand or frost?) at the bottom of the crater. Or, alternatively, it could represent a rock face on the interior slope which reflects the Sun. Note such reflections from the outsides of small craters in the vicinity.

It sure is curious looking, though.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 20:04:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 09:31:11 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 16:11:46 -0600

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 08:44:16 -0500>

<snip>

>"Frank, a UI faculty member since 1964, has been an
>experimenter, co-investigator, or principal investigator for
>instruments on forty-two spacecraft. His instruments include
>those used to observe the Earth's auroras, as well as those used
>to measure energetic charged particles and thin, electrically
>charged gases called plasmas."

>Dick Hall should note that Frank's small comet hypothesis is
>extremely controversial within astronomical circles. Does he
>really think Frank would shy away from UFO evidence if he found
>same?

Amusing that you should ask that question. In Frank's book, Big
Splash, published over ten years ago, he included mention of the
DMSP satellite photograph and my analysis of said photo. This
can be seen at my web site:

<http://brumac.8k.com>

Look for "Satellite Photo of UFO?"

He wasn't looking for a UFO. He was looking for any odd things
that defense satellites might have picked up that could possibly
support his ideas. The DMSP satellite did not support his ideas
but he wrote about it anyway.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 04:06:30 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:43:52 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Goldstein

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>>Every now and again I'll come up with something that just
>>makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those
>>days.

>>I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C.
>>Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

>>To this end, I went to:

>><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

>>and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer
>>with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most
>>notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass
>>worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside
>>the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a
>>gaseous cloud emanating from it.

>>Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred
>>magnification and see for yourself.

>Last week when I posted about the "worm" I described it as a
>"giant sperm". I mentioned the "trail" behind the sphere as if
>it had "rolled" into the position it now occupies. Now Furry is
>calling attention to it as if it had never been mentioned. It's
>like a comedy sketch, one guy comes up with a scheme or
>something and the guy standing next to him goes, "Hey I've got
>an idea" and then repeats what the first guy just said! <LOL>
<snip>

Hi John, Furry Dave, Mac, and all fellow listerions - especially
Dick Hall,

When this Martian oddity appeared upon my screen through the
good graces of Mac Tonnes I was intrigued about this worm,
sphere, tube, striped, duned, trailed thing, like nothing I had
ever seen before. I was excited about Arthur C. Clark's
statement. However, I had reasons to doubt many conclusions of
the Enterprise mission.

Fortunately, Mac has a different perspective than does "Hoagie".
Judging from the sudden outpouring of speculation and
suggestions on this list, a lot of Listerions were also
intrigued.

>Furry, what can I say, "great minds think alike!" ;) Ok, so now
>that somebody else has noticed this feature, what do you make of
>it?

>As for the "sand dune" theory: you guys must be looking at
>different or the wrong pictures! There is no mistaking the
>tubular structure of the objects I am looking at. I don't care
>how you 'light' the picture. A "tube" is a tube. That is not
>flat terrain. Those are clearly tubular structures and it
>appears to "contain" within it a really large spherical object
>of some kind. All of a sudden people are analyzing the pictures
>as if they were looking at flat ground (sand dunes) and
>completely ignoring the fact that the structure is a transparent
>pipe/tube of some kind. What's up with that? Either folks have
>downloaded the wrong images to study or they are blind. There is
>no third way about it.

>I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
>looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or
>a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures
>with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you
>don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images!
>Period.

About five days ago, after a few days of reading hot and heavy posts speculating about what this worm may be, I was going to post the following paragraph. But, due to laziness and a busy music schedule I never got around to it. Now I feel I must proceed.

Mac, John and others, you folks live by major metropolitan areas where there are major Universities. tAs you know, I am now living in Germany and don't spreche der lingo. How come nobody on this list has gone to the trouble of contacting a Martian geologist and asking what he or she believes this "worm" to be? Or any geologists? Mac, I would have hoped that by now you would have done so before so much speculating on your website. What do they have to say? What do the NASA Martian geologists have to say? Sure, we could build endless glass houses up there on Mars but what are the geological reasons that may be associated with what we are seeing?

Take care,

Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:47:20 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:14:21 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

I asked,

>>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>>testimony or not?

>>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>>ETH, based upon belief or not?

Dick asked in turn,

>With all due respect, when and where did Bruce Maccabee ever say
>that Arnold's testimony alone proves the ETH?

Dick, Bruce, List:

Bruce had written:

>>>let's consider Arnold and the
>>>pelicans: Arnold's clear description of the objects he saw
>>>indicated that they reflected the sun very brightly (or were
>>>light sources themselves). This one characteristic by itself is
>>>sufficient to rule out (gulp) _pelicans_ (regardless of the
>>>comments by ornithologists). Similarly, the speed measured by
>>>Arnold is enough to rule out jet aircraft of the day and also
>>>meteors.

>>>True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft...

You're right. Bruce actually said that this did not prove the ETH.
Sorry, Bruce, I jumped the gun. But Bruce did say,

>>>but they prove _something_ about the objects (according to
>>>Arnold they appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces,
>>>speeds beyond anything we had achieved). One thing they prove
>>>to me is that OI/NHI were involved (Other Intelligences/
>>>Non-Human INTelligences). In other words, these weren't
>>>"creations" of "dumb" (unintelligent) nature but rather
>>>manufactured objects...but we didn't manufacture them.

If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After

all, he said it, so he must believe it.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 23:10:38 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:51:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Carter, Rose & UFOs?
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:23:32 -0800

>Hello List,

>Charlie Rose Show, PBS, Tuesday, March 6, 2001: 30-minute
>interview with Chris Carter, creator of X-Files on Fox Network.

>X-Files needs no introduction. They are in their 8th Season,
>180+ hours.

>During the 30-minute interview of Chris Carter, the following
>words were never pronounced:

>UFO
>Flying saucer
>Aliens
>Extra-Terrestrial
>Abduction
>Secrecy,
>etc.

As I recall he was on the publicity tour for his new show the Lone Gunman, so no need to discuss the "mythology" side of the X-Files, but rather focus on whatever he is promoting, as the X files doesn't need the promotion. A lot of times when folks do the talk show circuit they prearrange in advance what areas they want to discuss as long as the host approves of it. Saves wasting time during the interview.

>Mr. Carter, a highly intelligent man, was never asked where
>he got all his ideas, nor if he believed all this stuff.

>There was no mention whatsoever of the show's main trend.

Does it matter whether he believes or disbelieves? Would it have mattered if Gene Roddenberry believed, or disbelieved in space ships that could travel between galaxies etc? Nope it doesn't.

<snip>

>Talking to Chris Carter with no mention of UFOs is like
>interviewing the Pope with no mention of religion or Joe Damato
>without no mention of sex.

Some people would say after 8 years of X-Files they are tired of talking about UFOs and Aliens with Chris Carter and want to talk/hear about something else besides that.

>Censorship at its best: this was deliberate avoidance of the
>subject of UFOs on mainstream serious informative TV.

Bottom line is Chris Carter is focusing on his new show. Its called job security. If the show succeeds like the X-Files, Carter will still be making money down the line.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:47:20 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:14:21 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 11:21:24 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

I asked,

>>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>>testimony or not?

>>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>>ETH, based upon belief or not?

Dick asked in turn,

>With all due respect, when and where did Bruce Maccabee ever say
>that Arnold's testimony alone proves the ETH?

Dick, Bruce, List:

Bruce had written:

>>>let's consider Arnold and the
>>>pelicans: Arnold's clear description of the objects he saw
>>>indicated that they reflected the sun very brightly (or were
>>>light sources themselves). This one characteristic by itself is
>>>sufficient to rule out (gulp) _pelicans_ (regardless of the
>>>comments by ornithologists). Similarly, the speed measured by
>>>Arnold is enough to rule out jet aircraft of the day and also
>>>meteors.

>>>True, these characteristics do not prove ET craft...

You're right. Bruce actually said that this did not prove the ETH.
Sorry, Bruce, I jumped the gun. But Bruce did say,

>>>but they prove _something_ about the objects (according to
>>>Arnold they appeared to have distinct shape, metallic surfaces,
>>>speeds beyond anything we had achieved). One thing they prove
>>>to me is that OI/NHI were involved (Other Intelligences/
>>>Non-Human INTelligences). In other words, these weren't
>>>"creations" of "dumb" (unintelligent) nature but rather
>>>manufactured objects...but we didn't manufacture them.

If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After

all, he said it, so he must believe it.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 23:10:38 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:51:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Carter, Rose & UFOs? - Gates

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Carter, Rose & UFOs?
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:23:32 -0800

>Hello List,

>Charlie Rose Show, PBS, Tuesday, March 6, 2001: 30-minute
>interview with Chris Carter, creator of X-Files on Fox Network.

>X-Files needs no introduction. They are in their 8th Season,
>180+ hours.

>During the 30-minute interview of Chris Carter, the following
>words were never pronounced:

>UFO
>Flying saucer
>Aliens
>Extra-Terrestrial
>Abduction
>Secrecy,
>etc.

As I recall he was on the publicity tour for his new show the Lone Gunman, so no need to discuss the "mythology" side of the X-Files, but rather focus on whatever he is promoting, as the X files doesn't need the promotion. A lot of times when folks do the talk show circuit they prearrange in advance what areas they want to discuss as long as the host approves of it. Saves wasting time during the interview.

>Mr. Carter, a highly intelligent man, was never asked where
>he got all his ideas, nor if he believed all this stuff.

>There was no mention whatsoever of the show's main trend.

Does it matter whether he believes or disbelieves? Would it have mattered if Gene Roddenberry believed, or disbelieved in space ships that could travel between galaxies etc? Nope it doesn't.

<snip>

>Talking to Chris Carter with no mention of UFOs is like
>interviewing the Pope with no mention of religion or Joe Damato
>without no mention of sex.

Some people would say after 8 years of X-Files they are tired of talking about UFOs and Aliens with Chris Carter and want to talk/hear about something else besides that.

>Censorship at its best: this was deliberate avoidance of the
>subject of UFOs on mainstream serious informative TV.

Bottom line is Chris Carter is focusing on his new show. Its called job security. If the show succeeds like the X-Files, Carter will still be making money down the line.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 20:56:07 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:57:48 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted

List,

I added two interesting photos to yesterday's piece on the reflective stripes found throughout Cydonia (and elsewhere).

Of particular interest is the six-sided, symmetrical "platform" found next to "Mound P." I enlarged and overcontrasted it to get a better look at its shape and it is certainly strange.

I also located what might be some sort of "grid" structure on the Cliff (separate from the bright "stitching" noted earlier). If the "grid" is ejecta from the nearby crater, it doesn't appear to have the radial pattern consistent with the impact. Also, it's rather isolated, and one of the first things you see when viewing the full-rez original from MSSS.

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

page 14

Mac

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 20:36:44 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 17:54:22 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy

>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 22:57:27 -0400
>From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

>>Hello List Members,

>>Every now and again I'll come up with something that just
>>makes me have to go "hmmmm" and today is one of those
>>days.

>>I decided that I wanted to take a closer look at what Arthur C.
>>Clarke calls "The Glass Worms" of Mars.

This is very curious, coming from Clarke, who isn't an ETH man.

>>To this end, I went to:

>><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

>>and then after capturing the image I examined it a little closer
>>with Corel Photopaint 9. There are two items that are most
>>notable. Firstly, the object that appears to be inside the glass
>>worm and secondly the dark boomerang shaped item just outside
>>the worm, close to what appears to be a complete sphere with a
>>gaseous cloud emanating from it.

>>Please examine the image around 3 to 5 hundred
>>magnification and see for yourself.

What I noticed with the 'Tubes' is a defintie circular shape,
and one other thing. To me as one who has seen all sorts of
reflections, the " Sphere" has to be a reflective surface-where
was the sun during the shot? That will tell the tale.

>Thanks for putting this up in the fashion you did. This is the
>most intriguing formation-or what have you-that I've seen on
>Mars. There is definitely a transparent quality to it.It's
>certainly not sand dunes.

>Don Ledger

Yes, defintiely not sand dunes. (Maybe Frank Herbert was
drawing on some sort of Racial Memory?)

GT McCoy

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 18:38:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.com
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>1994, according to local media.

>The lights were seen last night over the Popocatepetl and tens
>of residents from adjacent communities called radio stations to
>make this known, according to the "Buenos Dias" program
>broadcast on the ACIR network out of Puebla, 125 kilometers east
>of Mexico City.

This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous observations.

Gary Hart

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Leakers

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 00:41:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 18:44:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Leakers

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:52:58 EST
>Subject: Re: Leakers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 20:01:08 -0600
>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: Leakers
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>To this I must add that in UFO history, one person was nearly
>prosecuted for leaking comments to the press with allegedly
>classified information about instrumented tracking data that
>would reveal speed-size-altitude data on UFOs that had been
>obtained at White Sands in 1950, and that was Dr. Anthony O.
>Mirarchi of USAF Cambridge Research Labs. Mirarchi was subjected
>to a vicious and uncalled-for AFOSI investigation and attempted
>referral to the FBI and Justice Dept for prosecution in 1951-3,
>a two-year-long persecution that was not stopped until Gen
>Garland called a halt to it.

>His crime was in speaking out to the press in Feb 1951 to rebut
>he Urner Liddel Skyhooks-cause-all-UFOs nonsense and he
>stumbled out something that was highly sensitive and hit a raw
>nerve and had been majorly covered up and lied about -- the
>existence of UFO tracking data.>

>As I documented in my article "Ruppelt's Coverups" in the Sign
>Historical Group's UFO History Workshop Proceedings for 1999
>(before I found out about Mirarchi), the whole series of White
>Sands cinetheodolite trackings of UFOs on repeated occasions
>had been seriously covered up and lied about repeatedly by the
>AF.

Brad is correct about Mirarchi. The story of his nea run in with
the Air Force and FBI is told in Chapter 15 of 'The UFO FBI
Connection'. A portion is abstracted below.

(page 157)

Although Dr. Mirarchi retired in October 1950 and had no part in
writing the final Twinkle report that was completed over a year
later, his involvement with the green fireballs and saucers did
not end when he retired. Four months later he returned to action
in a public way and his actions nearly got him into serious
trouble three years afterward!

In the middle of February, 1951 Time magazine published an
article that featured a well known scientist, Dr. Urner Liddel
of the Naval Research Laboratory near Washington, DC. In the
article Dr. Liddel stated that he had studied around 2,000
saucer reports and, in his opinion, the only credible saucer
sightings were actually sightings of misidentified Skyhook
balloons, balloons which had been kept secret by the armed
services. Apparently Dr. Liddel wasn't aware of the several
sightings by balloon project scientists.

Evidently Dr. Mirarchi felt it was his civic duty to repudiate Liddel's claims because two weeks later he responded publicly. According to a United Press story filed on February 26, 1951 Mirarchi said he believed, after investigating 300 reports of flying saucers, that the saucers were missiles from Russia which had photographed our atomic bomb test sites. According to the United Press article the 40 year old scientist who "for more than a year conducted a top secret investigation into the weird phenomena said that he had worked with balloons and balloons did not leave an exhaust trail. Another reason given against the balloon explanation was that balloons could not be seen at night. Mirarchi explained how scientists had picked up dust particles containing copper which could have come from no other source than the saucer motive plants (the engines).

(This was a reference to efforts by Dr. La Paz to have air samples taken after a green fireball sighting to see if there were any small particles of copper or copper compounds in the air. Such compounds burn green or give off a characteristic green color when heated, so La Paz had conjectured that the green color could be attributed to burning copper compounds associated with the fireballs. In one case there was success in detecting such particles, although La Paz was not completely convinced that the particles were from the fireball.)

Mirarchi went on to explain that the "flying saucers or 'fireballs' as he terms them, were regularly observed near Los Alamos until he set up a system of phototheodolites to measure their speed, size and distance away.... but the fireballs mysteriously ceased appearing before the theodolites could go to work. Dr. Mirarchi concludes that spies must have tipped off the saucers' home base."

Mirarchi referred to two sightings for which there was photographic evidence: a single photo of a round glowing object and a motion picture which "showed one streaking across the sky for one and a half minutes." Mirarchi went on to say that he was aware that some sightings were actually sightings of balloons, but that "there was too much evidence in favor of saucers to say they could have all been balloons. 'I was conducting the main investigation. The government had to depend on me or my branch for information. He said he did not see how the Navy (i.e., Dr Liddel) could say that there had been no concrete evidence on the existence of the phenomena."

Mirarchi concluded by accusing the government of committing "suicide by secrecy" for not admitting that the saucers were real and probably missiles from Russia.

Strong words! So strong they nearly got Mirarchi in trouble more than two years later. According to an Air Force document released in 1991(!), in 1953, during a time of espionage and spy hunting (the Rosenbergs, atomic spies, were executed in 1953) the FBI queried the Air Force as to whether or not Mirarchi should be investigated for breaking security. Lt. Col. Frederick Oder, who had been instrumental in getting Project Twinkle started (see Chapter 12), responded by writing that, because Mirarchi had released to the newspaper some information that was classified Confidential or Secret it "could cause serious harm to the internal security of the country...if it were to fall into unfriendly hands...both from the point of view of the prestige of our Government and the point of view of revealing our interest in certain classified projects."

Brigadier General W. M. Garland, who was in charge of AMC in 1953, decided not to pursue Dr. Mirarchi because, in his opinion, the information was not that important. Furthermore, in Gen. Garlands' opinion, the facts about saucers being missiles, as stated in the newspaper article, had been "disproved or are, at best, personal opinions, and are not considered classified data." In other words, Gen. Garland apparently believed that the green fireball and saucer sightings were not Russian missiles, although he did not say what he thought they were.

Perhaps Gen. Garland let Mirarchi off the hook because he recalled that there had been a recommendation to declassify and release the results of Project Twinkle in December, 1951, a month after the final report was written. However, he could find no record of declassification in the files of AMC. Evidently he was not aware of the recommendation against declassification

contained in a February 1952 letter to the Directorate of Intelligence from the Directorate of Research and Development which states "The Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat has suggested that this project not be declassified for a variety of reasons, chief among which is that no scientific explanation for any of the 'fireballs' and other phenomena was revealed by the (Project Twinkle) report and that some reputable scientists still believe that the observed phenomena are man-made."

Another letter, this time from the Directorate of Intelligence to the Research Division of the Directorate of Research and Development, dated March 11, 1952, adds another reason for withholding the information from the public:

"It is believed that a release of the information to the public in its present condition would cause undue speculation and give rise to unwarranted fears among the populace such as occurred in previous releases on unidentified flying objects. This results from releases when there has been no real solution."

In other words, Air Force Intelligence had realized that the public could see through the smokescreen of previous explanations and wanted real answers, so, if they couldn't come up with real answers it was better to say nothing.

Over a year after Mirarchi responded to Liddel, LIFE Magazine published an article on flying saucers (discussed in Chapter 19). In that article the authors described some of the sightings which caused the Air Force to start Project Twinkle. One of the hundreds of letters which the magazine received in response to that article was from Captain Daniel McGovern who wrote "I was very closely associated with Projects 'Twinkle' and 'Grudge' at Alamogordo, N. Mexico where I was chief of the technical photographic facility at Holloman Air Force Base. I have seen several of these objects myself` and they are everything you say they are as to shape, size and speed." (LIFE, April 28, 1952)

Note: it was Mirachi who requested and received the White Sands movies which proved that anomalous objects were flying over the proving ground (filmed using theodolite cameras). It was in a document sent to Mirachi that we find proof that in at least one case there was a triangulation leading to a height - 150,000 ft- and a size - 30 ft- associated with these objects that traveled at high speed. This evidence was ignored or covered by the well known atmospheric scientist, Louis Elterman who wrote the final report of Project Twinkle. (See UFO FBI Connection, Chapter 15 for the story of the Twinkle Report and the White Sands Movies)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:23:03 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:23:03 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001

Filer's Files #10 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
March 5, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

UFOs CAUSE CONCERNS FOR AIR SAFETY: Another unexplained crash occurs in Georgia. UFO reports come in from New York, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Colorado, Oregon, United Kingdom, and Australia.

ARTHUR CLARKE ALSO SEES LIFE ON MARS

Arthur Clarke is known for spinning elaborate, visionary tales of futures that might be, none more famous than "2001: A Space Odyssey." But according to Clarke, the real 2001 has some pretty unbelievable things to offer. "I'm fairly convinced that we have discovered life on Mars," Clarke told Space.com Sunday as Buzz Aldrin listened. "There are some incredible photographs from [the Jet Propulsion Laboratory], which to me are pretty convincing proof of the existence of large forms of life on Mars! Have a look at them. I don't see any other interpretation." Thanks to Space.com:
http://www.space.com/peopleinterviews/clarke_believe_010227.html

Editor's Note: Since 1997, I have expressed my belief that Mars images show evidence of life on our neighboring planet. I suggest if a panel of experts were shown the evidence they would also conclude that life once existed on Mars.

GEORGIA: WAS A UFO INVOLVED IN THE CRASH OF ARMY TRANSPORT?

MACON-- John Thompson an excellent UFO investigator sent me information from the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. Writers Ron Martz and Alan Judd report that 21 National Guard personnel died in a farm field near this small Georgia town when a twin-engine turboprop transport plane crashed and burst into flames March 3, 2001. The worst military aviation disaster in Georgia's history involved the very reliable C-23 Sherpa troop and cargo carrying aircraft. There were heavy rains and thunderstorms reported in the general area. The Sherpa crashed about an hour after it took off at 8:57 a.m. from Hurlburt Field, an Air Force installation near Fort Walton Beach, Fla. The plane was en route to Oceana, Virginia., after a training mission at Hurlburt. President Bush issued a statement saying he was deeply saddened by news of the crash. "This tragic loss on a routine training mission reminds us of the sacrifices made each and every day by all of our men and women in uniform," Bush said in the statement. "The price of freedom is never free. Today's events remind us that it is sometimes unspeakably high.

Witnesses said the plane appeared to come down slowly and almost glide before crashing in a muddy field. Dennis Posey a farmer described the sound of the plane coming down as "a scream." He heard a crash and Posey jumped in his pickup truck and drove a mile from his house, discovering a plane that was beyond hope. "It was engulfed. By that time, there was nothing anybody could do, I assure you," Posey said. "The impact was so great," he said. "I knew nobody could be alive when the plane hit the ground." He described the fuselage of the Army transport plane as compacted. "There was no way there was anybody left," he

said. Posey said the plane apparently began to break apart before it crashed. A 4- or 5-foot piece of the tail section landed in a small pecan grove near the home of his father, D.E. Posey, about three-fourths of a mile from the crash site. A 20-foot section of the plane's left wing hit the ground about a quarter-mile from the pecan grove, closer to the crash site. Posey said there were no burn marks on either of those pieces or a half-dozen other pieces of the plane scattered in the area.

Editor's Note: I have concerns that a UFO may have been involved in this crash. First, UFOs are frequently seen flying at low level in the general area. Second, the Sherpa is a slow flying aircraft and it is unlikely that both a wing and tail would have structural failure even if the craft had flown into bad weather. Third, Similar crashes have occurred with unknown metals found on the tail structures and wings indicating a mid-air collision with an unidentified craft. Forth, The crew had no time to issue any warning or May Day indicating a collision of some type. Fifth, witnesses indicated there was no airborne explosion. I freely admit this is a remote possibility, however it is time that all possibilities be considered in the tragic loss of life. UFOs are frequently sighted in the area of crashes. The extraordinary power and high speeds of UFOs may accidentally cause damage to our aircraft.

NEW YORK DIAMOND SHAPED OBJECT

FISHKILL -- The witness reports three bright white lights crossed I-84 and headed west paralleling the highway towards Hudson River on February 22, 2001. Where the highway crests a ridge and drops into a valley there is a panoramic view so I scanned the sky for lights, and saw the usual assortment of recognizable aircraft lights at 8:15 PM. However, I saw a group of three very white bright lights in a straight line, close enough to each other that my initial reaction was that they couldn't be separate aircraft. They were also much lower than aircraft in the area typically fly. As I continued west, I tried to gauge the object's motion relative to mine. It made a banking maneuver which carried it across the highway directly in front of me, a 1/4 mile away, and only a couple of hundred feet up at most. Though it was night, there was more than enough ambient lighting so I could see it's bottom, which was a black diamond shape, with three bright white lights across it.

There were no discernable wings - it was as though I was looking at a large, black kite. Two of the lights were at opposite points of the diamond, with the third in the middle. Since the object was banked over, the three lights were in a vertical line. The object continued it's turn, then leveled out at treetop height and continued westbound towards the Hudson River, paralleling the highway but on the other side from me. I called my girlfriend who lives two miles from my position intending to ask her to go outside and look for the object. When she answered, she started telling me that she was watching an object from the house. We agreed that it was the same craft, and she was able to view it for a couple minutes. She had initially noticed it through the living room window, due to it's bright, unusually configured lights and low altitude. Having spent five years in the Air Force with a keen interest and familiarity with most types of aircraft, I know that what I saw was not a conventional aircraft nor were its flight characteristics. Even if it was a military aircraft from Stewart AFB nearby, I can't understand why it would fly so low over an interstate highway, then descend to treetop level and parallel the road. Thanks to Peter Davenport Director NUFORC www.ufocenter.co

MARYLAND FIRE IN THE SKY

MOUNT AIRY -- Saturday, March 2, 2001, Erik was walking his dog at around 12:50 AM when he thought he saw the moon, but then realized it was a flaming light in the sky. It was about 1 to 2 miles away, not too high in the sky. The flaming got more intense lighting up the sky in the area. The light then formed into a horizontal light form and then slowly (over the course of about 2 minutes) faded out. Several cars turning down the road at this time were probably trying to get a closer look. Eric's sister saw something similar in the past year. It was too still to be a plane, too big and fiery to be a helicopter. It was like fireworks hovering in the sky for 5 to 10 minutes. Thanks to Eric D. and billbean@ufoman.ne contact@mgroove.net

NORTH CAROLINA HOVERING

LAKE JUNALUSKA --On February 26, 2001, at 5:35 PM, Jade Moon writes, "I was headed south on Highway 209, from Crabtree when I saw a white dot in the southwestern sky that was not moving. By the time I reached the bridge that crossed over I-40, I noticed that the dot in the sky at 10 o'clock was fading fast, but almost instantly another had appeared at 4 o'clock. Several sightings of cigar shaped objects have occurred over Lake Junaluska in the past.

I traveled another 50 yards south, and by the time I had reached the Citgo truck stop, both objects had disappeared. There was no sound and nor jet stream, as any aircraft would have left in the sky. My 8 year old daughter did not look quick enough to see the first object, but she also verified the sighting of the second object. You may feel free to post this report. Thanks to: Jade Moon jademoon68@earthlink.net

TENNESSEE FACELESS ROBED ENTITY

The UFO photographs on your website taken several miles from Nashville are astounding! I had an encounter some thirty years ago in La Vergne with a faceless, robed entity. Not until recently, would I have connected my encounter with extra-terrestrials. The E.T. encounter I had was very peaceful and loving. Thanks to Murfreesboro, TN resident

ILLINOIS FLYING LIGHTS CONTINUE

ROCKFORD -- On Saturday February 10, 2001, my wife and I were driving eastbound in Rockford when at 10:25 PM a formation of lights in the sky caught my wife's attention. She asked me what it was? I had no clue either, but we noticed that we were not the only ones seeing it because most people were pulling over on the side of the street to take a good look of the lights, which were traveling in a southwest direction. We pulled over in a Restaurant's parking lot, and we noticed all the patrons at that restaurant were outside watching those lights, despite the cold temperature which must have been on the teens. The lady standing next to me theorized that they were some kind of memorial lanterns lit up and launched from a nearby hospital and that were being carried by the wind. However it was interesting to see that the lights were shifting positions very slowly and it was interesting to see that at the end of the sighting one of the lights started traveling in the opposite direction as the other lights. This event was also on Fire scanner channels and observed by fire personnel. The sighting was also reported on local TV, station. All units moved at various speeds and direction.

COLORADO UFO WITH STUBBY WINGS

MOFFAT -- Christopher O'Brien reports, "Tony," his wife and their young child were traveling east on County Rd T, on March 2, 2001, when they observed "a small cigar-shaped UFO flying south toward Blanca Peak. The craft was the size of a Cessna plane. At first we thought it was a small plane but it didn't have a [vertical stabilizer] tail," and they noted it was "traveling too slowly to be a conventional plane." The witnesses estimated the object was less than 1/4- mile away and was flying at an altitude of "100 feet." The craft flew by the front of their car for about ten seconds when, to their surprise, "it blinked out" and disappeared. "We couldn't believe our eyes--it just vanished." The craft was "dull silver" in color and noted it may have had "stubby little wings" extending out from the fuselage. At the time of their sighting there was no wind and the sky was clear over the valley floor with some broken clouds over the Sangre de Cristo Mountains which are located 15-miles to the east of the sighting location. They did not discern a cupola or cockpit or see any identifying markings nor was there any sound. Seconds after the fly-by "Tony" who is normally quiet and low -- key excitedly called Chris on his cell-phone to file their sighting report. Thanks to Christopher O'Brien author of The Mysterious Valley (St Martins Press)

OREGON DISC SIGHTING AFTER FIFTY TWO YEARS

ROGUE RIVER -- Dr. Bruce Macabee writes, "Last week in Filer's Files #9 you wrote: > In one of the best reports I've received recently a former SR-71 Air Force Crew Chief phoned to tell me

he and his family of four had a witnessed a disc shaped UFO outside their home around 8:30 PM on both February 21st, and 22nd, 2001. It started when he noticed a bright light at the top of the mountain behind his home> The mention of Rogue River caught my attention because one of the most credible sightings of all time occurred there in May, 1949. The story is told in Chapter 10 of THE UFO/FBI CONNECTION." Very briefly, a pancake-shaped object with a single small vertical fin was observed by three men and two women while they were in a fishing boat on the Rogue River near Gold Beach, Oregon. It was late afternoon on a clear day, May 24, while they were scanning the river looking for fish jumping that they noticed the object approaching from the northeast. It stopped moving and hovered about east of their location for several minutes. During this time two of the men, who were employees of the Ames Research Laboratory near San Francisco, were able to look through 8X binoculars each man having about a minute of viewing time. To the naked eye it looked like a coin seen obliquely, but in the binoculars it resolved to a thick pancake shape and the surface looked "wrinkled and dirty." It should be obvious that under such excellent viewing conditions any ordinary aircraft shape or balloon shape would have been clearly obvious (if you can see an object well to see surface details you can certainly see the overall shape). While one of the men was watching this object rotated on its vertical axis and then accelerated away to the southeast. They estimated that it achieved the speed of a jet in a few seconds, all with no noise.

What sets this sighting apart from other "run of the mill," multiple witness, daylight sightings under optimum viewing conditions is what happened... or didn't happen afterward. The witnesses did not tell the local paper, the radio or TV. In fact there is no evidence they told anyone EXCEPT the _security office _ at Ames Research Laboratory. Their report began an investigation into the sighting by officers of the Air Force Office of Special Investigation. The investigation involved interviews with all the witnesses and interviews with acquaintances of the Ames employees. The investigation showed that the witnesses were credible and probably very accurate in their report. The specific description of the shape and dynamics of the object make it clear that this is either the "real thing"... a flying saucer/craft not made by humans or a hoax. But I reject the hoax explanation because anyone who has a job that requires a security clearance, as at Ames Research Laboratory, will not (unless he is totally crazy) try to hoax the security office where he works. (Loss of clearance = loss of job) This case is listed as one of the 12 best unknown sightings between 1947 and 1952 by the Battelle Memorial Institute in the so-called Special Report #14 of Project Blue Book. There are further details and the results of my own investigation presented in the UFO/FBI book. The book can be purchased on-line at Amazon or Barnes and Noble and is in ookstores, published by Llewellyn in May, 2000. Thanks to Bruce Macabee.

CHILE, PILOTS SPOT GIANT SILVER SAUCER

ANTOFAGASTA -- Two airborne jetliners spotted a giant silver UFO hovering at an altitude of 60,000 feet near the city of Antofagasta in Northern Chile around 11:00 AM on February 16, 2001. News reports indicate that a high altitude silver colored balloon had been released earlier and may have been responsible for the sightings. The object had been tracked by radar and was identified as a small silver object west of El Loa's provincial capital. Thanks to Scott Corrales

AUSTRALIA MORE SEE STRANGE OBJECTS

The Border Watch Newspaper, February 27, 2001, reports of an unidentified flying objects along the southeast Coast line last week have increased. Four people sitting in a car near Port MacDonnell lighthouse last Tuesday night described what they believe was a UFO. Their sighting has been verified by two more people. The object was flying in the vicinity of Victoria and towards the ocean. Their descriptions of the "Alien Machine are virtually identical to two sightings near Port MacDonnell light house, the other near Mumbannar. They described, "A large white hazy object in the sky, which moved at incredible speed when not moving slowly or stationary." People traveling in a car at 12:40 AM last Tuesday night saw the object near Mumbannar. Their description matches that of the separate sightings at Port McDonnell and seems to describe an object which-moved in a huge

arc across the sea then inland. It was moving at varying speeds, then just disappeared in a flash. The Victorian people who phoned us said they had contacted the weather bureau but there was no balloon activity. The motorists said the object was round, large white and surrounded by a haze. The five people who saw the object at Port MacDonnell are convinced they saw a UFO and were "quite freaked out" Thanks to Trevor Raynor and Diane Harrison National Director of The Australian UFO Research Network Australian Skywatch Director

UNITED KINGDOM ORANGE LIGHTS

Roger Kennedy writes, "I was just reading your article about orange lights over Australia." I was visiting the site because at about 6:50 (GMT) five orange lights flew above our home in Fleetwood, England. The lights began as an orange color and progressed to yellow before disappearing. They were arranged in a V formation and one light always maintained the "wingman" position. They changed this position into what looked like a half swastika, they then returned to form a V shape, the lights gradually changed shape and color and finally disappeared, wingman last. At first I thought they must be planes, but 3 interesting things changed my mind. 1/ they made no sound, we get loads of planes overhead and they are always loud, 2/They were flying too slow. we get lots of helicopters too, and they are faster than these lights, 3/When I tried to take a photo of the lights, nothing showed up on the viewfinder. I was just wondering if you have heard of anything like this. Thanks to: R. Kennedy rogerk@rogerk.screaming.net

AIRLINE PILOTS OFTEN SEE UFOs

Jennifer writes, "Just thought you'd like to know, A few years ago, my neighbor, a Delta Airlines captain, said he had seen several "things" he couldn't explain over the years but he never reported them because it is well-known among the commercial pilots that one would be branded a nut and "looney." He would be taken off active duty for a period of time while he (not the incident) were investigated. "not worth it," he stated. Thanks to Jennifer Brown-Jacobs

NEW MEXICO: NSA FACILITY/MANZANO WEAPONS STORAGE AREA

SANDIA BASE -- Robert Collins writes, "The National Security Agency Facility located at the entrance to the Coyote Canyon area of Sandia Base, in Albuquerque played a significant role in the Paul Bennewitz UFO affair." The Kirtland AFB, AFOSI office began investigating in October 1981, and ending in August 1983. Both NSA and the FBI were said to have carried on the investigation till 1985. What reportedly got NSA involved in the first place was Paul Bennewitz beaming radio transmissions at the Manzano Weapons Storage area: Right away this was a security issue since at the time Manzano was the home of 17,000 + tactical nuclear weapons. Added comments, nuclear weapons facilities were often reportedly used to hide UFO related artifacts and then President Reagan and Vice President Bush made frequent trips to Manzano during Reagan's presidency to view UFO exhibits. Please see http://home.sprintmail.com/~rigoletto/reports/nsa_facility_sandia_base.htm

NEW JERSEY GREAT UFO CONGRESS 2001

BORDENTOWN -- March 31 and April 1 at the Days Inn on Route 206 at the NJ Turnpike Exit #7. Jan Aldrich will talk about his Project 1947 investigations, Don Ecker will discuss the Dark Side of the Moon, Viki Ecker's talk concerns "In Search of the Secret Keepers," Dolores Cannon discusses The Soul, Between Death and Life, Richard Cassaro will speak on the truth concerning Ancient Egypt, , Bob Durant's talk is about The Ramey Memo, and Nancy Talbot talk is on the Physical Evidence regarding plants, soils at crop formation sites. Call Pat Marcatillio for reservations at 609 631-8955

NEW NASA SHUTTLE VIDEO OF UFOs IN SPACE

Jeff Challender has prepared a new tape of various UFOs that were caught on recent Shuttle video footage. Jeff has over an hour long tape of UFOs shot in space. Jeff spends hundreds of hours watching the shuttle broadcasts from space and is now an expert on NASA missions and even those onboard the shuttle are

unlikely to see what Jeff does. Using Jeff's directions you will be able to learn the difference between space junk, ice crystals and real UFOs. I feel confident we could go into a court of law and convince any jury that there are UFOs moving at high speed around the Earth. Send \$25 to: Jeff Challender 2768 Mendel Way - Sacramento, California 95833-2011

BEFORE YOU BUY OR SELL A HOME SEE MY FREE REPORT

All real estate agents are not the same? Some real estate agents are part timers and inexperienced. Others are experts with an excellent experience and capabilities. When you are selling or buying your home, you need to make sure you have the best real estate agent working for you before you make any important financial decisions on one your biggest investments! Remember, the majority of people do not know the right questions to ask, and what pit falls can cause major problems. Picking the right real estate agent can be a wonderful experience, and picking the wrong one can be a big mistake that can waste your time and cost you thousands! Find out, " What you need to understand before hiring any real estate agent!" Learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent for your needs. To get a free copy of this report, just call (609) 654-0020 or e-mail us at Majorstar@aol.com. We can also help you with your own or corporate Worldwide Relocation to Australia, Benelux, Canada, Cayman Is, England, France, Guam, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the US.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL that costs only \$30 per year by contacting MUFONHO@aol.com. Mention that I recommended you for membership. Filer's Files is copyrighted 2001 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the files on their Web Sites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. These reports and comments are not necessarily the official MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar@aol.com. Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name, address, or story confidential. Caution, most of these are initial reports and require further investigation.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [contact](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 00:45:45 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:27:14 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 16:57:53 -0800

>>Date: Sun, 04 Mar 2001 18:13:23 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>I think his insights and the depth of his observations are
>>>brilliant. I would love to have another metallurgist take a look
>>>at the debris but I doubt any would be willing unless I paid
>>>them.

>>Hello, Ed, all...

>>Note that Ed first complains that no "experts" will stop and
>>look AA seriously, ignoring that fact that yours truly works in
>>film, video and special effects for a living. Oh, sure, I'm not
>>on the level of Francis Ford Coppola or Stan Winston, but I've
>>been in this business for over 25 years. I certainly know as
>>much about film, video production and special effects as the
>>metallurgist does about metal. More to the point, I can actually
>>look at the video, itself, to form an opinion; it's my medium.
>>On the other hand, the metallurgist has never held the debris in
>>his hands; he has no idea if it's metal or not! But my opinions
>>don't count because I don't believe in AA.

>Roger,
>

>Your opinions do count. That's why I sent you the first copy of
>the AA CDs and the Flatland. Why do you think I gave you the
>CDs, no strings attached? I want you to view the footage and hear

Did you ever get around to shipping Roger a VHS copy?

>what you have to say about it. Then we'll all be on common
>ground and if you find something that proves that the AA is a
>hoax, or fraud, or fake, so be it. We think our evidence and our
>narrative is so strong that you won't be able to punch holes in
>it and will eventually agree that we should take another look at
>the evidence for the legitimacy of the AA. I think you'll at
>least put it in your gray file and not call it a bunch of crap.

From reading the aa supporter posts, it appears that even if
Roger finds something, it would be explained away.

>You still won't open the CDs and take a look for yourself.
>That's what has been so frustrating about this discussion. I can
>tell by the way you and Robert, and Bob discuss the AA that none
>of you have spent much time looking at the footage in a critical
>fashion. Why?

I have seen the footage quite a number of times. It looks like
a Hollywood FX job.

>I think proving that the AA is authentic would change the face
>of ufology. M. Dennis' report and Neil's article could be just

>the beginning. If others find fault, then it's their
>responsibility to at least look at the footage before they pass
>judgment.

>I don't have a video I can send you nor does Neil. You're
>perfectly capable of opening the CDs if you want to do so. Neil
>has given you plenty of advice on our options.

So how did you get it to CD in the first place? Of of what
medium? Just curious

>>Further proof of this exists in his line about the
>>metallurgist, "I think his insights and the depth of his
>>observations are brilliant." Why are they brilliant?

>It's because of the way he went about investigating the footage.
>He worked with Theresa Carlson and both were skeptical then and
>still are. He and Theresa spent long hours examining the
>footage. The one thing on which they both agree is that the AA
>is a work of art and extremely elaborate for a hoax.

Bottom line apparently is they think its a phony.

>>views support that of Ed, never mind the fact that a
>>metallurgist can't tell if something is metal or not by looking
>>at images only. Never mind the fact that no tests or analysis
>>can be performed by looking at video tape, only. Just how
>>"serious" can a metallurgist look at video tape to determine the
>>metallic properties of the objects displayed within?

>For all the reasons Dennis explained. If you don't agree with
>his reasoning then tell us why. You'll have to view the footage
>to continue this discussion.

>>The irony here is that Ed prefers the opinion of an expert
>>metallurgist about metal he doesn't even have access to over
>>the opinion of an expert videographer about video that he does
>>have access to. In the end, Ed wants other experts to look at
>>AA, but only if they look at it "seriously".

>>What defines "seriously"? Agreeing that AA is real, it would
>>seem.

>I don't understand this response. Are you the videographer? To
>what video do you have access. Roger, I get the impression that
>you've never watched the real Santilli AA. Am I wrong about
>that? Why won't you open your CDs. Then you can tell us what you
>see. Of course I'm going to take the word of a trained metal
>worker who has spent hundreds of hours viewing the debris over a
>videographer who has spent little or no time trying to unravel
>this mystery.

Again only one so called "trained metal worker." Now if you had
a number of so called trained metal workers saying the same
thing as the one dude, that would make it real interesting. I
suspect that if you put this out to a group of trained metal
workers they would disagree with your one guy.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

U-Haul Graphics

From: **Jim Klotz** <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 21:58:03 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:31:10 -0500
Subject: U-Haul Graphics

For those of you interested in just the graphics on U-Haul trailers (and for all I know trucks) check out:

Nevada, New Mexico and the others. See:

<http://www.uhaul.com/supergraphics/archive.html>

- Jim Klotz

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Flash Messages From Space

From: John W. Auchetl <Prauf@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 01:30:07 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:33:59 -0500
Subject: Flash Messages From Space

Oz & ASIA DATA RESEARCH
Phenomena Research Australia

EBK & Researchers,

DATE: 07th Mar 2001
TITLE: Flash in the pan may be messages from outer space.
BY: Richard Macey

"A Sydney astronomer is watching the skies for aliens he suspects may be flashing at us.

Since 1960, scientists involved in the now international Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) have been using radio-telescopes to listen for signals that will tell us we are not alone.

But so far the hunt has been fruitless, turning up just occasional false alarms triggered by stray radio interference from man-made gadgets.

An astrophysicist at the Campbelltown campus of the University of Western Sydney, Dr Ragbir Bhathal, believes the problem is that alien civilisations may be so advanced they have abandoned radio in favour of more sophisticated forms of communication.

"On Earth, we are already moving away from communicating by radio to optical communication with fibre optics and lasers," he said. "By 2050 most of our communications will use light which can carry hundreds of thousands of times more information than a radio signal."

He said that during US President Reagan's failed Star Wars military program of the 1980s scientists designed high energy lasers which could produce nanosecond light pulses.

Studies showed that pulses from extremely powerful lasers placed 100 to 1,000 light years away could be easily detected by a telescope and sensitive detectors. "The flashes would outshine a sun-like star," said Dr Bhathal, who believes aliens could already be using lasers to signal their position.

So, whenever Campbelltown's nights are clear, Dr Bhathal, director of the Australian Optical SETI project, or Oz Oseti, is in the university observatory using its twin telescopes to scan the skies for flashing stars.

He has chosen 200 sun-like stars within 100 light years of Earth to watch. He spends up to five hours a night, observing from five to 10 stars. "So far we have looked at 20 stars," he said. "We haven't found anything at all." He hopes to have examined all 200 within six months, before expanding his search to include 10,000 stars out to 1,000 light years.

He was confident any light signal should be unmistakable. If one telescope spots a flash he will check what the second saw. If

both record a flash he will be confident it was a real event,
not a technical glitch.

Dr Bhathal believes intelligent civilisations must be out there,
despite being hard to find. "Look at how many millions of stars
there are in the universe. It is unreasonable to expect there is
no life on any of them."

Even if he spots a flashing star, he has no plans to flash back.
"It's a search strategy," he said. "Not a
reply strategy."

PRA Australian Sky:
http://members.aol.com/ht_a/praufo/PRA1/austskyhome.htm

Regards,

John W. Auchettl - Director PRA Research

Dr Ron Barnett - Deputy Director

PRA WEB:
<http://members.aol.com/praufo/PRA1/Pra1.htm>

Phenomena Research Australia [PRA]
P.O. Box 523, Mulgrave, Victoria, Australia, 3170
Australian & Asia UFO
1961-2001 - 40 YEARS OF RESEARCH SERVICE
=====

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Article on New York 'Peanut' Video

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 00:52:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:36:03 -0500
Subject: Article on New York 'Peanut' Video

I have just added to my web site an article about a video taken in New York a couple of years ago showing a "peanut" or "double UFO."

Oddly enough the object turned out to be identical to what appeared in a photo shot in Georgia a year earlier. In the Georgia case the witnesses referred to the object as having a "dumbell " shape.

See what you think.

<http://brumac.8k.com/PeanutUFO/PeanutUFO.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 01:44:01 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:39:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:05:15 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Daniel D. Moroff <smoothie7@home.com>
>Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>>"Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", my
>>wife said as the Frasier show ended. I must admit that comedy or
>>not, tonight's show was one of the most cleverly written I've
>>ever seen. Almost 'cutesy'.

>>The gag was; John Glenn is sitting in a sound booth at the radio
>>station and he begins to confess about "all the stuff we saw out
>>there" and, "we couldn't say anything about it because NASA was
>>afraid of a 'War of the Worlds' scenario, and, "I've been an
>>honest man all my life," or "I don't like to be part of anything
>>deceptive"and on and on like that. The 'set-up' in the program
>>was funny/humorous, but the lines and every word that came from
>>Glenn's mouth were loaded for bear. Very powerful stuff even
>>when presented in the context of a comedy show.

>>Ah, I'm imagining things I'm sure. Maybe this is how conspiracy
>>nuts get started! I'll have to keep a close eye on myself to
>>make sure I don't start listening to "Cooper video's." <LOL>

>>Very strange segment of Frasier. And, as 'looney' as it may
>>sound to some out there, I think my wife's simple but honest gut
>>level reaction to it was correct. I think (within the context of
>>a comedy routine) we just heard astronaut and Senator John Glenn
>>_confess_ to the American people on a prime time program. ;)
>

>Was listening to the Art Bell show last night. His guest was
>Richard C. Hoagland.

>Mr. Hoagland made much the same point when referring to that
>particular show. Perhaps, Errol might just want Richard Hoagland
>to come on his show shortly to follow up.

Hi Dan, hi All,

Shoot me now. Ghod help me if I'm on the 'same wavelength' as
Nostradamus Jr. (Mr. Hoagland! <LOL>)

Actually, it wasn't 'funny' to watch. It was a disturbing thing
to listen to. (Comedy routine or not) John Glenn spoke those
lines with his typical sourpuss/deadpan, straight from the
hip, old Marine, hard-core military style that he has.

John Glenn has _always_ been as serious as a heart attack every
time I've seen him speak publicly (news or interview etc.) It
was bone chilling to listen to because he recited the lines as
if he was speaking openly and intimately and _seriously_.tt As if
he was bearing his soul. It 'sounded' like a confession, not a
'reading' of written lines. There was something very spontaneous

and _gut_level_ about the way he spoke.

To hear John Glenn say,

"NASA wouldn't let us say anything because they were afraid of a 'War of the Worlds' scenario."

and,

"I've been an honest man and told the truth all of my life, I don't like being used to deceive anyone."

and,

"You wouldn't believe the stuff we saw while we were up there." Whereupon they cut away to Frazier and Roz in the control room (working out their differences,) with John Glenn in the background waving his arm around in a zipping motion as if describing how the objects they saw moved. The 'laughter' was roaring in the background but it was all just very -sobering.- Disturbing to listen to. There was just something eerie about it.

I'm not kidding, I don't care if anybody thinks I'm being an uncritical fool, I honestly believe we saw an American hero, one of our first astronauts, unburden himself in his old age in a way that left the back door open for denial. (Within the context of a comedy sketch.) I'm sure the Senator didn't care 'how' he told the American people, as long as he got to tell them. I believe he did. It was bone chilling to witness. It was 'too real' to be 'funny.' I wonder how many arms he had to twist to be able to do that? I'd love to know 'whose arms' he twisted!

Regards,

John - Oh Ghod I'm thinking like Hoagland - Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 04:14:54 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:43:56 -0500
Subject: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article

Hello All,

If anyone wishes to read Richard Hall's article, "Conceptualizing UFOs" it is posted at the A.I.C. website. Go to the homepage:

<http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/>

and click on the link for the "Points Of View" page. Richard's article is the first link/selection. It is an excellent piece and recommended reading for all.

I guess it's ok to say it now, (I was sworn to secrecy before!) but I have known Richard for about 5 years and we've communicated many times during that period. I had the privilege appearing with him (and Budd) on a CNN newscast that we did a few years ago. I just want to say what a genuinely intelligent and nice person Richard is. I have always thought very highly of him and I'm proud to know him. We're lucky to have a gentlemen of this caliber involved in ufology and most recently on this List.

Richard followed this List quietly from behind the scenes for some time and I was hoping that he'd jump in one day. Now that he has, the List, and all of us are better for it. Enough, I don't want this to sound like dialog from the "Sammy Maudlin Show." <LOL> But, it is sincerely felt and I wanted him to know that he is held in high regard by a great many people. Myself being one.

Best to all,

John Velez
Webmaster, A.I.C.

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Jones

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 18:52:39 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:47:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Jones

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Labels And Communication
>Date: Fri, 02 Mar 2001 22:14:39 -0000

Hi Richard, Listers

>Since we all tend to throw labels around rather loosely,
>sometimes as epithets, I suggest we discuss the meaning of
>recurring terms so that we can better understand each other and
>facilitate communication. (In the political world it's liberal,
>conservative, radical, middle-of-the-road, anarchist,
>libertarian, etc.)

>I would like to see discussion of what you (each of us) means
>when we label someone as being (in relation to the UFO subject)
>a:

- >(1) skeptic
- >(2) believer
- >(3) debunker
- >(4) scoffer
- >(5) apologist
- >(6) advocate
- >(7) choose your own label

>When I hear the term "debunker" or "scoffer," I tend to think of
>Donald Menzel, Phil Klass, James Oberg...

>The term "skeptic" to me is rather sacrosanct because of my
>philosophical training (though I realize most people don't use
>the term in the traditional philosophical sense).

>To me it is an honorable term to describe critical-minded
>scholars who doubt, but investigate and don't scoff or debunk.
>(To me, that definitely excludes 95% of CSICOP.) I think of Jan
>Aldrich, Dennis Stacy, Jenny Randles, and even myself (except
>that I have become convinced of the probable explanation) as
>being skeptics.

>There is a lot of room for misunderstanding and friction when we
>use these terms carelessly and think that we all mean the same
>thing, which obviously we don't. And often when we use the
>terms, they are intended to be an insult, or at least to have
>strong negative connotations.

I think that you described sCeptics here, not sKeptics. As far as
I am concerned there is a big difference.

Skeptics as far as I am concerned are "wanna be" debunkers,
either/or they purport to be sceptical, but in fact they have
already made up their mind that ET doesn't exist at all, thus
all UFOs can be identified at some point in time, ala Andy

Roberts.

I would consider myself sceptical, but I do hold stock in the Extra Terrestrial Hypothesis.

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 21:24:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 21:50:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Martian Martian Worm/Tunnel - Hatch

>From: Ted Toal <ttoal@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Martian Worm/Tunnel [was: Cydonian Imperative: 3-2-01...]
>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 20:48:03 -0800

>>Date: Fri, 2 Mar 2001 12:41:19 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: Hoagland's "Tunnel"
>>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>The "worm" or "tunnel." This inexplicable formation is one of
>>many.

>>Whatever the "tunnel" is, it's enormous: a seemingly translucent
>>cylindrical formation resting in a gouge in the Martian surface,
>>giving the impression of a subterranean "pipe."

>The impression one gets of a tube or worm is wrong. If you look
>at it with room light shining from the same angle as the sun did
>on the original scene, you can see that the "worm" is actually
>just a valley with what appears to be waves of sand at regular
>intervals along the bottom. This sort of thing seems to be
>common in the area, because there is another one at 38.98 deg.
>lat., 28.35 deg. long.:

>http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

>a bit to the left of the first image in the area image at:

>http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/areas/c_45n015.htm

>And in that second image it is a lot easier to see the valley,
>especially if you rotate the image 180 deg. and place light at
>your upper left.

>Ted Toal

Hello Ted:

That first image is a long download (850K) but worth it.

To my eyes, we have fissures, valleys, perhaps even nice
ancient river channels. They run straight and then curve
nicely like a river channel might.

More telling, is where they widen and narrow, again like a river
channel over varying terrain. It is there that the "sand banks"
widen as well, as one would expect if one accepts this
interpretation. In one spot toward bottom of the image, the
"channel" splits and rejoins, and the sand (if that's what it
is) does likewise.

The "ribbing" then could easily be interpreted as wind blown
sand dunes, and again the image seems to support this, at least
to my eyes.

Thank you for the heads-up on this revealing image.

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:32:27 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:10:30 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hatch

>From: Matt Hurley <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>Hi List,

>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>porn ?

>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>Just a thought

Hello Matt:

That is an interesting question. For what its worth, I suspect there are an awful lot more people interested in UFOs than there are folks who will admit it. This could result, at least in part, from the ridicule factor.

The internet offers anonymity, both for the browser, and even for the person putting up a website if he/she so chooses.

I don't know how many UFO type websites there actually are. I just sent one search engine (Altavista) looking for "UFO", just like that, the single word.

Altavista came up with 464,288 listings! There are a lot of pages/sites devoted to the musical group UFO, so I tried again. My version allows logical operators, so this time I asked for "UFO AND NOT Music". This query pulled in 388,551 listings, any one of them clickable in theory. Note that this disallows any web-pages that mention music regardless.

One of these has to be my own website. I have a hit counter that registers anywhere from 50 to 100 hits per day (when the counter is up that is). Multiply these figures and you have an astounding number of anonymous public "inquiries" into matters ufological, every day; and this does not count the OVNI sites (France, Spain, Latin America..) and other terms used elsewhere.

I need not comment on the quality of most UFO web pages or sites of course. I immediately hit the Back button when I see a grey alien staring out of the screen.

But, the numbers are still amazing.

One thick, wide "fringe"!

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 8](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 11:03:30 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:19:29 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan@aol.com>
=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 6, Number 10
March 8, 2001
Editor: Joseph Trainor

<http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

MALAYSIAN MAN GETS SHANGHAIED INTO SPACE

A 45-year-old man in Malaysia vanished on Tuesday evening, February 20, 2001, and his wife and family say he was abducted by aliens.

"A woman told police" in Tambunan, Keningan district, Malaysia "that her husband became 'invisible' right before her eyes and has not been seen since he vanished."

"Keningan district police chief, Deputy Superintendent Abdul Hadi Baharudin, confirmed that the report was lodged by a housewife who said her husband, hospital attendant Yabi Gistubod, 45, had gone missing."

"However, he declined to give details of the police report saying that they only have been confirmed as a missing-persons case."

"'Like all missing-persons cases, we have flashed the information to all OCPDs (local Malaysian police departments--J.T.) and are seeking the help of the village committee to help track Yabi,' he said."

"Mainis Gampat, mother of eight children, claimed that Yabi suddenly became invisible and vanished into thin air before her eyes just before dinner on" Tuesday, February 20, 2001.

"'We haven't been able to locate him since then,' she told reporters at her home in Kampung Kepayan Baru."

"She claimed that it was the second time her husband had disappeared."

"In the last incident, which occurred two days before his second disappearance (i.e. Sunday, February 18, 2001--J.T.) Mainis said Yabi was found sitting in a bush in a stupor. They sent him for a medical checkup, and he was found to be in good health."

"Yabi's brother-in-law, Mahat Kulimpang, said Yabi had spoken to him of an encounter with a man whom he claimed as an 'alien' with a square body."

"'Yabi told me that the alien wanted him to go to a strange place,' Mahat said."

"He (the alien--J.T.) claimed that Yabi had always wanted to go to that place."

"The night before Yabi disappeared, he was wearing white, and his feet were not touching the ground. When I touched his shirt, it slowly turned black and he soon passed out," claimed Mahat, who seemed puzzled by the phenomenon."

"Police, however, are not ready to comment on the family member statements, saying only that they were searching for Yabi."

The case took a strange twist 11 days later, on Friday night, March 2, 2001 when Yabi suddenly returned--just as mysteriously as he had left.

"A man whose family claimed he was abducted by aliens has returned home after 11 days."

Yabi "was seen walking toward his home in Kampung Kepayan Baru as dogs broke out barking at 10:30 p.m. on Friday."

"He keeps his eyes closed most of the time and communicates with his wife, Mainis, in sign language."

"Doctors found him physically well and have referred him for psychiatric treatment. He is currently under observation in the district hospital."

"I thank God he is back. I thank everyone who helped in the search for my husband," said Mainis, who reported to police that her husband vanished right in front of her eyes after dinner on February 20."

Deputy Supt. Abdul Hadi Baharudin "said yesterday (Sunday, March 4, 2001) that they would record Yabi's statement after he completed his medical treatment."

"We are happy that he was found. We don't know where he went or why he left but he seemed to have returned the same way he left," Baharudin said.

According to Baharudin, "family members told Tambunan police that they heard dogs barking and on checking they found Yabi coming out of a forested area, about 150 meters (500 feet) from his house."

"Yabi was wearing the same white shirt and trousers he was last seen in, police said."

(See the Malaysian newspaper The Star for February 27, 2001, "Wife sees husband 'vanish.'" and for March 5, 2001, "Man who 'vanished' reappears near home." Many thanks to Gerry Lovell for forwarding these newspaper articles.)

(Editor's Comment: Welcome to Alien Week at UFO Roundup. Don't go away, readers. There are more ETs to come.)

CHILEAN COUPLE'S FIRST DATE TURNS INTO AN ENCOUNTER WITH ALIENS

A couple's first date turned into a terrifying encounter with two aliens on the outskirts of the city of Angol in Chile.

Forest technician Ingrid Amalia Sperperg Sepulveda, 26, of Angol, and Patricio Andres Vallejos, 26, who lives in La Serena, first met in a chat room. On Friday, February 16, 2001, Patricio "accepted her invitation and told her that he would arrive on the 8:30 p.m. bus."

Meanwhile, Ingrid asked one of her workmates, a 40-year-old Angol woman who declined to be identified in the newspaper, if she would serve as the couple's chauffeur that evening. The woman agreed and drove Ingrid to the bus station in her car.

"After driving around the city for a while, they decided to go to a lookout located on the outskirts of the city to show the visitor (Patricio) an interesting sight--a beautiful view of Angol, its lights blazing in the night."

"At around 10:55 p.m., they reached the location known as El

Mirador, one kilometer (0.6 miles) to the southeast of Angol, and known to local residents as Las Pinas."

The overlook encompasses a small cliffside park with a driveway and parking lot paved with riprap stones.

"Unlike other nights, there were no other vehicles in the vicinity, only the immensity of the wilderness and the starry sky lit with a gibbous moon. The driver parked her vehicle four meters (13 feet) away from an iron gate adorned with cartwheels, which guards the entrance to a field studded with pine and eucalyptus trees.."

Leaving the vehicle, "Ingrid and Patricio walked some 20 meters (66 feet) to the place from which it is possible to see Angol at night, while the driver waited beside her vehicle. "

"Looking toward the field, Ingrid and Patricio could see a white light rising in a vertical line 150 meters (500 feet) away. At first the couple thought the light was level with the ground, but then they realized that it was at a 45 degree elevation."

"The woman who had remained beside the car then joined the couple, and the trio witnessed that the beam of light spread open like a fan, displaying an orange hue at the base, yellow further up, then red and finally the upper stage in a soft violet tone."

"'It lit up everything for some 40 meters (132 feet) around. The iron gate, all the depressions, the green of the trees and shrubs could clearly be seen,' the witnesses said."

"In its fan-like position, the object began to move slowly in a horizontal direction, without varying its lights. The witnesses were able to behold the phenomenon for three or four minutes."

"'I was quite frightened at the time. My friends enjoyed the whole spectacle but I felt fear and went back to the car. I don't like seeing strange things, and I'm skeptical about UFOs,' Ingrid said."

"While she was in the car, Ingrid tried to light a cigarette but her nervousness kept her from doing so. Seeing her nervousness, the vehicle's owner returned to the car and spoke to her. She tried to open the front right door but the dome light wouldn't work. She had to turn it on manually,' Ingrid said."

"While the event occurred, Patricio and the driver had remained outside the vehicle, and they had heard a sound similar to two bells, which repeated itself with a certain regularity. After the UFO vanished, all three friends began to discuss" what had just occurred.

"'I insisted that we should go home. Patricio tried to calm me down, saying that it was all over. Patricio asked me to come out of the car, and after getting out I stood to the right of the car. My friend (the driver) stood to the left,' Ingrid recalled."

While they talked about the UFO, Ingrid "heard a noise similar to the sound of metal being dragged across riprap. 'That's when I looked up, and behind the iron gate were two figures. They were 1.6 meters (5 feet, 2 inches) tall, dark and slight. They weren't walking. They were dragging themselves along.'"

"'The beings' faces, hands and legs couldn't be seen, and they resembled shadows, with a tunic that covered their slight bodies.'"

"'When I saw them, I looked at Patricio, who was about to ask what was happening. At first I thought it must be people as I struggled to find a rational explanation as to what was going on. I heard the sound of metal. I'm sure the figure on the left carried something strange, two metallic rods, but I don't know what they were.,' said Ingrid."

"The beings stopped about a meter behind the gate, and at that moment, the one of the left phased through the gate and into the presence" of Patricio, Ingrid and the driver. The small

alien "then did a walk-around, turned around and re-entered the field. After it rejoined the other being, the two entities turned around and walked away down the riprap road" leading back into the field.

"After they had walked about two meters, the vehicle's owner turned on the car's high beams (headlights--J.T.) but the entities had already disappeared as if they had made themselves invisible to the car's lights." Although the event "left her speechless, Ingrid 'told Patricio and my friend to please get us back home.'"

"While none of the witnesses communicated with the entities, the women claim having heard the entity" that came beyond the gate "making noises similar to speech. The witnesses also agree that a strange element raised the local temperature and made them feel extremely warm. 'It was as if the heat was concentrated in the space where we stood,' Ingrid said."

"A further detail was added--an odd smell, like burning wiring, filled the air." (See the newspaper Diario de Temuco for February 25, 2001, "A shocking UFO encounter!" Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales, autor de los libros Chupacabras and Other Mysteries y Forbidden Mexico y tambien Gloria Coluchi para eso articulo de diario.)

(Editor's Comment: Next time, Patricio, take her to see The Wedding Planner.)

GIANT ALIEN FRIGHTENS AN ELDERLY COUPLE IN CHILE

Ancient ruins, willow and eucalyptus trees dot the Butaco Valley. Over the past few months, UFOs have been seen in that location, to the north of Angol, with unusual frequency."

"Pedro Rivas drives his horse-drawn wagon at 6:30 in the morning and at 10 o'clock at night for the past three years. But a month ago, as he drove along, he witnessed an incredible sight."

"'There was an enormous thing in the sky that lit up the entire valley. It was orange in color. My horse was spooked, although no noise whatsoever could be heard. The thing was very large and moved very high u. I think it was a thousand meters up,'" Rivas said.

"The 42-year-old sharecropper states that there was another (UFO) incident last month."

"Not far from there, Armando Ulises recalls that late last year (December 2000) he was 'near the willows, by the river bank' with other people when they witnessed three gigantic circular objects one evening. The unknown objects formed a very bright triangle as they traveled."

"'I've only seen it once, but it can't be a satellite or a star, because how are they going to send three satellites into space in such an exact position? I don't think it was a star, either, because the objects were no more than 600 meters (1,890 feet) high.'"

"Seven kilometers (4 miles) into the Butaco Valley is a sparsely-populated area and one soon reaches a tiny white wooden chapel. Behind it dwells Maria Concha Rivas de Husiquil, 77, who doesn't like to discuss the oddities she's seen ."

"'Since 1968 we've seen these lights in the sky, but for a long time we thought we were just seeing things. The last time, my husband and I saw the shape of a giant humanoid about three meters (10 feet) tall. We saw him in a straight line from the house down by the riverside.,' Sra. Husiquil said, 'We didn't dare take a closer look because it frightened us, and we went back inside the house.'"

"Her husband, 84-year-old Mario Husiquil, held his head in his hands and mumbled, 'We don't know what it was, but it was as large as a giant. It frightened us, and we went straight to bed. All of the people around here have seen something strange.'"

"According to the locals, there is a large circular imprint--left behind by a UFO--on one of the local

mountainsides. Local researchers are preparing an expedition to find this location, which is at some point" in the foothills of the Andes. (See the newspaper Las Ultimas Noticias for March 2, 2001, "Local residents share strange experiences: Fireballs seen in Butaco." Otra vez, muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Gloria Coluchi, y gracias especiales a Rodrigo Cuadra para eso articulo de diario.)

"EARTHQUAKE SEASON" HITS FULL STRIDE IN SEATTLE

The (USA's) Pacific Northwest was rocked Wednesday, February 28, 2001, "by the most powerful earthquake to hit the region in 52 years., a 40-second-long tremor that shattered windows, crumbled bricks and buckled pavements across Seattle, and cracked the (state) Capitol dome in Olympia, a dozen miles (19 kilometers) south of the quake's epicenter."

It was the worst earthquake on the USA's Pacific Ocean coastline since the Northridge, California quake of 1994.

About 400 people "were injured, and officials said property damage could run into billions of dollars. The quake, which struck at 10:54 a.m., sent a wave of fright through schools and offices."

"The U.S. Geological Survey said the" earthquake measured 6.8 on the Richter scale and caused "buildings in downtown Portland, Oregon, 175 miles (285 kilometers) south of Seattle, to sway for nearly 30 seconds."

In downtown Seattle, bricks fell from the roof of the Starbucks World Headquarters building, crushing cars in the street below.

About 30 people were trapped in the restaurant atop the Space Needle. Rescuers freed them a few hours later.

"'Within seconds the whole building was swaying back and forth and everyone was yelling, 'Get under your desk!' said Novella Carpenter, a 28-year-old editor at Sasquatch Books, who works on the second floor of a brick office building" in downtown Seattle.

"'From under my desk, I watched a hail of concrete, rock chips, bricks and plaster falling from the upper floors. Afterwards, we all went out into the street and moved to an open space. We were afraid of aftershocks."

In Olympia, Wash., the shock chewed up sidewalks, sending individual blocks poking one meter (3 feet) into the air. "At the Capitol building in Olympia, Maureen Walsh, a Republican legislative assistant, watched a large crack spread across her boss's wall. 'I think what frightened me the most is to realize that this massive building we are in is all marble and stone and it was literally just jumping up and down,' she said."

On Saturday, March 3, 2001, engineers announced that the Capitol roof was very unstable and the building "is uninhabitable."

"The Seattle-Tacoma International Airport sustained structural damage at its control tower and at one of its satellite terminals." The airport was closed for a few hours, and flights were diverted to Portland, Ore. and Spokane, Wash.

Robert Ashton, a Minneapolis-based Northwest Airlines pilot, was taking a shower in a downtown Seattle motel when the earthquake hit."

"'It was fairly strong. I knew right away what it was,' said Ashton, a 14-year pilot who divides his time between Washington state and the Twin Cities" of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota The quake "felt almost like an airplane in moderate turbulence."

In Everett, Wash., north of Seattle, "Tom Doley was at his desk using a phone in an office building on the ground floor. 'I saw the floor move a little bit and then they told us all to evacuate the building,' he said, 'We were out in the street for about 20 minutes' and then it was 'business as usual.'"

"Cindy Haveman was driving her truck with her two children when

the earthquake struck. 'My truck rocked around as if it were on waves and then rolled. I couldn't believe it,' said Haveman, 23, of Ferndale, Wash., about 19 miles (16 kilometers) north of Seattle. Her two children were not hurt."

"In Renton, Wash., 10 miles south of Seattle, Shannon Mediskey, 25, was at her desk designing Web pages for a software company when the quake hit."

"'The carpet was rolling like it was water,' she said, 'I ran to a doorway.'"

Two strong earthquakes also struck in Central America right after the Seattle quake.

"An earthquake that measured 6.0 on the Richter scale struck the center of El Salvador Wednesday," February 28, 2001. "The quake destroyed more buildings in San Pedro Nonualco," which was heavily hit by an earthquake only four days earlier on Saturday, February 24, 2001."

The following day, Thursday, March 1, 2001, "an earthquake measuring 4.6 on the Richter scale rattled a jungle area at 8:35 p.m. According to the Instituto de Seismologia de Panama, the epicenter was located in the Kuna Yala zona indigena (Indian reservation), located 125 kilometers (75 miles) west of Balboa, Panama. The quake collapsed rural houses and toppled tall trees and caused about 205 injuries and one death." (See the newspapers Seattle Times, Tacoma News-Tribune, The Olympian of Olympia, Wash., USA Today, Chicago Tribune, Minneapolis Star-Tribune, St. Paul Pioneer Press and the Wisconsin State Journal for March 1, 2001. Also the Duluth, Minn. News-Tribune for March 4, 2001. Tambem, muito obrigado aos Visitantes Cosmicos por esas informacoes sobre os terremotos em El Salvador e Panama.)

UFOs VISITED TROUT LAKE PRIOR TO THE QUAKE

Two UFOs visited the Self-Mastery Earth Institute a couple of days prior to the magnitude-6.8 earthquake that rocked the state of Washington.

The institute in Trout Lake, Wash., located about 40 miles (64 kilometers) northeast of Portland, Ore. has been the site of many UFO encounters during the year 2000. The institute is located right in the middle of the earthquake zone.

Ranch owner James A. Gilliland reported, "Due to the clouds, rain, snow and subzero temperatures on Mount Adams, there had not been any sightings lately. But that all changed" Sunday night, February 25, 2001 "when we saw at approximately 8:30 p.m. on Sunday night, a very large red-colored object flew over and hovered at around 2,000 feet (600 meters). It was silent, brilliant red and when we signaled it, the object hovered directly over the main lodge."

Although the UFO did not communicate with them or provide any sort of explicit warning about the impending earthquake, Gilliland said the object's motions were "unsettling."

"Not a good sign," he reported, "The brilliant craft, from our understanding, is one that we try to avoid if possible. There were real strange energies all that night, and things did not feel right."

(Editor's Comment: Very interesting! Could the psychics and sensitives at the institute have possibly tuned in on the tectonic stresses building 30 miles (48 kilometers) beneath their feet, deep within the earth?)

"On Monday night, February 26, 2001, , again around 8 p.m., we were outside due to a telepathic signal." The psychics were "feeling a benevolent presence in the area. We looked straight up over the main lodge and saw a very large golden-white object, larger than the first (the red UFO--J.T.) coming in from the north. directly from Mount Adams. It was at a lower elevation, about 1,500 feet . It went directly over the main lodge and then disappeared in the exact location as the earlier object."

(Editor's Note: UFO Roundup received Mr. Gilliland's report 24

hours before the Seattle earthquake.)

Other psychics and seers also successfully predicted the quake.

New Age psychic Veronica Woodruff of Vermont predicted the Seattle earthquake back in August 2000. Veronica had a vision of a newspaper headline reading EARTHQUAKE ROCKS SEATTLE, followed by a terrifying vision of the city's Space Needle swaying back and forth like the Tilt-A-Whirl at the carnival (fun fair in UK--J.T.) while people were screaming.

At a motel-based revival meeting in the USA's Upper Midwest in October 1999, evangelical Christian seers of the Prophecy Club, based in Topeka, Kansas, had visions of "a strong earthquake in the Seattle area, causing billions of dollars of damage."

And in 1985, another evangelical, Pastor Langford, saw "a powerful Northwest earthquake." (Many thanks to James A. Gilliland. Also to Veronica Woodruff. See also The Prophecy Club broadcast for October 14, 1999 and the Call to Prophecy broadcast for September 22, 2000.)

(Editor's Comment: Maybe we should have a Nostradamus Awards ceremony, like the Oscars, to honor the year's most accurate prophets.)

SMALL METEOR HITS A GARDEN IN YORK, UK

A small meteor struck the ground in the city of York in the United Kingdom on Wednesday, February 28, 2001.

"The small meteorite landed in the back garden of a house in York. Police said it left a hole one foot (0.3 meters) wide and three feet (0.9 meters) deep. Officials from the Yorkshire Museum have inspected the hole and confirmed that the object is a meteorite."

"According to North Yorkshire police, a woman was out walking her dog in the Hopgrove section of York when she heard a loud explosion, followed by a rush of air and then saw a smoking crater in a field opposite the (Motorway) A64."

"Sylvia Mercer was out walking her dog when she heard a strange banging noise" just before the meteor hit. (See BBC News for February 28, 2001. Many thanks to Martin Montague for this item.)

DAZZLING UFO SIGHTED OVER DENVER, COLORADO

On Sunday, February 25, 2001, Elizabeth Wilson saw a bright UFO near Cheeseman Park in Denver, Colorado.

"I live in a 12-story highrise (apartment building--J.T.) about 25 blocks from downtown Denver," she reported, "My place is across from Cheeseman Park. I went upstairs at 7:10 p.m., out onto the roof. And the sky was so clear you could see many stars. I was just about to go back inside and was looking straight ahead over the east end of the park when right before my eyes appeared a UFO. The object was about two blocks away, also a whitish-blue light that burst into being. I would say it was the size of maybe two small helicopters. It hovered only momentarily and then it streaked in a very straight line due west. When it was about 15 to 20 blocks west of the park, it disappeared completely and as instantaneously as it had first appeared." (Email Form Report)

NEAR SENDS ITS LAST SIGNAL FROM EROS

The Near Earth Asteroid Rendezvous (NEAR) spacecraft "which landed on Eros February 12, 2001," concluded its mission on Friday, March 2, 2001 "after a two-week mission extension to gather bonus scientific data from the space rock's surface."

"NEAR sent its last piece of information to NASA's Deep Space Network Wednesday, February 28, ending a five-year voyage that exceeded all expectations."

"'This mission has been successful far beyond what was in the original mission plan,' mission director Robert Farquhar said."

"Besides orbiting the asteroid for a year, NEAR also got photos

of another asteroid--Mathilde--and was the first (Earth) spacecraft to land on an asteroid."

'All this at no extra cost,' said Farquhar, who is based at John Hopkins University's Applied Physics Laboratory in Laurel, Maryland. 'When you talk about 'faster, cheaper, better,' this is 'better.'"

"The \$223 million mission, launched in 1996, was expected to end after its year-long circling of the 21-mile-long (34-kilometer-long) asteroid, over 196 million miles (315 million kilometers) from Earth."

"Not only did the craft land gently enough that its solar panels continued to operate, but it continued to send back data to Earth," which allowed NASA scientists "to receive more data from the spacecraft's Gamma Ray Spectrometer." (Many thanks to Steve Wilson for this NASA news release.)

AREA 51 PLAYS HOST TO BIG ALLIED AIR MANEUVERS

Nevada's Nellis Air Force Base, Groom Lake, better known as Area 51, and the Tonopah Bombing Range will host the biggest Allied air maneuvers in years, Exercise Red Flag 01-3.

The exercise will be divided into three training periods, each one lasting about two weeks. Following morning class work, pilots from the participating countries fly missions from 1 p.m. to 10 p.m. over the mountain and desert terrain of southeastern Nevada.

Red Flag 01-3 involves 120 fighter aircraft and 7,000 personnel from the six participating countries, plus support cargo aircraft and helicopters.

Fighter squadrons involved in the training missions include squadrons from the U.S. Air Force, the UK's Royal Air Force, France's Armee de l'Air, Germany's Luftwaffe, Spain's Fuerza Aerea de Espana and the Singapore Air Force.

According to Norio Hayakawa of Groom Watch, "Residents of the Las Vegas Valley and east of Area 51 are witnessing an increase of military aircraft during the operation," which began on Saturday, March 3, 2001.

This week's exercises include USAF F-16 Fighting Falcons, F-15 Eagles, B-52 Stratofortress bombers, E-2 Sentries and KC-135 Stratotankers. Allied aircraft include RAF GR-7 Harriers from UK, EF-18 Hornets from Spain, Tornados from Germany and F-16s from Singapore.

"The best viewing for the exercises is at the rear (north) fate of Area 51," Hayakawa added. (Many thanks to Norio Hayakawa for this news story.)

IN MEMORIAM

DESMOND LESLIE, AUTHOR AND PILOT

Desmond Leslie, author of Flying Saucers Have Landed, passed away at his home in the south of France last weekend. He was 79.

Leslie came by his interest in the paranormal early in life. He was born in Castle Leslie, near Glaslough, County Monaghan, Ireland. The castle "is said to be the most haunted in Ireland and is best known to researchers of the paranormal for its levitating bed."

He attended Trinity College, Dublin. When World War Two broke out in 1929, he joined the RAG and became fighter pilot. His military career was a little less than spectacular, though. During the war, he crashed two Supermarine Spitfires and one Hawker Hurricane. "Famous for his aerial pranks, he was court-martialed for flying under a bridge and for clipping the sign off a pub" with his plane's wingtip.

In the early 1950s, Leslie met George Adamski, the first of the UFO contactees of that era. He questioned Adamski about his experience in California's Mohave Desert in November 1952, and wrote Flying Saucers Have Landed. Published two years later,

the book became an international bestseller.

In the 1960s, Leslie continued his paranormal studies and hung out with rock stars Mick Jagger and Marianne Faithfull. Leslie was married twice, first to stage actress Anne Bernelle and later to Helen Strong, who was with him at the time of his death. During his final days, he told family and friends that he was cheerfully "releasing my atoms to Mother Earth, Goddess Gaia." (See the Irish Independent for March 4, 2001. Many thanks to Chris Rolfe of UFOMEK for forwarding the obituary.)

From the UFO Files...

1932: NORTH CAROLINA'S FIRE POLTERGEIST

A rare but repetitive phenomena in the annals of Forteanism is the fire poltergeist. This is a series of mysterious fires, usually featuring blue flames, that breaks out spontaneously and repeatedly in a single house or location.

One of the most famous fire poltergeist cases in USA history took place in the small town of Bladenboro, North Carolina in January 1932.

Mrs. C.W. Williamson, a middle-aged housewife, was wearing a cotton dress, and it suddenly "unaccountably burst into flames. She was not standing anywhere near a heater, fireplace or stove. She was not smoking. She had not saturated her dress with cleaning fluid or any substance that might have caused combustion."

"The flaming dress was torn from her body by her husband and teenaged daughter. All that remained of the frock was a charred rag, yet Mrs. Williamson did not suffer a single burn. Neither did her husband or daughter, although they had ripped the dress free with their bare hands. Later that same day, a pair of Mr. Williamson's trousers in a closet were reduced to ashes."

"On the following day, while the family and friends watched, a bed burst into flames, and the bedclothing was destroyed. A set of curtains in an unused room burned to ashes. "

"For three days, fires destroyed various objects in the home, then vanished without spreading to flammable materials lying below or beside the objects. Witnesses included (Bladenboro) Mayor J.A. Bridger; Dr. S.S. Hutchinson, the family physician' and J.B. Edwards," the health agent from Wilmington, N.C.

"The bluish flames, similar to those from a natural gas jet, consumed materials rapidly without changing color, but without burning anyone who tried frantically to put them out.. 'There was no smoke and little odor from the strange flames,' according to the AP account."

"On the fourth day the (Williamson) family moved out, and the police moved in. Arson and fire control experts checked the house for any materials that might cause spontaneous combustion. They found none. Electricians unsuccessfully searched the wiring. Gas company experts could locate no leak. Yet the weird blue flames continued to appear out of thin air under the noses of the helpless officers."

"'The fires have burned and vanished as if guided by an invisible hand,' the AP reported, 'There has been no logical explanation.'"

"The fires disappeared on the fifth day. The Williamsons moved back into their house, somewhat nervously. But they had nothing more to fear. It was all over." (See the book Mysterious Fires and Lights by Vincent H. Gaddis, Van Rees Press, New York, N.Y. 1967, pages 188 and 189. Also True Strange magazine for March 1957.)

Well, that's it for this week. Will the current flurry of alien sightings continue? We'll find out next week in "the paper that goes home-- UFO Roundup." See you then!

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2001 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their websites or in newsgroups provided that they credit the

newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan@aol.com>
or use the Sighting Report Form at:

http://ufoinfo.com/forms/form_sighting.htm

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>

UFOINFO: <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives of the UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences,
UFO + PSI Magazine also available, plus archives of
Filer's Files and Oz Files.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:20:56 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 05:39:57 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Randles

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 15:13:41 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 21:33:23 -0600

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 20:51:37 EST
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>>Date: Sat, 3 Mar 2001 18:40:58 -0600

>><snip>

>>>Hi Dennis,

What is the model of behavior or activity expected for ET
>UFO's? Your responses to my posting seem to tacitly assume some
>model of alien behavior against which the UFO phenomenon is
>constantly being tested and found to fall short. But we need to
>know what is this model or hypothesis of ET behavior, its MO,
>its operational pattern, its strategic posture? I am going to
>go through your posting and point out this implicit model and
>ask what it is each time.

Hi,

All valid questions.

I have been thinking about this debate (during daily trips to
the hospital) and wonder if we might not be able to do something
together, as a community, rather than continue needlessly to be
at one another's throats.

The net is a powerful tool but is rarely used beyond its fun
value as a talking shop.

Although I know there is a lot of negativity about UFOIN, it
exists in the UK as a working UFO investigators list - not a
forum (that's why it is invitation only) - and it operates very
successfully in the limited brief that it has to pursue UK cases
in extreme depth.

However, it seems to me that this net debate shows the ETH is
clearly a viable hypothesis for the phenomenon and all that we
seem to disagree over is whether or not there is sufficient
evidence for it to be taken seriously by science.

In fact this seems one of the few issues that believers,
skeptics - in fact all shades in between - agree upon in

principle.

So why not use that to do something positive?

Could we not create a net based 'panel' specifically involving - say - 16 people. These people could be nominated to the list by colleagues on the basis of their experience in the field and their willingness to engage in the work required. Many major groups could be represented. CSICOP and CUFOS could - for instance - work together this way!

We could agree up front that, say, four panel members be designated pro ETH Ufologists, four anti ETH Ufologists, four uncommitted researchers and four from outside the field (eg relevant experts such as cosmologists and exobiologists).

This list would then debate between themselves one question - what evidence does Ufology need to provide in order to demonstrate to science a working fact based argument that extraterrestrials may indeed have visited the earth / or still be doing so?

Evidence that we can then - as a community - put before science and ask them to judge on the merits as they would evidence for any other controversial theory.

With this multi-faceted panel behind it and with that panel being sponsored by the UFO community as a whole across all shades of opinion then science would be hard pressed not to at least give this evidence the time of day.

Once a protocol for the evidence needed to set before science is created by this nominated net based panel, then it should be published to Ufology as a whole with the challenge to all researchers to provide specific data from their own first hand study into the project that they think matches this required scenario.

The 'panel' should then debate each offered case between themselves and issue a statement / discussion regarding its views on the merits / demerits of that case back to the UFO community to comment as they wish.

After, say, a six month period, we will see what evidence Ufology has come up and set before the panel and that we can then put before science.

Provided the selection of this panel is done fairly (i.e. by free nomination of all) and that the make up is evenly balanced (as suggested giving a voice to all sides) and its actions are entirely and immediately published in full and so publicly accountable to Ufology - wouldn't this be a useful way to progress (rather than stagnate) this important debate?

It is just an embryonic idea and its basis, make up, numbers, form of publishing are open to alternative suggestions.

But do you think it could work and that we can all try - for once - to pull together and engage in a serious, non polemical or political community project that would have genuine merits and expunge emotional point scoring for who knows what end result?

It has to be worth a go.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:23:05 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 05:42:56 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Randles

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 14:46:47 -0000

>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 18:25:56 +0000
>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>>>Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists
>>>about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO
>>>partisans (pro and con)?

>>>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>>>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>>>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>>>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>>>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>>>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>>>ALL of you!

>>I was wondering, who first brought this to light on UpDates? And
>>for what purpose, if debate wasn't the main one?

>Roy,

>Finger-pointing and name-calling is not debate. What is being
>"debated" here is who is the bigger liar or distorter of
>information. I doubt that's the purpose of this List.

Hi,

With respect Dick I don't recall doing any of this in my
messages. All I recall is posting what information I could on
the already revealed air crew interviews and my opinion of same
as well as asking for patience for the appearance of the full
report.

I also recall saying that I won't make my mind up on where we
now stand with regards to the full case until I see all the data
tied together by that report.

I don't find that to be fairly described as posturing or
unscientific. It just seems to me to be the sensible way to go
about this matter.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 06:30:12 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 05:45:26 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Strickland

>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 15:25:42 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 23:54:37 -0500

>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 12:43:53 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>>>Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 10:41:57 -0500

Listers:

First, thanks John for posting the picture. It's truly remarkable. If it's not a hoax, it's mighty interesting. You wrote:

>>>I don't get all the "sand dune" talk. We're (some of us) not
>>>looking at anything that even remotely resembles a sand dune or
>>>a series of them. I am looking at clearly tubular structures
>>>with some kind of large spherical object "inside" of it. If you
>>>don't see those features, you're looking at the wrong images!
>>>Period.

Sand dune is a stretch. I've studied those. Not likely with the parallel striations so symmetrical all along the form. The form looks segmented, spherical, with contact to ground, much like a snail, maggot or slug moves. Something spherical appears to be inside the form in 2 distinct places (eyes)?

In my humble opinion we are looking at a worm.

Sue

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmborg

From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 07:46:20 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 05:54:18 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Lehmborg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 16:22:08 -0600

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:33:08 EST
>>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 20:27:09 -0000

>>>>From: Matt Hurlled <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>>>To: "UFO Updates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

>>>>>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>>>>>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>>>>>Internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>>>>>porn?

>>>>>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>>>>>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>>>>>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>>>>>Just a thought

>>>>>Thanks for your observation. I hope it has more to do with
>>>>>something other than a shared obscenity of content.

>>Hey! Anyone think they know what obscenity is? Is it the same
>>stuff that causes prurient thought while having no artistic or
>>educational value, like the US supreme court said? But doesn't
>>_that_ sound like every American TV commercial you've ever seen?
>>Sex is kept dirty in this country. And you know what? So are
>>UFOs.

>>>>The majority
>>>>(probably large majority) of UFO sites contain strong evidence
>>>>of uncritical thinking and include mounds of garbage,
>>>>unfortunately. I fear that more often than not they contain
>>>>sociological data about human beings rather than serious or
>>>>useful information about the UFO phenomenon.

>>Which is almost the same thing on another level, but you haven't
>>taken into account why they might have less 'useful' or
>>'serious' information (or how you can feel so comfortable
>>pronouncing on it, BTW). I see a lot of easy smugness in your
>>communication. The sociological data you suggest might be

>>gathered would yield a trove of unsettling information on the
>>mechanics of their ignorance, wouldn't you agree? And coming (no
>>pun intended) number two after porn only means that it is
>>important to a lot of people, reflects theirs thoughts and
>>fears, and accurately paints their justified suspicions. They're
>>interested despite the ridicule so quickly shoveled upon it. Be
>>not smug. There's not a whole lot of difference between the
>>ignorance you allude to and the knowledge of anyone else. This
>>kind of talk is just whistling past the graveyards of the
>>aggregate fear.

>>>This brings to mind the tiresome repetition of Nocturnal Light
>>>reports, sans times, directions and sometimes even dates, which
>>>are so often posted far and wide.

>>Most of it's fake, Mr. Young. Some of it is not. There's a whole
>>universe of strange actuality in that remaining fraction. I
>>would think that you would be made uncomfortable, and that's why
>>you can't be too blithely smug.

>>>The late Donald Menzel used to talk of Saucer Addicts.

>>Aren't most of them college educated? Ever wonder why
>>revolutions almost always start in college?

>>>I'm
>>>afraid that much of what seems to pass for investigative
>>>activity is only masturbatory in nature.

>>Remember that when you point a finger somewhere else, you point
>>three back at yourself. Or, what brings you to the List?

>>>Present company excepted, of course!

>Well, aren't we smug!

No, actually, but certainly not in a way that is deconstructive
or negative if 'we' are. You confuse smugness for confidence,
sir. That confidence comes from a clear eyed ability to
accurately identify an insider attitude, and so be able to
recognize it when I see it.

>See how easy it is to label people rather
>than to respond to the substance of their arguments.

The labels, albeit implied in this post, were your own, sir.
They are more clearly articulated in "The CUFONSM Interview of
Richard Hall" When you pronounce with no small amount of venom
(when asked about the "Most important aspect of UFology
today?"):

..."Cleaning house by becoming more professional, applying
rigorous scientific standards for analysis of data, and
expression of strong disapproval of mystics, clowns,
opportunists, New Agers, and others who make a shambles of our
work and bring discredit on our heads because we seem to go
along with them and tolerate them."

What you and the rest of the "insiders" yet fail to take into
account is that your rigorous application of scientific
standards and its self limiting analysis of data (that likely
changes because you have looked at it), confines itself to a
narrow band of the total experience, you must agree. I don't
think humanity is yet capable of the aggregate grok that you
insist must lie only in the use of one tool, the scientific
method. Measurement is contingent on assumption, and how does
one measure assumption, sir?

As to the "response to substance" you appealed to... that's
quite a projection on your part, Mr. Hall, and talk about
pot-kettle-black... I responded exactly to your substance,
narrow fielded as it was and is. You addressed none of mine.
Your expressions of "strong disapproval" that would
de-legitimize investigation outside your through-the-tissue-tube
manner of viewing things ufological -- does not do ufology short
term credit, and in the long run keeps it in the purview of
charlatans and scalawags. Your approach does not satisfy the
souls of people, provides no satisfaction or explanation -- does
not illuminate or demystify. Reality is more than the scientists
that pronounce upon it. Man does not live by bread OR science
alone. Moreover, our ufological ignorance does not come from a

predisposition to stupidity. It comes from the mechanisms contrived and in place to keep us stupid. Critical thinking is not rewarded in our society, Mr. Hall. It is, in fact, discouraged and punished.

>I was not
>trying to define obscenity (though both obsession with human
>genitalia and sex acts, and various violent crimes against
>humanity might equally qualify). Otherwise, I have no idea what
>you are talking about.

Well, forgetting for a moment that I think you know exactly what I'm talking about -- we'd have to define obsession as it regards the quickened interactions of selected bits of billion year old carbon and that the intense interest in it must only come about as a result of the cross-purposed ignorance with it. Same as UFOs.

>As for what is "useful" or "serious" information about UFOs,
>perhaps you should define your terms rather than denigrating my
>comments, and then we might be able to discuss the issue
>rationaly.

Where sir -- was my denigration? I merely pointed out complacent assumptions you are making. I suspect that is what's jerked a knot in your parochial tail. Moreover, our discussion will not be rational if it restricts itself to the use of one tool, even if it arguably is the sharpest one in the shed.

>My views are amply on record. I feel comfortable in
>commenting on it (not "pronouncing") because I have a long track
>record of serious-minded research and investigation.

A proud appeal to authority added to the heap of assumption and fallacious thinking that seems to chronical the insider approach. It doesn't seem to have lessened the load of intellectual discomfort that the field suffers... perhaps you should consider evolving your paradigm.

>And what is your excuse?

Glad you asked, Mr. Hall. I'm the guy on site researching the material and subject to that investigation's slings and arrows and thousand natural shocks. I'm the guy who has to personally pay the freight for a rational interest in a subject that has all the hallmarks of being the next step up in human evolution. I'm the guy assessing masses of evidence that is photographic, physical, historical, anecdotal, and personal. I'm the guy that suffers evidence that is dismissed and ridiculed by suspect persons religiously fundamental about the exclusive use of one tool.

I had a career inexplicably blow up over my very rational and balanced ufological interests. It's costing me. I want some freaking answers, sir, and get a little anxious when I see the ufological insiders smirking at the rank and file while doing nothing whatsoever to ameliorate the mechanisms that keep them ignorant in the first place. ...My excuse, such that it is.

On reflection, you fundamentalist science worshippers don't fill the bill, I imagine, because you don't follow that one rule of science to go where the evidence takes you. If that direction heads off to the uncomfortable, inconvenient, or unprofitable (?) then that direction is the direction generally not traveled. Disturbed by the attitude of the insider and convinced that the job is just not getting done in an intelligently inclusive manner, I'm compelled to my own research, investigation, and report.

A lot of our conclusions and speculations are in parallel, sir. Our synergy might be key, perhaps even necessary in the successful search for real answers and better questions -- it's obvious that you're not getting there on your own. There are only more tongues in more cheeks, and that's not ALL the fault of the mystics, clowns, opportunists, New Agers, and '*others'. Be careful what you dismiss out of hand. Like any fundamentalist, you'd toss the tot with the bathwater.

Now -- pull my finger. <g>.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

Check out "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Hostpros URL.
<http://www.worldwiderenaissance.org>
or <http://www.alienview.net>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually.
He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put
one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention
he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail.
\$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see
from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by
the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

About Whitley Strieber

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:21:12 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 05:56:05 -0500
Subject: About Whitley Strieber

Hi to All,

My twin interests in folklore and CEIII/IV narratives have drawn me to the books of Whitley Strieber many times. As I am fascinated by his remodelling of the Celtic fairy faith but unconvinced by the bulk of his allegedly auto- biographical anecdotes, I would like to receive comments from others with information regarding his work. (I am aware of the official and unofficial sites dealing with his writings.)

One doubt that bugs me is his claim that he prophecied the depletion of the ozone layer in 1985 while co-writing the fictional novel Nature's End with Jim Kunetka. To my knowledge - and I'd like to be corrected if need be - Japanese scientists discovered the reality of the ozone problem in 1984, though in fact two other scientists, Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina, already predicted such an event in the 1970s.

In 'The Secret School' Strieber writes that another imaginary glimpse of the future, a nuclear accident resembling Chernobyl, "was considered so improbable at the time that it was edited out of the published version of Nature's End" (page 192 of my now tatty paperback edition).

My first thought on reading this was that if an effort was made to keep Strieber's and Kunetka's ideas within the bounds of possibility, the depletion of the ozone layer must have been considered a real enough idea to be included in the novel.

So what indication existed that led them to this conclusion if not the Japanese findings or the earlier predictions of Rowland and Molina?

In passing I would like to add that until I read The Secret School, Strieber had been gradually winning me over with his claims of having experienced something out of the ordinary. So I was disappointed to find that his fourth book was just a clumsy patchwork of the bestselling esoteric topics of the time: abductions, Cydonia, Star Trek physics, mock 'Celestine Prophecy'-type 'lessons,'and New Age predictions about the future. Stanton Friedman's comment printed on the first page was that the book was 'Hard to put down.' I can honestly say I found it hard to pick up, for fear of what new absurdity I might find each time.

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 10:46:08 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:36:10 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 19:13:29 -0400
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>So what? It's up to you to disprove it-not the other way around.
>Just sniping away, Bob, proves or disproves nothing.

Hi, Don:

Well, I beg to differ with you here. It is the responsibility of the proponent of a hypothesis to prove it, not the skeptics. Bruce's stated hypothesis, here, being that what Arnold saw were structured craft created by non-human intelligences, and that Arnold's testimony to their brightness and speed, alone, is sufficient to accept this hypothesis as proved.

There is a role for scoffing, skepticism or whatever you want to call it. Otherwise, any idea, no matter how outlandish or impossible, must be accepted until proven wrong. You might be confusing American-English criminal law, where one is presumed innocent until proven guilty, with science, where ideas are presumed to be false, unless their case is proven.

The two are actually opposite.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 10:46:09 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:39:09 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 11:33:08 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Matt Hurlled <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
>>>To: "UFO Updates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: The Paradox Of Urology
>>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 17:10:35 -0000

Matt originally asked:

>>>Has it struck any of you a paradox that although Ufology is
>>>considered a fringe interest with the general public, on the
>>>Internet it is almost one of the most popular subjects after
>>>porn?

>>>It seems as if the minority of those interested in the subject
>>>seem destined or compelled to create sites, thus creating a
>>>disproportionate amount of UFO sites on the web.

>>>Just a thought

I commented:

>>This brings to mind the tiresome repetition of Nocturnal
>>Light reports, sans times, directions and sometimes
>>even dates, which are so often posted far and wide.

and then I added, perhaps indelicately:

>>The late Donald Menzal used to talk of Saucer Addicts.
>>I'm afraid that much of what seems to pass for
>>investigative activity is only masturbatory in nature.

You jumped in:

>Well, aren't we smug! See how easy it is to label people rather
>than to respond to the substance of their arguments. I was not
>trying to define obscenity (though both obsession with human
>genitalia and sex acts, and various violent crimes against
>humanity might equally qualify). Otherwise, I have no idea what
>you are talking about.

Dick:

Sorry if you misunderstood. I was commenting on the question
which Matt posed, related to the Internet. Please note my use of
the word, "posted". My comments referred to the posting of
fragmentary reports of night lights which the Internet so ably
distributes, periodically. I think most followers of this List
have seen many examples, we get them often. I was not, in any
way, referring to your recent book, or for that matter, the
article you posted recently.

>As for what is "useful" or "serious" information about UFOs,
>perhaps you should define your terms rather than denigrating my
>comments, and then we might be able to discuss the issue
>rationaly.

I mentioned missing information, such as directions of sightings, times of sightings and even missing dates of sightings.

I was not commenting upon your post, but Matt's. I just included the reference to your post because you were in the discussion. Sorry if you are so touchy.

>My views are amply on record. I feel comfortable in
>commenting on it (not "pronouncing") because I have a long track
>record of serious-minded research and investigation. And what is
>your excuse?

I am not sure that I follow the question. Is this the part where we waive around our professional Ufologist's credentials, or what?

Respectfully,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:46:38 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:44:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: 02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers
>Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2001 10:38 PM
>Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

>>Hi All,

>>"Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", my
>>wife said as the Frasier show ended. I must admit that comedy or
>>not, tonight's show was one of the most cleverly written I've
>>ever seen. Almost 'cutesy'.

> An edited transcript:

> Astronaut Senator John Glenn guesting on 'Frasier' sits at mic.
> in Frasier's radio studio awaiting Roz who's producing the space
> documentary special he's narrating. Glenn chides himself for
> falling for a Frasier 'catch-Roz'. Roz is confronting Frasier in
> her control room behind glass in background]

> Glenn: [To himself & microphone] It's my nature to be honest,
> and, you know...

> Back in those glory days I was very uncomfortable when
> they asked us to say things that I didn't want to say and
> deny other things...

> [Cut to Roz & Frasier Glenn now other side of glass audio monitor
> muted - they hassle - cut back to studio]

> Glenn: Some people ask, you know, "were you alone out there?" We
> never gave the real answer and yet, we've seen things out
> there, strange things.

> ...But we know what we saw out there and we couldn't...
> We couldn't really say anything and... And the bosses
> were scared of this.

> They were afraid of "war of the worlds" type stuff and...
> And about panic in the streets and so we had to keep
> quiet. And now we only see these things in our... Well,
> in our nightmares or... Or maybe in the, in the movies
> and some of them are pretty close to being the truth.

> [Cut to Roz & Frasier - Glenn other side of glass still talking,
> using finger& thumb on forehead to describe one-eyed alien -
> studio monitor still muted - R & F hug make up - Glenn comes
> into control room]

> Glenn: Uh... Look, uh, about what I just said out there - can we
> just keep that between us?

> Roz: [Turning to audio cassette machine in rack and popping tape]

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?

> Oh! Of course, senator.

> Glenn: Good. Well... Oh, wait. You were recording all that?

> Roz: Yeah, but that's okay. We've got plenty of tape.

> Glenn: I'm going to need that tape. [Takes cassette, heads back into studio]

> Roz: Whenever you're ready, Senator.....

>>Very strange segment of Frasier. And, as 'looney' as it may sound to some out there, I think my wife's simple but honest gut level reaction to it was correct. I think (within the context of a comedy routine) we just heard astronaut and Senator John Glenn confess to the American people on a prime time program. ;)

> Glenn was having himself a good time his visual descriptions through the glass spoke

This is truncated, Errol.

But, does anyone else agree that this is just the kind of ufological occurrence or happenstance that smears the line of credulity into the state we have today? A lot can get hidden or gets unethical cover in something like this. I'm tired of this pussyly slow break-in to the paradigm shift, if that's the point. We've had our toe in the water, we know it's cold, but we also badly need a bath. Let's get it over with.

Lehmberg@snowhill.com

~~0~~

EXPLORE "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Hostpros URL.

<http://www.alienview.net> or

<http://www.worldwiderenaissance.org>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:52:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:45:58 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 19:28:27 EST
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 13:53:56 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>Just to make sure that we're all on the same page here, I have
>>posted a temporary webpage (it will be down on 3/ 8) which has
>>the images I have been talking about. Please go to:

>><http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/worm/worm.html>

>>Kindly note that:

>>1. One of the "arches" goes over the spherical object. Please
>>take careful note of the direction of the "arches." They go
>>over' the tube, definitely not 'under' it.

Howdy Young Bob, hi All,

Bob writes:

>John, List:
>
>I think that the "spherical object" is a crater. The bright
>spot (if one sees a sphere it could be a specular reflection)
>could be bright material (sand or frost?) at the bottom of the
>crater. Or, alternatively, it could represent a rock face on
>the interior slope which reflects the Sun. Note such
>reflections from the outsides of small craters in the vicinity.

I agree that the 'sphere' is a natural formation of some kind.
Although my perception is more of a 'mound' or rounded hill.
There is something unusually reflective at the top. It could
be frost as you say or it could be the stretched covering of
whatever that tube is made out of. The 'sphere' whatever
it is, seems to have stretched/distended the portion of the
'tube' that it resides in. The whole area has all the same
topological features as an earthly mud flat. It's the tube
thing that's really got me by the ya-ya's.

>It sure is curious looking, though.

Oh you betcha! Very curious indeed. Whatever it turns out to be,
it'll represent something new, whether in terms of known geology
or as an anomaly.

Damn Bob, coming from you, even an admission that you find
anything "curious" about this feature makes me feel like I
converted the Pope to Paganism! <LOL>

Warm regards,

John Velez ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 13:40:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:49:25 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's words into
>>a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

>Lan:

>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>testimony or not?

>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>ETH, based upon belief or not?

I don't know why you would ask Lan about my belief.

But anyway, the answer to 1 depends upon what you mean by "supported." Certainly we have Arnold's testimony. There was also the testimony of Fred Johnson who claimed to have seen the same objects just after Arnold. (Johnson was south of Arnold in the Cascade Range at the time). And there was a report that a forest fire ranger in a lookout tower may have seen the same objects (I don't think there anyone located the person... don't recall now.) Moreover, Arnold's testimony is quite clear in terms of what he says he saw and there is no evidence that he was "out of his mind" (drunk, delusional, etc.)

So, if you mean that we have no physical evidence for support, no photos, film or radar tracks, etc., you are correct. Testimony only.

The answer to 2 is no, if you mean ETH = extraterrestrial entities. What I have argued is that the Arnold sighting by itself (with support from Johnson if you wish) is sufficient to prove that something unusual happened and, furthermore, based on the description of the objects he saw and their speed capabilities, the phenomenon involved solid objects that could fly at high speed... a sort of "aircraft" or "flying craft"... that was not a product of "dumb" natural processes (not flat, semicircular meteor shapes that happened to zip by, not mylar coated pelicans zooming along) but rather a product of intelligence.. manufactured objects... but not our (human) intelligence because we didn't have airplanes that could do what Arnold claimed those objects did (and Johnson... claiming that they affected his compass, had a "tail" in the back waving back and forth, were traveling faster than anything he had seen before and were last seen "standing on edge banking into a cloud"; Johnson had a good view of the objects through his telescope; Johnson's sighting is the FIRST sighting listed as unidentified

by Project Sign/Grudge/Blue Book). So I have argued that SOME UFO sighting point toward the presence of Other Intelligences/ Non-Human Intelligence.

The ET hypothesis is, I have argued, the _conceptually simplest, most direct_ way to explain the presence of OI/NHI sightings around the world.

That does not mean that Arnold's sighting proves the ETH but rather that Arnold's sighting is evidence of OI/NHI as opposed to ice meteors, motes in the eye, mirages, wave clouds, clouds of billowing snow, reflections from dust and haze layers, water drops on the windshield, ordinary military aircraft (only 6 miles away), US secret aircraft, USSR secret aircraft, meteors, swans and pelicans (all explanations offered in the past)..

Could the ETH be wrong? Sure. Until we can follow a craft from the earth to another planet or perhaps a mothership way out in the solar system, somewhere we can't be sure.

But of one thing I am sure: They Are Here, whoever they are, wherever they came from. And I wish they would go away (they introduce yet another uncertainty into human affairs... and human affairs generally don't like uncertainty)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 8 Mar 2001 11:45:55 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:51:50 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hamilton

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 19:28:27 EST
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 13:53:56 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>Just to make sure that we're all on the same page here, I have
>>posted a temporary webpage (it will be down on 3/ 8) which has
>>the images I have been talking about. Please go to:

>><http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/worm/worm.html>

>>Kindly note that:

>>1. One of the "arches" goes over the spherical object. Please
>>take careful note of the direction of the "arches." They go
>>over' the tube, definitely not 'under' it.

>John, List:

>I think that the "spherical object" is a crater. The bright
>spot (if one sees a sphere it could be a specular reflection)
>could be bright material (sand or frost?) at the bottom of the
>crater. Or, alternatively, it could represent a rock face on
>the interior slope which reflects the Sun. Note such
>reflections from the outsides of small craters in the vicinity.

>It sure is curious looking, though.

It is difficult for me to see this as a crater as it appears to
be embedded in the glass-like tube. I guess appearances can be
deceiving, but I think we need to use image analysis on this one
to look more closely at the specular reflection and surrounding
pixels to determine whether the surface is concave or convex if
possible.

Bill Hamilton

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 22:44:01 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:55:21 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall

I am pleased to report that 10 or 12 requests for my article already have been received from across three continents. Just think: When I first started seriously investigating UFOs there were no personal computers, no world wide web, and my electric typewriter at NICAP was "high tech."

The space program had just begun and no one had been to the Moon, and no space probes to the planets and beyond. Major Keyhoe used a Dictaphone and the most common airliners were DC-6s or DC-7s.

Anyway, those of you who spell things weirdly certainly may change "center" to "centre" and "skeptic" to "sceptic" if you wish. Also note that two-thirds of the way down page two I misspelled anthropologists as "anthopologists." Otherwise, I look forward to comment, feedback, and discussion.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:27:57 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:22:03 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hall

>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 04:06:30 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

<snip>

>>> <http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

<snip>

I hadn't really been paying attention to this thread, since I have had it up to here with wild claims about "artifacts" on Mars, but when someone I admire (Josh Goldstein) alerted me to the Arthur Clarke image...Wow! This either has to be a fake photo or evidence of something profoundly important. I see no third alternative.

Bruce Maccabee and others: Take a look!

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/08/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 18:37:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:23:49 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/08/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 8, 2001

** EMBASSY BUGGING: A 1964 DAMAGE ASSESSMENT
** SELECTED HANSEN CASE FILES

If the New York Times story about a secret tunnel built for eavesdropping under the Soviet Embassy in Washington is true, declared Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs on March 5, then it would constitute nothing less than "a gross violation of the universally recognized norms of international law, operating throughout the world in respect of foreign diplomatic missions."

In fact, however, it appears that the bugging of each other's embassy has been the norm in U.S.-Moscow relations.

In April 1964, the U.S. discovered that the Soviet Union had planted at least 17 microphones and other devices in the U.S. embassy in Moscow, and that clandestine Soviet electronic surveillance had proceeded for years without detection.

In October 1964, the State Department completed a damage assessment of the consequences of the Soviet embassy bugging.

Remarkably enough, the assessment found no identifiable damage from the entire operation.

"The results of our review of the political effects of the bugging of our Moscow Embassy are paradoxical," the partially declassified document begins.

"On the one hand, in the judgment of the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency, the Soviets achieved a major intelligence breakthrough, i.e., for a period of years they had the capability to read most, if not all, of our telegraphic messages between Washington and Moscow and between Washington and posts in Eastern Europe."

"On the other hand an extensive review of major crises and negotiations over the past twelve years does not provide evidence that the Soviets made use of knowledge thus gained to the detriment of our interests."

It seems that "the Soviets valued the source far more than the use of any particular piece of information they got from it."

"In order to keep us from discovering their intelligence coup the Soviets appear to have sacrificed many of the specific gains they might have made, and eschewed actions that might have given them away."

As one explanation for this surprising finding, the assessment proposes that "Soviet intelligence officers may well have hoped that this source of information might give them advance warning in the event that the United States ever decided to attack the USSR, and they would have been reluctant to jeopardize the source."

Yet even though "extensive quantities of classified information were compromised," the fact remains that "No instance could be found in which Moscow was shown to have made a specific decision detrimental to U.S. interest on the basis of information derived from reading particular messages."

The damage assessment was included in Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, volume XIV, which was published by the State Department on February 21. This interesting volume is not yet available online.

However, the 1964 damage assessment is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2001/03/moscowbugs.html>

SELECTED HANSSSEN CASE FILES

Accused spy Robert P. Hanssen poses a flight risk and must be detained, the U.S. government insisted in a March 1 motion in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

"Virtually up to the moment of his arrest, he was querying the FBI's internal classified computer for indicators that he was under investigation. It is reasonable to assume that he was not doing this for the purpose of determining when best to surrender."

See "Government Proffer in Support of Detention":

http://www.fas.org/irp/ops/ci/hanssen_detention_proffer.html

"The prosecution of this case will require that the government provide defense counsel with access to certain classified information," U.S. attorneys noted in a March 5 motion. "The government has agreed to produce a substantial amount of such classified information to the defense in pre-indictment discovery."

See "Government's Motion for Protective Order and Incorporated Memorandum of Law":

http://www.fas.org/irp/ops/ci/hanssen_motion_protect.html

Procedures governing the handling of classified information by the parties were set forth in a March 5 "Protective Order" issued by U.S. District Judge Claude M. Hilton:

http://www.fas.org/irp/ops/ci/hanssen_protective_order.html

Judge Hilton is a new member of the secretive Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which was instrumental in Hanssen's arrest.

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:02:22 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:26:16 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
>"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
>that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

How about trans-dimensional or trans-temporal phenomena? Surely
you don't think that the ETH is the only possibility?

Regards,

Joe

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:02:54 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:27:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted - Young

>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 20:56:07 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted
>To: UfoUpdates <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>I added two interesting photos to yesterday's piece on the
>reflective stripes found throughout Cydonia (and elsewhere).

>Of particular interest is the six-sided, symmetrical "platform"
>found next to "Mound P."

Mac:

Nice. Have a look at this shot from the Lunar Orbiter IV, pix 177-H2, the area around the Lunar crater Burckhardt shows many six-sided craters. This is a typical shape of many Lunar craters, due to the structure of the underlying rock fractured by impact.

http://www.lpi.usra.edu/htbin/lunar_orbiter/lo.pl?info1676

Scanning through the pictures in the NASA Digital Lunar Orbiter Photographic Atlas will turn up lots more. Go to,

http://cass.jsc.nasa.gov/pub/research/lunar_orbiter/index.html

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:08:05 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:29:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Young

>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>>1994, according to local media.

<snip>

> This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does
>not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous

Hi, Gary, Scott:

Unless these are just airplanes and helicopters flying over to
check out the volcano's caldera. I'll bet it's a pretty sight.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

The Watchdog (e-update) - 08-03-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 22:17:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:31:47 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog (e-update) - 08-03-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind."

EXCLUSIVE

UFO X FILES ANNOUNCES ROSWELL SMOKING GUN

Internet site announces that it will present material alleged to be from Roswell UFO crash that is extraterrestrial in origin. Smoking gun or smoldering dud? UFOWATCHDOG.COM will present its exclusive interview with UFO X Files on this incredible announcement.

NEWS

~Astronaut Glenn Admits to UFOs on NBC?
~UFOWATCHDOG.COM to Take Legal Action

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Richard Hall Article 'Conceptualizing UFOs'

From: Jim Klotz <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>
Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 20:40:03 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:33:38 -0500
Subject: Richard Hall Article 'Conceptualizing UFOs'

Thanks to Richard Hall who has also made his thoughtful and timely article: "Conceptualizing UFOs" available to us. It is now available in CUFON's Contributor's Section:

<http://www.cufon.org>

and click on the "Contributor's Section" button.

We acknowledge that this article is also available on John Velez' site, A.I.C, and note that it may be made available elsewhere.

Wherever you locate this article I heartily recommend you read it!

- Jim Klotz
CUFON SYSOP

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 04:48:59 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:38:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Hale

Sean wrote:

>From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 18:52:39 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication

>Skeptics as far as I am concerned are "wanna be" debunkers,
>either/or they purport to be sceptical, but in fact they have
>already made up their mind that ET doesn't exist at all, thus
>_all_ UFOs can be identified at some point in time, ala Andy
>Roberts.

>I would consider myself _sceptical_, but I do hold stock in the
>Extra Terrestrial Hypothesis.

Hi Sean,

I must agree with you on this one. I get the message from certain posts on this List, by sceptics' that those of us who happen to have a view on the possibility of ET visiting Earth, are nothing more than cranks, etc. And that they <sceptics>are here to rescue humanity from this dreaded clown parade, as they wish to portray themselves to the public, as the sane and rational thinking ones, who are very steady human beings with full working perspectives on ET related events.

And I suppose these sceptics never have arguments, never have failed marriages, never suffer from alcohol abuse, drug abuse, sexual adventures/affairs of the heart, all the things that make us humans who we are. Oh and parking tickets amongst others! And if they don't, then I guess we are looking at the wrong aliens!

And are we to take it that sceptics represent the public in any way, like a good guy saving the day from the UFO nutters. If so who appointed them?

Roy..

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

PRG Update - March 9, 2001

From: **Steven G. Bassett** <ParadigmRG@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:08:36 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:53:24 -0500
Subject: PRG Update - March 9, 2001

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

March 9, 2001 - Update

Arthur C. Clarke and John Glenn

On February 25, in an interview with Buzz Aldrin video taped by Space.com, Arthur C. Clarke said:

"I'm fairly convinced that we have discovered life on Mars. There are some incredible photographs from [the Jet Propulsion Laboratory], which to me are pretty convincing proof of the existence of large forms of life on Mars! Have a look at them. I don't see any other interpretation." See:

www.space.com/peopleinterviews/clarke_believe_010227.html

On Tuesday evening, March 6, former astronaut and senator John Glenn appeared on the sitcom Frasier and gave a remarkable soliloquy:

"Back in those glory days, I was very uncomfortable when they asked us to say things that I didn't want to say, and deny other things. Some people asked, you know, 'Were you alone out there?' We never gave the real answer. We've seen things out there, strange things. But we know what we saw out there. And we couldn't really say anything, the bosses were scared of this. They were afraid of 'War of the Worlds' type stuff, about panic in the streets. And so we had to keep quiet. And now we only see these things in our nightmares or maybe in the movies. And some of them are pretty close to being the truth."

A video clip of a portion of this show segment is below.

The first link is for broadband users, the second is for dialup users:

http://images.nbc.com/main/richmedia/nbc_tv/frasier/fra_030601_100.ram
http://images.nbc.com/main/richmedia/nbc_tv/frasier/fra_030601_056.ram

Efforts are being made to contact John Glenn directly as well as the producers of Frasier to get clarification about this appearance by Glenn.

How might one interpret this? The disclosure train is slowly leaving the station. Everyone directly or indirectly connected to the UFO/ET issue over the last 50 years, whatever that connection, have a choice to make: get on the train or stay on the station platform and wave good-bye. What would you do?

Lobbying Registration

A registration has been filed on behalf of Destination Space at: www.destinationspace.net

Recent Capitol Hill Meetings

Senator Sarbanes: senior aide
Congresswoman Morella: senior policy advisor

UFO/ET material on The Learning Channel (TLC)

It has been a year since TLC scheduled an Alien Invasion Week. Hopefully, there will be another soon. In the interim, the pages relating to the TLC portfolio of documentaries get buried and can only be accessed using a site word search such as <Alien Invasion Week.>

Quite possibly the TLC UFO/ET documentary portfolio is the most important information set relating to the field which impacts general public awareness. There have been hundreds of segments aired over the past three years. It is assumed there will be a few new additions to the portfolio this year.

Below are three key archived pages relating to TLC's portfolio, including an unusual section on UFO/ET activists - the only one of its kind residing on the website of a major cable channel or network.

Alien Invasion Week Main Page
<http://tlc.discovery.com/tlcpages/alien/ontlc.html>
Activist Section on the TLC website
<http://tlc.discovery.com/tlcpages/alieninvasion/alieninvasion.html>
Current TLC Documentary Inventory
<http://tlc.discovery.com/tlcpages/alien/ontlc.html>

Petition Signatures

The Open Congressional Hearing Petition continues to gather signatures, both electronic and paper.

This petition, which was introduced at the Roswell 20th Anniversary conference in July of 1997, is now in its fourth year.

Signatures will continue to be collected until such as time as it is appropriate to introduce them into the political process.

Tim Cullen of Yuma, Colorado just mailed in 70 signatures on paper from his area. Great job, Tim!

While electronic signatures are welcome at this page,
<http://www.paradigmclock.com/petition.htm>

Paper signatures are the most powerful. Both an MSWord 6.0 doc and Adobe Acrobat doc are available at this page:
<http://www.paradigmclock.com/therighttopetition.html#Email>

Please consider downloading one of these paper versions, making copies, getting them filled out with signatures, and mailing them back to PRG.

Media Schedule

Bassett on "Clear Talk" w/ Constance Clear
Tuesday, March 13, 2001
8:00 PM EST
KENS AM 1160 - San Antonio
Webcast at: <http://www.kensradio.com>

Bassett on Strange Days.....Indeed
www.cfrb.com/profile/strangedays.html
Saturday, March 10
(regular appearance)
Saturday, March 17
10 pm to 1 am EST
CFRB AM 10101 - Toronto
www.cfrb.com/
Webcast at: www.cfrb.com/listen/listenlive.html
(Three hour program on developing a Canadian disclosure initiative.)

Regular political column at: www.alienzoo.com
Regular political column with: UFO Magazine
www.ufomag.com

Paradigm Research Group
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
E-mail: ParadigmRG@aol.com
Phone: 301-564-1820
Fax: 301-564-4066
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Spread the word about X-PPAC & the politics of disclosure.
Contribute online at: www.x-ppac.org/Contribute.html
or mail to: 4938 Hampden Lane, 161 Bethesda, MD 20814

"There is almost no limit to what you can accomplish,
if you are willing to give away the credit."

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Fernandes

From: Joaquim Fernandes <jfernan@clix.pt>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:49:58 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 09:59:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Fernandes

>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 05:34:19 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies

>Maybe someone can shed some light on these matters:

>1) There are several historical UFO reports involving the
>finding of a jelly-like substance as a result. These are the
>dates of the incidents known to me:

>1718 (East Indies)
>1803 (Silesia)
>1811 (Heidelberg)
>1819 (Massachusetts)
>1846 (New York)
>1958 (Ireland)

>In most cases the objects look like comets falling to earth and
>the jelly is found where the impact crater would normally be
>(but usually isn't).

>Are there any other cases to add to the list? Is there a
>scientific explanation for these events?

>2) In 1655 a businessman mysteriously turned up in Portugal and
>was taken before the Catholic Inquisition. The man claimed he
>had been standing outside his office in Goa, a Portuguese
>territory in India, when he was suddenly taken through the air
>and transported to Portugal. The Inquisition decided he had to
>be a witch, so he was burnt at the stake.

>This tale appears in a UFO book with no bibliographical
>reference. Does anyone know it's origin?

>3) Another teleportation is said to have taken place in
>Selangor, Malaysia, on August 5th 1970. Somebody was transported
>140 miles, but I haven't found a complete or even partial
>report. It could be an interesting story...

Dear List members,

This is the same question I make: where is the
bibliographical reference for the teleportation
case of a Portuguese from Goa into Lisbon?

I have a guess that this is only a tale of the religious kind
very recurrent since the Medieval Age through the XVII century
in the catholic countries like Portugal and Spain. The
Inquisition is only a cultural anecdote because we have a lot
of such tails - probably repeated from an original - during the
portuguese expansion and colonization between the XV and XVII
centuries. It happens when the Portuguese soldiers or
missionaries were captured by the arabs or indians soldier and
suddenly, according such religious tales, they were found in
Lisbon without knowing how or by whom.

So, it was a miracle due normally the Virgin Mary or Christ

which are refered by dozens of cases in our old libraries.

Best regards,

Joaquim Fernandes
University Fernando Pessoa
Porto
Portugal

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach - Fernandes

From: Joaquim Fernandes <jfernan@clix.pt>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:50:00 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:02:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach - Fernandes

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Studying UFOs: Proposed Approach
>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 16:53:31 -0500

>I have found the discussions about methodology and communication
>on this List so stimulating that I have written a short article
>outlining my ideas for "Conceptualizing UFOs".

>It discusses the labeling or name-calling issues, suggests some
>definitions, indicates the central scientific questions, and
>proposes broad hypotheses that hopefully everyone could agree on
>for studying the UFO phenomenon, be they Doubters or Proponents.

>Now I'm offering this article free to anyone who wishes to post
>it on their web site. Of course, you don't have to agree with
>everything in it and should feel free to add whatever commentary
>you like. It is intended to encourage discussion, not to present
>Commandments carved in stone. The only proviso is that you must
>agree to present the article in full, without any editorial
>changes.

>The article is two U.S. pages, single-spaced in 11-point type.
>The format is Microsoft Word (6.0 or 7.0, I forget which). I
>will send it as an e-mail attachment to anyone who requests it
>and agrees to reproduce it in full.

Dear Richard,

Please, can send it to me?

It's to be cited in my thesis. Thank you.

Joaquim Fernandes
University Fernando Pessoa
Porto
Portugal

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Stratospheric Balloon

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 06:13:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:07:09 -0500
Subject: Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Stratospheric Balloon

Dear Readers,

We have confirmation that the UFO seen over Calama, Chile on February 16, 2001 was in fact a MIR balloon. Argentinean researcher (and IHU member) Luis Eduardo Pacheco forwarded us the following communiqué this morning.

Scott Corrales--IHU

+++++

CEFAA SCHOOL OF TECHNICAL AERONAUTICS
PRESS RELEASE
CALAMA CASE ON FEBRUARY 16 2001

In mid-February of this year the news media covered the sighting of a luminous object which was seen by aeronautical personnel of Calama's El Loa aerodrome and two commercial flight air crews. The luminous object seen by these aeronautical witnesses on February 16 at around 10:45 local time was described as circular, very shiny and apparently suspended over the aerodrome at a considerable height, and then showing movement toward the west.

According to these witnesses, the observation lasted approximately 30 minutes. The analysis of all the background information collected by the Comité de Estudios de Fenómenos Aéreos Anómalos (CEFAA) revealed that on the previous day, February 15, a MIR (Montgolfière Infrarouge) stratospheric balloon was launched from the locality of Bauru, Brazil as part of the MIR 2000/2001 program being developed by CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), a dependency of France's CNES (Centre National d'Études Spatiales) with the support of Brazilian universities.

The MIR balloon is heated by solar radiation by day and by terrestrial infrared radiation at night. It is made of a special polyester blend 12 microns thick and has an overall volume of 40,000 m³ and a diameter of over 100 meters. It can carry a 60 Kg. payload and its upper section is coated with a thin layer of aluminum; its lower section is transparent, allowing it to "capture" energy flows rising from the earth. It operates at altitudes in excess of 30 Km. during the day and between 23 and 18 km. at night. Its flight has a duration of between two and three weeks, depending on its altitude and cloud cover. The program's goal is to study special plasmas at the border between the magnetosphere and the ionosphere during the magnetic sub-storm period (Interboa Experiment).

The MIR balloon's trajectory is monitored by a special automatic telecommunications system on the HF band known as "Chacal" (jackal) and by the INMARSAT satellite.

The information furnished by CNES to CEFAA today notes that the fourth MIR balloon launched at February 15, was monitored at 13:38 UTC (10:38 hours local time) over the Calama Sector at an altitude 34,700 meters and a speed of approximately 200 km/hr. --information which coincides with the background information gathered by CEFAA earlier. To see the map of the [balloon's]

trajectory, go to: <<http://ballon.cnes.fr>:8180>.

####

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Luis Eduardo Pacheco, Informe Alfa

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Conisbrough, England 1966

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 03:17:11 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:10:07 -0500
Subject: Conisbrough, England 1966

Hello all:

While looking something else up, I found this old report in my data:

```
#7023: 1966/3/28 2030h 1:13W 53:29N 3333 7/2  
CONISBROUGH,ENGL:5 OBS:CLASSIC FOTO of 3 SCRS nr  
POWER POLE :: A likely fake per BUFORA
```

There are numerous sources, many showing the photo itself no doubt.

I noted that Bufora considered it a likely fake, but don't recall when or how.

My question simply is: Has this case been trashed thoroughly enough that I should delist it from my UFO Database?

Did anyone confess to faking the photo for example?

If so, it more rightly belongs in my "discredited" list online.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted -

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 06:48:56 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:12:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted -

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:02:54 EST
>Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative: New Images Posted
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>Nice. Have a look at this shot from the Lunar Orbiter IV, pix
>177-H2, the area around the Lunar crater Burckhardt shows many
>six-sided craters. This is a typical shape of many Lunar
>craters, due to the structure of the underlying rock fractured
>by impact.

http://www.lpi.usra.edu/htbin/lunar_orbiter/lo.pl?info1676

I can't see any "six-sided craters" here for the life of me.
They look as round as pancakes.

I should mention that the six-sided thing in Cydonia is not a
crater or depression, but an elevated formation.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 14:57:30 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:15:32 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco - Hall

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:23:05 -0000

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: The Lakenheath Fiasco
>>>Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 22:14:53 -0000

>>>>Am I alone in wondering why this poisonous atmosphere exists
>>>>about the Lakenheath case and what it tells us about UFO
>>>>partisans (pro and con)?

>>>>Without naming names, let me just say that the rhetoric and
>>>>posturing on both sides of the Pond is inexcusable and there
>>>>ought to be an immediate cease-fire and truce until all the
>>>>facts are in and there is time for careful examination and peer
>>>>review. Otherwise, all of you are behaving in a childish,
>>>>irresponsible, and distinctively unscientific manner. And I mean
>>>>ALL of you!

>>>I was wondering, who first brought this to light on UpDates? And
>>>for what purpose, if debate wasn't the main one?

>>Roy,

>>Finger-pointing and name-calling is not debate. What is being
>>"debated" here is who is the bigger liar or distorter of
>>information. I doubt that's the purpose of this List.

>Hi,

>With respect Dick I don't recall doing any of this in my
>messages. All I recall is posting what information I could on
>the already revealed air crew interviews and my opinion of same
>as well as asking for patience for the appearance of the full
>report.

>I also recall saying that I won't make my mind up on where we
>now stand with regards to the full case until I see all the data
>tied together by that report.

>I don't find that to be fairly described as posturing or
>unscientific. It just seems to me to be the sensible way to go
>about this matter.

Jenny,

Your posts have always been civil and relevant. My use of the word "All" may not have been fair in that respect. My main criticism or comment in regard to your group is in regard to the constant "leaking" of information and strong hints of the case being effectively demolished before publication of the report. I am aware that your statements have been more moderate. Wishing you well in your domestic crisis.

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:01:41 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 10:20:10 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hall

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:20:56 -0000

<snip>

>I have been thinking about this debate (during daily trips to
>the hospital) and wonder if we might not be able to do something
>together, as a community, rather than continue needlessly to be
>at one another's throats.

>The net is a powerful tool but is rarely used beyond its fun
>value as a talking shop.

>Although I know there is a lot of negativity about UFOIN, it
>exists in the UK as a working UFO investigators list - not a
>forum (that's why it is invitation only) - and it operates very
>successfully in the limited brief that it has to pursue UK cases
>in extreme depth.

>However, it seems to me that this net debate shows the ETH is
>clearly a viable hypothesis for the phenomenon and all that we
>seem to disagree over is whether or not there is sufficient
>evidence for it to be taken seriously by science.

>In fact this seems one of the few issues that believers,
>skeptics - in fact all shades in between - agree upon in
>principle.

>So why not use that to do something positive?

>Could we not create a net based 'panel' specifically involving -
>say - 16 people. These people could be nominated to the list by
>colleagues on the basis of their experience in the field and
>their willingness to engage in the work required. Many major
>groups could be represented. CSICOP and CUFOS could - for
>instance - work together this way!

>We could agree up front that, say, four panel members be
>designated pro ETH Ufologists, four anti ETH Ufologists, four
>uncommitted researchers and four from outside the field (eg
>relevant experts such as cosmologists and exobiologists).

>This list would then debate between themselves one question -
>what evidence does Ufology need to provide in order to
>demonstrate to science a working fact based argument that
>extraterrestrials may indeed have visited the earth / or still
>be doing so?

>Evidence that we can then - as a community - put before science
>and ask them to judge on the merits as they would evidence for
>any other controversial theory.

>With this multi-faceted panel behind it and with that panel
>being sponsored by the UFO community as a whole across all
>shades of opinion then science would be hard pressed not to at
>least give this evidence the time of day.

>Once a protocol for the evidence needed to set before science is
>created by this nominated net based panel, then it should be
>published to Ufology as a whole with the challenge to all
>researchers to provide specific data from their own first hand
>study into the project that they think matches this required
>scenario.

>The 'panel' should then debate each offered case between
>themselves and issue a statement / discussion regarding its
>views on the merits / demerits of that case back to the UFO
>community to comment as they wish.

>After, say, a six month period, we will see what evidence
>Ufology has come up and set before the panel and that we can
>then put before science.

>Provided the selection of this panel is done fairly (i.e. by
>free nomination of all) and that the make up is evenly balanced
>(as suggested giving a voice to all sides) and its actions are
>entirely and immediately published in full and so publicly
>accountable to Ufology - wouldn't this be a useful way to
>progress (rather than stagnate) this important debate?

>It is just an embryonic idea and its basis, make up, numbers,
>form of publishing are open to alternative suggestions.

>But do you think it could work and that we can all try - for
>once - to pull together and engage in a serious, non polemical
>or political community project that would have genuine merits
>and expunge emotional point scoring for who knows what end
>result?

>It has to be worth a go.

>Best wishes,

>Jenny Randles

Jenny & List,

I think this general idea deserves serious consideration, though
I have reservations about the complexity and strongly doubt
CSICOP or scoffers would be willing to participate. I look
forward to discussion about it.

- Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:22:57 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:58:07 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 07:46:20 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000

<snip>

>On reflection, you fundamentalist science worshippers don't fill
>the bill, I imagine, because you don't follow that one rule of
>science to go where the evidence takes you. If that direction
>heads off to the uncomfortable, inconvenient, or unprofitable
>(?) then that direction is the direction generally not
>traveled. Disturbed by the attitude of the insider and convinced
>that the job is just not getting done in an intelligently
>inclusive manner, I'm compelled to my own research,
>investigation, and report.

>A lot of our conclusions and speculations are in parallel, sir.
>Our synergy might be key, perhaps even necessary in the
>successful search for real answers and better questions -- it's
>obvious that you're not getting there on your own. There are
>only more tongues in more cheeks, and that's not ALL the fault
>of the mystics, clowns, opportunists, New Agers, and 'others'.
>Be careful what you dismiss out of hand. Like any
>fundamentalist, you'd toss the tot with the bathwater.

Alfred,

Feel better now? I always knew I would have made a good therapist. Your posting is too long, complex, and often illogical for me to try to answer it in any detail here but if you would like to discuss a few matters offline, I will give it a try.

I was called "smug" something like three times in one posting, though I didn't think it came from you. That is denigrating, and name-calling. There was some confusion in that thread about who was saying what to whom, as Bob Young and I have discussed privately.

I strongly stand by what I said in the CUFORN interview; although that wasn't on this List, it is now clear why you are in such high dudgeon. I have been highly critical of science's non-handling of the UFO subject and think the paradigm does need adjusting, but you come across as frothing-at-the-mouth anti-scientific and appearing to believe the method of science is inadequate. The posturing of New Agers does nothing to correct the weaknesses of science.

You must have loved my articles in UFO Magazine, if you saw them! Peace be with you.

- Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:27:10 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:59:45 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Hall

>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:21:12 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: About Whitley Strieber

>Hi to All,

>My twin interests in folklore and CEIII/IV narratives have drawn
>me to the books of Whitley Strieber many times. A

>One doubt that bugs me is his claim that he prophecied the
>depletion of the ozone layer in 1985 while co-writing the
>fictional novel Nature's End with Jim Kunetka. To my knowledge -
>and I'd like to be corrected if need be - Japanese scientists
>discovered the reality of the ozone problem in 1984, though in
>fact two other scientists, Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina,
>already predicted such an event in the 1970s.

Chris,

Jim McDonald was warning about it about 1967.

- Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:13:34 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:02:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies - Aubeck

>From: Joaquim Fernandes <jfernan@clix.pt>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:49:58 -0000

>>Date: Sun, 4 Mar 2001 05:34:19 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Two Teleportations and Six Jellies

>>2) In 1655 a businessman mysteriously turned up in Portugal
>>and was taken before the Catholic Inquisition. The man
>>claimed he had been standing outside his office in Goa, a
>>Portuguese territory in India, when he was suddenly taken
>>through the air and transported to Portugal. The Inquisition
>>decided he had to be a witch, so he was burnt at the stake.

>>This tale appears in a UFO book with no bibliographical
>>reference. Does anyone know it's origin?

>Dear List members,

>This is the same question I make: where is the
>bibliographical reference for the teleportation
>case of a Portuguese from Goa into Lisbon?

>I have a guess that this is only a tale of the religious kind
>very recurrent since the Medieval Age through the XVII century
>in the catholic countries like Portugal and Spain. The
>Inquisition is only a cultural anecdote because we have a lot
>of such tails - probably repeated from an original - during the
>portuguese expansion and colonization between the XV and XVII
>centuries. It happens when the Portuguese soldiers or
>missionaries were captured by the arabs or indians soldier >and
>suddenly, according such religious tales, they were found >in Lisbon
without knowing how or by whom.

>So, it was a miracle due normally the Virgin Mary or Christ
>which are referred by dozens of cases in our old libraries.

>Best regards,

>Joaquim Fernandes
>University Fernando Pessoa
>Porto
>Portugal

Hello Joaquim,

Luis Manso kindly sent me the bibliographical reference he found
in Fortean Times. This leads us to John Aubrey's "Miscellanies,"
which was published in London in 1695.

I have tried to locate this book but it is classed as a rare
one. My hope is that someone in England or the USA can send me a
copy of the passage or chapter in question from Aubrey's work,
from a local library or archive perhaps.

I am collecting pre-1947 cases of this kind and would like to know of any others.

Chris Aubeck

PS I'd like to take this opportunity to commend Joaquim on his excellent book about the Fatima incident. It's about time somebody published an English translation for everyone to use and enjoy.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:10:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:04:43 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:20:56 -0000

>Could we not create a net based 'panel' specifically involving -
>say - 16 people. These people could be nominated to the List by
>colleagues on the basis of their experience in the field and
>their willingness to engage in the work required. Many major
>groups could be represented. CSICOP and CUFOS could - for
>instance - work together this way!

This is a terrific idea. At the very least, it would focus discussion.

Wrapped up in questions of evidence, though, is a very tricky issue -- how would we expect extraterrestrials to behave if they really were here? It's fascinating to see how many assumptions about this get made, in all facets of the UFO literature. Here are a few:

-- aliens would take samples of plants and soil, in order to study our planet. (This was a frequent explanation of reported alien behavior in early "occupant" reports, from the 1960s, when alleged sightings of "flying saucer occupants" were first widely discussed.)

-- aliens would have high-tech procedures that would bypass crude physical acts like collecting our sperm and eggs. (A frequent criticism of abduction reports.)

-- each UFO sighting, assuming they're really sightings of alien craft, represents a separate visit from an alien planet. (Unspoken assumption by Carl Sagan, when he argues, in "The Cosmic Connection," that UFO sightings can't be of real aliens because there are too many of them -- so many that all the races in the universe, sending scout ships out to explore, couldn't account for them.)

-- alien behavior would be incomprehensible to us, just as our behavior is incomprehensible to cats. (A wonderful remark by Aime Michel.)

-- aliens don't have conscious and unconscious thoughts, as we do, but instead have a single unified consciousness. Thus their communications reach us on two channels, one that we perceive consciously, and one that we perceive unconsciously. (The channeler Lyssa Royal, explaining why reported contacts with aliens often seem to occur in something like a dream state.)

I'd suggest that our assumptions usually fall on the conservative side -- that is, they resemble the first two items on my list, rather than the last two. The SETI literature is especially notable this way. First, of course, is the assumption that aliens would communicate by radio, but beyond that, it's intriguing to dip into the SETI literature and see other assumptions that get made. At one point (and I'm sorry that I don't have the references just now), SETI scientists asked how

aliens might be different from us, and the answers were quite mundane -- maybe they'd achieved immortality. The basic assumption, which SETI scientists don't question, as far as I can see, is that aliens would communicate in ways we can understand, or in other words that they'd be more like us than unlike us.

For this reason, I think that Jenny's panel should be expanded to include a philosopher and a poet, or some other kind of imaginative writer, maybe (to pick only from science fiction writers) Octavia Butler or Ursula Le Guin. (I've forgotten exactly how she spells her name.) We tend to forget that there are vast differences even between cultures on our own earth. Aliens might surprise us. Or might not, but we should be ready for all sorts of possibilities. Two that I've encountered:

-- aliens might speak a language with no nouns. Thus they'd conceive everything in terms of processes, and not conceive, as we do, of objects. (This is in a story by Borges, though it's about a place on earth, not an alien planet. The Navajo language, I'm told, is much like this.)

-- aliens might have a vastly different value system, and might be bored by what they'd regard as prosaic questions ("What planet do you come from?" "Is cold fusion possible?"), and respond much better when we try to involve them in art. (Another idea from Lyssa Royal, which naturally I like, since I'm in the arts myself.)

I think it might also be wise to have psychologists and social scientists on an adjunct panel, considering how we conceptualize alien visits, and especially what our feelings about them are. I think we have trouble dealing with this question in part because it's deeply emotional. In fact, I think the main panel needs a facilitator, who could bring out unspoken assumptions that tend to derail rational argument. We've had more than 50 years to come to grips with all this, and we've failed. I'm not sure we'll succeed now unless we address the reasons for our failure.

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Paradigms and Personal Experiences

From: **Matt Hurley** <m.hurley@ntlworld.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 16:19:30 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:07:55 -0500
Subject: Paradigms and Personal Experiences

Hi List,

I think we have to bear in mind that our perception of reality is based mainly on what we've experienced in life. I would say a lot of scoffers, debunkers etc haven't experienced first hand what they are scoffing or debunking, for example, a spectacular daylight UFO sighting, or something else like Poltergeist phenomena.

I personally have experienced Poltergeist phenomena so my angle on it will be different to someone who hasn't experienced it. Therefore, I could spend hours debating with a debunker on a discussion forum the validity of my experience to no avail.

Maybe a % of experiencers were scoffers or debunkers at one time but an experience has changed their paradigm.

I think you are what you've experienced.

Crowded skies,

Matt

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:13:40 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>testimony or not?

>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>ETH, based upon belief or not?

Seems to be there's something very simple going on here.

Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that -- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what he thought he saw.

I take it, then, that if Bob was convinced Arnold did see what he reported, that Bob, too, would be supporting the ETH.

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:24:36 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:16:05 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:02:22 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
>>"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
>>that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

>>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

>How about trans-dimensional or trans-temporal phenomena? Surely
>you don't think that the ETH is the only possibility?

Hi, Joe:

No, I certainly don't.

You know, Arnold himself was once quoted later in his life as saying that he didn't think what he saw were solid objects but may have been from another plane of reality, whatever he meant by that.

His reason was that he said that over the years (he was a pilot) he had kept his eyes peeled and has on two other occasions had seen something like what he saw that clear summer day in 1947. He said that the objects seemed to be surrounded by a greenish shimmer and that he almost thought he could see through them, or something to that effect. I don't have the citation, here; maybe somebody else can help out with this.

Since reading this I have wondered if Old Donald Menzel might have been right about mirages. A more recent book which examines this possible aspect in more detail is Steuart Campbell's *The UFO Mystery Solved* (Explicit Books 1994). The problem with Campbell's approach is that he seems to believe that he has found the one answer to UFOs. Some of the incidents he examines may have other answers and he may have been trying to fit a square peg in some round holes. But his examination of the Arnold case, and his discovery that nine peaks of the Cascades could have been responsible for mirages in the direction Arnold may have been looking, is fascinating reading.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Balloon - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:50:04 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:17:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Balloon - Young

>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 06:13:11 -0500
>Subject: Confirmed: Calama UFO was MIR Stratospheric Balloon

>>Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2001 08:52:38 +1100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Diane Harrison Director AUFORN <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
>>Subject: UFO Over Collaroy NSW Australia Report 02-28-01

Scott wrote:

>We have confirmation that the UFO seen over Calama, Chile on
>February 16, 2001 was in fact a MIR balloon. Argentinean
>researcher (and IHU member) Luis Eduardo Pacheco forwarded us
>the following communiqué this morning.

<snip>

>The MIR balloon is heated by solar radiation by day and by
>terrestrial infrared radiation at night. It is made of a special
>polyester blend 12 microns thick and has an overall volume of
>40,000 m3 and a diameter of over 100 meters. It can carry a 60
>Kg. payload and its upper section is coated with a thin layer of
>aluminum; its lower section is transparent, allowing it to
>"capture" energy flows rising from the earth. It operates at
>altitude in excess of 30 Km. during the day and between 23 and
>18 km. at night. Its flight has a duration of between two and
>three weeks, depending on its altitude and cloud cover. The
>program's goal is to study special plasmas at the border between
>the magnetosphere and the ionosphere during the magnetic
>sub-storm period (Interboa Experiment).

Previously, Diane has posted:

>>Incident Report Collary NSW Australia

>>Date: 28th. 2 .2001.
>>Via Bryan Dickenson UFOR NSW

>>On Friday evening of 23 February 2001, at 10.45 pm at Collaroy
>>NSW - a large, reddish object with a glowing red hemispherical
>>base and a "dark, unlit, castle-like upper section" passed from
>>west to east, then out to sea before disappearing several
>>kilometers offshore

Scott, Diane, List:

Could the Australian object have been this balloon, circling the
Southern Hemisphere?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 13:15:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:20:44 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:27:57 -0000

>>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 04:06:30 +0100
>>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

><snip>

>>>><http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

><snip>

>I hadn't really been paying attention to this thread, since I
>have had it up to here with wild claims about "artifacts" on
>Mars, but when someone I admire (Josh Goldstein) alerted me to
>the Arthur Clarke image...Wow! This either has to be a fake
>photo or evidence of something profoundly important. I see no
>third alternative.

>Bruce Maccabee and others: Take a look!

<LOL> Ahh, waiter! Can we get a cup of coffee over here
for my friend?

I'm glad you finally decided to read one of the posts in
this thread. Although I'm disappointed that it took Josh to
get your attention. (The rest of are 'dismiss-able' eh? <LOL>)

Yes Dick, "something profoundly important indeed." Although
I understand and can empathize with your "Martian artifact
fatigue" we still have to keep "our ears on" in case something
like this comes along. I've been blowing wind through my bullhorn
since I first laid eyes on that thing on Mars. For my money,
it's the first genuine and unmistakable anomaly to have been
found. It's just a shame that so much static noise has been
infused into the subject before now. These pictures are truly
mind blowing stuff.

You don't need a slide rule or any fancy theories to know that
what you're looking at is extraordinary. I'm dying to know what
NASA says these features are. Josh made an excellent suggestion
(indictment.) I will see if there's any one at NYU or Columbia
that's willing to take a look at these pix and venture an
educated opinion. If I get any responses I'll post them to the
List.

Welcome aboard the "Arrakeen Worm" express! Grab a maker hook
and hold on for dear life. It's going to be a bumpy ride! ;))
You, A.C. Clarke, Don Ledger and others, (we even got 'Young Bob'
to admit that it looks "curious"!) I guess I'm in -good company-
out here on this particular limb! ;)

Regards,

John 'Tree-hugging Hippie' Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 9](#)

Wendelle C. Stevens?

From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami@prodigy.net>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 13:45:05 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 16:22:02 -0500
Subject: Wendelle C. Stevens?

Need Help!!!

I need to get in touch with Col. Wendell C. Stevens. Does anyone know his e-mail, address or phone number?

Thank you,

Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo ufomiami@prodigy.net

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 15:41:16 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 15:57:18 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Velez

>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 13:40:11 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
>>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's words into
>>>a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

>>Lan:

>>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>>testimony or not?

>>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>>ETH, based upon belief or not?

>I don't know why you would ask Lan about my belief.

>But anyway, the answer to 1 depends upon what you mean by
>"supported." Certainly we have Arnold's testimony.

<snip>

>Could the ETH be wonrg? Sure. Until we can follow a craft from
>the earth to another planet or perhaps a mothership way out in
>the solar system, somewhere we can't be sure.

Hi Bruce, hi All,

Bruce writes:

>But of one thing I am sure: They Are Here, whoever they are,
>wherever they came from. And I wish they would go away

Not as much as all your brothers and sisters that are being
'messed with' by these 'what-ever.' Taking the 'next logical
step' seems to be difficult even for those who have come this
far in terms of their own thinking about UFOs.

This has nothing to do with "Arnold" but if you will please
indulge me for a moment I want to grab an opportunity to give
voice to something related to your statement that bothers me.

Nobody ever mentions the abductees or their claims when they
profess their belief that the UFO phenomenon is real. (Whatever
its source.)

Bruce although this (includes) you, it is not aimed 'at' you. ;)

I've said this before, one day the reality of this UFO business will all be a matter of 'common knowledge.' Whether it be by our own investigative efforts or intercession by the "aliens" themselves.

We have touched and been touched by this "unknown." (that is not so "unknown" to some of us, and that some of you are convinced is real.) Yet few seem willing to take any kind of a stand on our behalf. Bright, educated, open-minded guys like Bruce can do all the math when it comes to working out the sizes, distances, and vectors of a UFO sighting, but seem unable to give equal time (or consideration) to the 'human side' of the equation.

There is a human toll being taken by this phenomenon that nobody seems willing to acknowledge. People are so focused on the "knife," (UFOs) they can't see the guy standing next them who is bleeding to death from a cut received from that same blade.
(Abductees)

Don't get me wrong. I'm glad that we have guys like Bruce with the knowledge and experience it takes to do 'good science' on UFOs. I simply cannot understand how the reporters, (experiencers) of the phenomena can so easily be ignored and almost forgotten in the process. We are 'taboo,' 'persona non grata' even in the minds of many respected ufologists who believe that UFOs are real.

We really need to get our priorities straight when it comes to the abductees. Until a serious and formal multi-disciplinary investigation is focused on the experiencers as well as the craft, many important answers will not be forthcoming. We need to muster public support for such a thing or it will never happen. Respected ufologists never acknowledging or mentioning the abductees is not going to help us get it.

Oh pooh, I don't think it really matters at this point anyway. I am convinced that it's way too late to do anything about it. For all intents and purposes the "Invasion" such as it is, is over! They are here, they are doing what they will with us, and apparently there's damn little that any of us can do about it.

Looks like "schakmat" to me.

(German for 'checkmate.')

Humanity will not "panic" when the revelation is made. (if it ever gets made) Instead, it'll be like Gene Wilder in Mel Brook's "The Producers." Standing there in complete shock, holding its little blue blanket, and repeating over and over again like a mantra, "No way out,...no way out,...no way out,...."

Regards, (hope you didn't take any of this personally Bruce. It was an 'opportunity' to vent and give voice to it. Couldn't pass up the oppt'y buddy. ;)

John Velez - Abductee

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

The Watchdog - 03-09-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 23:30:02 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 15:59:47 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-09-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind."
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

EXCLUSIVE

UFOWATCHDOG.COM interviews spokesperson from UFO X Files about alleged Roswell UFO artifact. Story will be posted Saturday, 10-MARCH-2001. Is this the Holy Grail for Roswell? Smoking gun or smoldering dud...stay tuned as UFOWATCHDOG.COM follows this story.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:13:11 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:00:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?!
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:46:38 -0600

>But, does anyone else agree that this is just the kind
>ufological occurrence or happenstance that smears the line of
>credulity into the state we have today? A lot can get hidden or
>gets unethical cover in something like this. I'm tired of this
>pussyly slow break-in to the paradigm shift, if that's the
>point. We've had our toe in the water, we know it's cold, but we
>also badly need a bath. Let's get it over with.

>Lehmborg@snowhill.com

Translation?

This thread is a joke, isn't it?

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10 - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 22:35:21 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:40:03 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10 - McGonagle

Apologies, the links in my last post were incorrect,
they are corrected below:

>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 11:03:30 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 10

>Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

><Masinaigan@aol.com>
>=====

> UFO ROUNDUP
>Volume 6, Number 10
>March 8, 2001
>Editor: Joseph Trainor

><http://www.ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

<snip>

>SMALL METEOR HITS A GARDEN IN YORK, UK

>A small meteor struck the ground in the city of York in the
>United Kingdom on Wednesday, February 28, 2001.

>"The small meteorite landed in the back garden of a house in
>York. Police said it left a hole one foot (0.3 meters) wide and
>three feet (0.9 meters) deep. Officials from the Yorkshire Museum
>have inspected the hole and confirmed that the object is a
>meteorite."

>"According to North Yorkshire police, a woman was out walking
>her dog in the Hopgrove section of York when she heard a loud
>explosion, followed by a rush of air and then saw a smoking
>crater in a field opposite the (Motorway) A64."

>"Sylvia Mercer was out walking her dog when she heard a strange
>banging noise" just before the meteor hit. (See BBC News for
>February 28, 2001. Many thanks to Martin Montague for this
>item.)

There are two versions of this story at the BBC website, this item
is from:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/uk/newsid_1198000/1198793.stm

I believe a more up to date and detailed version is at:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/sci/tech/newsid_1196000/1196688.stm

which attributes the event to an electrical cable fault.

Regards,

Joe

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Dozens See UFO Over Tegucigalpa, Honduras

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 16:45:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:51:32 -0500
Subject: Dozens See UFO Over Tegucigalpa, Honduras

SOURCE: Diario "La Tribuna" (Honduras)
DATE: March 9, 2001

DOZENS OF CITIZENS SEE ANOTHER UFO

Without having quite recovered from having concluded that the area of the La Tigra National Park harbors a mysterious attraction for UFOs, or may be a "magnetic vortex " or "window area" for said activity, dozens of persons yesterday saw another starship (sic) over the Honduran capital.

It was around 11:30 a.m. with the sun almost blazing in full noon glory when an oval, unknown artifact, grey in color and occasionally vibrating with intense whiteness, appeared over a region of the city's periphery on a contrail which seemed to come from the "Cristo de El Picacho" area.

This time, the sighting took place to one end of the right lane of the peripheral boulevard or beltway, in the direction of the Kennedy Sector, toward the exit leading to the country's southern reaches. The initial witnesses were two telephone technicians, one of whom happens to work for LA TRIBUNA.

When Gerardo Aceituno and his assistant, Juan Francisco Mairena, informed us of "the experience of their lives", noting that the starship was perhaps searching for a power source (since in the opposite lane, some 400 meters down the road, there is an electrical substation), we were reminded about what contactees and ufologists had told us about the way in which certain extraterrestrial civilizations enter our planet.

Our co-worker and his assistant were heading toward the main office of this newspaper aboard a SIEMENS Fiorella-type panel truck driven by a young motorist, and had barely passed a few meters in front of a filling station near the southern end of the beltway when the UFO appeared in the sky, at an estimated altitude of 300 meters.

[...]

Similarly surprised were college student Ivan Flores and amateur photographer Juan Carlos Molina, who managed to snap photographs of the two different UFOs (sic), the first one near "Cristo del Picacho" and the second one facing "La Tigra" from their Santa Lucia residence. Until yesterday, Gerardo Aceituno and Juan Francisco Mairena only knew of the phenomenon through the mass media. Both were surprised to learn that certain extraterrestrial beings power their starships to earth using the magnetic force of the areas they wish to reach--in other words, the so-called "magnetic vortexes" or "window areas".

One such area could be the entire mountainous massif which includes "La Tigra" up to the El Picacho hill, which appeared to be its point of origin.

[...]

"We were driving along the Kennedy (boulevard) to LA TRIBUNA's

(offices) and passing the filling station we were chatting in the car. Upon looking ahead, we saw something moving back and forth, up and down, some 300 meters up. At first we thought it was a piece of paper in the wind, but when we stopped the vehicle we clearly saw it was a flying saucer," states Gerardo Aceituno, who initially requested anonymity for obvious reasons.

"We stopped the car and saw that the UFO was grey, oval and with a whitish intensity, and while it was far away, it could have easily measured some five meters in diameter," he described, while Juan Francsico Mairena corroborated the event, adding that the was overcome by the sighting, which could have lasted about three minutes.

A row of 20 cars formed behind the SIEMENS vehicle and their occupants stared at the UFO's erratic movements in sheer amazement before it vanished southward with stunning swiftness. "It's velocity was amazing, perhaps faster than sound," suggested Mairena, who confessed to still being stupefied by the event. When the event was over, our interviewees asked an elegant lady who had pulled over in her pickup if she had also seen the UFO, but her only response was a smile of admiration and complicity in confirming something obvious. She drove away along the right lane with her daughter.

#####

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology
Special Thanks to Gloria R. Coluchi

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro Jsmortell@aol.com
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 18:44:21 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:58:42 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Mortellaro

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 07:46:20 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000

<snip>

>>As for what is "useful" or "serious" information about UFOs,
>>perhaps you should define your terms rather than denigrating my
>>comments, and then we might be able to discuss the issue
>>rationaly.

>Where sir -- was my denigration? I merely pointed out complacent
>assumptions you are making. I suspect that is what's jerked a
>knot in your parochial tail. Moreover, our discussion will not
>be rational if it restricts itself to the use of one tool, even
>if it arguably is the sharpest one in the shed.

>>My views are amply on record. I feel comfortable in
>>commenting on it (not "pronouncing") because I have a long track
>>record of serious-minded research and investigation.

>A proud appeal to authority added to the heap of assumption and
>fallacial thinking that seems to chonical the insider approach.
>It doesn't seem to have lessened the load of intellectual
>discomfort that the field suffers... perhaps you should consider
>evolving your paradigm.

>>And what is your excuse?

>I had a career inexplicably blow up over my very rational and
>balanced ufological interests. It's costing me. I want some
>freaking answers, sir, and get a little anxious when I see the
>ufological insiders smirking at the rank and file while doing
>_nothing_ whatsoever to ameliorate the mechanisms that keep them
>ignorant in the first place. ...My excuse, such that it is.

>On reflection, you fundamentalist science worshippers don't fill
>the bill, I imagine, because you don't follow that one rule of
>science to go where the evidence takes you. If that direction
>heads off to the uncomfortable, inconvenient, or unprofitable
>(?) then that direction is the direction generally not
>traveled. Disturbed by the attitude of the insider and convinced
>that the job is just not getting done in an intelligently
>inclusive manner, I'm compelled to my own research,
>investigation, and report.

>A lot of our conclusions and speculations are in parallel, sir.
>Our synergy might be key, perhaps even necessary in the
>successful search for real answers and better questions -- it's
>obvious that you're not getting there on your own. There are
>only more tongues in more cheeks, and that's not ALL the fault
>of the mystics, clowns, opportunists, New Agers, and '*others'.
>Be careful what you dismiss out of hand. Like any

>fundamentalist, you'd toss the tot with the bathwater.

>Now -- pull my finger. <g>.

Dear Mr. Hall, Alfred and EBK, along with the rest of you guys...

Mr. Lehmberg has indeed suffered the slings and arrows of his honesty. However what he did not report as significant, and it is with me, is the narrow minded silliness implied in some of the answers we hear from mainstream science. Often, the main stream paints a yellow trail in the snow.

This, to one who has (or perceives he has) experienced what the expert researcher has prognosticated upon. It doesn't make any sense to listen to the opinions oft' expressed by UFO researchers. Because to the experiencer, not only does the opinion not explain anything, but it doesn't even address the issues which the experiencer considers relevant.

In other words, nothing is revealed.

In other words, "what he said."

Jim

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Mars 'Worm'?

From: Sean Liddle <gortrix@kos.net>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 19:31:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 17:03:24 -0500
Subject: Mars 'Worm'?

Hi Everyone:

On a whim, amazed and intrigued as I am, I asked a co-worker who is a specialist in geology and hydrogeology what his opinion was on the 'Mars Worm' photos. He was very, very interested in what he saw and after looking at Mac's site, found himself more interested than skeptical pertaining to the bizarre photos of late that have been popping up.

He came up with one suggestion as to a possible natural way in which such a 'worm' could have been formed.

He suggested that a dry riverbed containing sub-surface sedimentary stratigraphy with a ribbed-topography could have existed, below which a sub-surface magma may have popped up. When it cooled and the sedimentary rock eroded, an obsidian like material could then have been exposed which, after natural polishing due to blowing sand, would keep the ribbed appearance of the former sedimentary rock yet reflect light.

Sounds like he is stretching for an answer but, he did say it was the best he could come up with. :)

Sean Liddle
KAPRA

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Cecchini

From: **Ron Cecchini** <Ron.Cecchini@GD-CS.COM>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 20:06:55 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 17:55:15 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Cecchini

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:10:11 -0500

>I'd suggest that our assumptions usually fall on the conserva-
>tive side -- that is, they resemble the first two items on my
>list, rather than the last two. The SETI literature is
>especially notable this way. First, of course, is the assump-
>tion that aliens would communicate by radio, but beyond that,
>it's intriguing to dip into the SETI literature and see other
>assumptions that get made. At one point (and I'm sorry that I
>don't have the references just now), SETI scientists asked how
>aliens might be different from us, and the answers were quite
>mundane -- maybe they'd achieved immortality. The basic
>assumption, which SETI scientists don't question, as far as I
>can see, is that aliens would communicate in ways we can
>understand, or in other words that they'd be more like us than
>unlike us.

First, "radio SETI" is not the only SETI project underway. Other approaches are being investigated and implemented to varying degrees. It's just that "doing radio" is easy, and not completely far-fetched, given what we currently know about the Universe.

Second, why should we expect to be able to understand ET?

We don't. Not at all.

But the main goal, right now, of the SETI Institute, at least, is to first find the darn signal. If and when that's found, then the linguists, cryptographers, et al, will be called in to do their thing. But right now not so much time is spent on trying to figure out what exactly an ET signal would look like; obviously we have no idea.

By the way, back in the 60's, I believe, MIT's Phil Morrison (probably the real "father of SETI") proposed developing a new branch of mathematics or linguistics called "anti-cryptography", which would be the idea of trying to make information as easily decipherable as possible. Its use here is obvious.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: ron.cecchini

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 18:03:37 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 17:59:13 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Tonnies

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 15:27:10 -0000

<snip>

>>One doubt that bugs me is his claim that he prophecied the
>>depletion of the ozone layer in 1985 while co-writing the
>>fictional novel Nature's End with Jim Kunetka. To my knowledge -
>>and I'd like to be corrected if need be - Japanese scientists
>>discovered the reality of the ozone problem in 1984, though in
>>fact two other scientists, Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina,
>>already predicted such an event in the 1970s.

>Chris,

>Jim McDonald was warning about it about 1967.

A claim that bugs me is this: about two years ago, when Strieber started talking about his face-to-face encounter with a person he identifies as "the Master of the Key in a Canadian hotel room, he mentioned off-handedly that he had 'previously met' this same guy and that they had discussed "the true meaning of the Tarot" (whatever that is).

So finally "The Key" comes out. Having been much intrigued by "Communion" and "Transformation" (and others) I buy it from his website and find that it contains a whole chapter devoted to discovering the "Master of the Key's" identity - but not one reference to the encounter he let slip on his site years before!

I promptly emailed him about the discrepancy and he replied with the advice to "absorb the philosophy and stop nitpicking over details."

My perception of Strieber took a significant fall. I asked a simple, obvious, perfectly relevant question and it was brushed off - and evidently erased from his website archives as well.

====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 20:23:37 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:02:02 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Evans

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:10:11 -0500
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 12:20:56 -0000

Previously, Jenny wrote:

>>Could we not create a net based 'panel' specifically involving -
>>say - 16 people. These people could be nominated to the List by
>>colleagues on the basis of their experience in the field and
>>their willingness to engage in the work required. Many major
>>groups could be represented. CSICOP and CUFOS could - for
>>instance - work together this way!

Greg replied:

>This is a terrific idea. At the very least, it would focus
>discussion.

<snip>

>I think it might also be wise to have psychologists and social
>scientists on an adjunct panel, considering how we conceptualize
>alien visits, and especially what our feelings about them are. I
>think we have trouble dealing with this question in part because
>it's deeply emotional. In fact, I think the main panel needs a
>facilitator, who could bring out unspoken assumptions that tend
>to derail rational argument. We've had more than 50 years to
>come to grips with all this, and we've failed. I'm not sure
>we'll succeed now unless we address the reasons for our failure.

Hi, Greg, Jenny!

On of the things that always seems to be left out of these
proposed "think tanks" is humor. Is it not possible that aliens
have a sense of humor? I know some people think I'm joking, but
I am not.

Hardly any of the tactics or actions of reported UFOs or ETs
seem to fall into any category of rational thought, by Earth
standards that is. However, if we consider that aliens just
might have a sense of humor and find delight in how we humans
react, then things don't seem so strange, after all. As Greg
pointed out, aliens might not understand our actions any more
than a cat does. Conversely, how many times have humans teased
cats? How many times have we "played" with animals of lesser
intelligence, just for the sheer entertainment and humor derived
from such an action?

Science fiction has instilled in us a preconception that an
encounter with ET would be dead serious and almost religious in
nature. Who knows? It may just as likely be "A Night at the
Opera" or "A Day at the Races", in cosmic terms. It is
presumptuous of us to think that we are more interesting on a
purely scientific level than on an amusement level. If I was an

alien observing the day to day actions of humans from a discrete location, I'd be laughing my butt off. More to the point, I'd invite all my alien friends to drop by a look for themselves.

Add a comedian to the "think tank". There might be a common ground for communication that no one has explored.

Roger Evans

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:05:58 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive
>evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks
>Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that
>-- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at
>least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what
>he thought he saw.

>I take it, then, that if Bob was convinced Arnold did see what
>he reported, that Bob, too, would be supporting the ETH.

Hi, Greg:

Yeah, right.

Actually, no, not necessarily. Ignoring the problem of proving
that what a now deceased person said they saw 50 years ago is
actually what happened, there could be a number of possibilities
that in my judgement would be more likely than non-ET craft
created by non-human intelligences (Bruce's OI/NHIs):

- 1) Mirages of snow-capped peaks. One of the oldest theories.
Still a Menzelian best bet.
- 2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.
- 3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities.).
- 4) U.S. secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.
- 4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose
distance Arnold had misjudged.
- 4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.
- 5) Canadian secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.
(Sorry EBK, guys, I must assign this a somewhat lower
probability, principally for technical reasons, such as
economics.)
- 6) Nazi secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation (with
ex-nazis or other non-OI/NHIs piloting).
- 7) Nine genuine ET craft, ET piloted or robotically controlled.
Since within 21 years, we had a human-piloted spacecraft
circumnavigate the Moon, someone else might be around. Note
that this is assigned the lowest probability, although it is
still given a higher marking than Bruce's OI/NHIs. This is also
principally for technical reasons, such as I haven't the

slightest idea what he is getting at, unless it's,

8) Angels, Seriphim, Apollo in his Sun chariot pulled by nine horses, or nine other OI/NHIs, etc.

Well, that's it, Greg. I would even go for ETs before the rapture.

May there always be Clear, Cloudless Skies and a Temperature Inversion over the Cascades in July,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 23:24:44 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:08:33 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 10:46:08 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 19:13:29 -0400
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>So what? It's up to you to disprove it-not the other way around.
>>Just sniping away, Bob, proves or disproves nothing.

>Hi, Don:

>Well, I beg to differ with you here. It is the responsibility of
>the proponent of a hypothesis to prove it, not the skeptics.
>Bruce's stated hypothesis, here, being that what Arnold saw were
>structured craft created by non-human intelligences, and that
>Arnold's testimony to their brightness and speed, alone, is
>sufficient to accept this hypothesis as proved.

>There is a role for scoffing, skepticism or whatever you want to
>call it. Otherwise, any idea, no matter how outlandish or
>impossible, must be accepted until proven wrong. You might be
>confusing American-English criminal law, where one is presumed
>innocent until proven guilty, with science, where ideas are
>presumed to be false, unless their case is proven.

>The two are actually opposite.

Hi Bob,

I disagree. There is no room for scoffing. Skeptism maybe-that's healthy. Scoffing is a denial on the basis of no information or education in the subject matter. Skeptism is based on having access to the same information as the claimant or the proponent of the sighting and raising questions pertinent to that information, and perhaps not yet ready to agree to a premise that has been presented.

American justice is based on English common law and both maintain the innocence of the accused until proven otherwise.

I could make a case for Arnold, for example, saying that he has made his claim-now it's up to you to prove him false. "Most" on this list are capable of filtering out the noise/garbage - or as you call it - the outlandish [a good term I might add] but dwelling on those and tarring the better cases with that same brush is what bothers me. There is- no doubt about it - a huge signal to noise ratio in Ufology. Which brings me back to justice-every criminal case must stand on its own - as should the UFO cases we get involved with.

Someone, a few days ago, alluded to anonymous witnesses, whistle blowers etc. The inference was that their testimony is worthless because they don't come forward. There again, I disagree. I know it's not a very flattering analogy but in a way they are the "snitches" or perhaps more romantically the "depthroats" we rely on in this game. We had/have a half dozen in the Shag Harbor case-military men, tough men, good men who none-the-less have a real fear of retribution if they go on the record.

This is getting long.

Regards,

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 22:49:59 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:10:23 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Young

>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:21:12 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: About Whitley Strieber

<snip>

>One doubt that bugs me is his claim that he prophecied the
>depletion of the ozone layer in 1985 while co-writing the
>fictional novel Nature's End with Jim Kunetka. To my knowledge -
>and I'd like to be corrected if need be - Japanese scientists
>discovered the reality of the ozone problem in 1984, though in
>fact two other scientists, Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina,
>already predicted such an event in the 1970s.

Hi, Chris:

Just checked my boxes of old Science News year-end index of
news.

In the December, 1981 issue, there was an entry for that year's
top science news that, "Preliminary findings showed the first
evidence of decrease in stratospheric ozone. (120:116)"

This was 1981, thus prophecy was unnecessary

In the December, 1984 year-end index there was an entry under
Environment, Satellite measurements confirmed that solar
ultraviolet light enhances the production of stratospheric ozone
(126:205), and a National Research Council report concluded that
ozone concentrations in the upper atmosphere are less vulnerable
to human activities than previously thought (125:134).

Knew those old mags would come in handy, sometime.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 20:27:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:14:02 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - McCoy

>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 13:15:13 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:27:57 -0000

<snip>

>Yes Dick, "something profoundly important indeed." Although
>I understand and can empathize with your "Martian artifact
>fatigue" we still have to keep "our ears on" in case something
>like this comes along. I've been blowing wind through my bullhorn
>since I first laid eyes on that thing on Mars. For my money,
>it's the first genuine and unmistakable anomaly to have been
>found. It's just a shame that so much static noise has been
>infused into the subject before now. These pictures are truly
>mind blowing stuff.

Yes, you speak truth,

>You don't need a slide rule or any fancy theories to know that
>what you're looking at is extraordinary. I'm dying to know what
>NASA says these features are. Josh made an excellent suggestion
>(indictment.) I will see if there's any one at NYU or Columbia
>that's willing to take a look at these pix and venture an
>educated opinion. If I get any responses I'll post them to the
>List.

>Welcome aboard the "Arrakeen Worm" express! Grab a maker hook
>and hold on for dear life. It's going to be a bumpy ride! ;)
>You, A.C. Clarke, Don Ledger and others, (we even got 'Young Bob'
>to admit that it looks "curious"!) I guess I'm in -good company-
>out here on this particular limb! ;)

Yes sir, I for one am holding tight.

>Regards,

>John 'Tree-hugging Hippie' Velez

GT McCoy

'Former One: who "dropped slimy red mud on buring trees from
antique airplanes."'

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 20:32:00 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:16:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - McCoy

Hello, all

>Source: <http://filersfiles.com/>

>Filer's Files #10 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>March 5, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com
>Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

<snip>

>GEORGIA: WAS A UFO INVOLVED IN THE CRASH OF ARMY TRANSPORT?

>MACON-- John Thompson an excellent UFO investigator sent me
>information from the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. Writers Ron
>Martz and Alan Judd report that 21 National Guard personnel died
>in a farm field near this small Georgia town when a twin-engine
>turboprop transport plane crashed and burst into flames March 3,
>2001. The worst military aviation disaster in Georgia's history
>involved the very reliable C-23 Sherpa troop and cargo carrying
>aircraft. There were heavy rains and thunderstorms reported in
>the general area. The Sherpa crashed about an hour after it took
>off at 8:57 a.m. from Hurlburt Field, an Air Force installation
>near Fort Walton Beach, Fla. The plane was en route to Oceana,

I nearly got whacked a couple of times in something far larger
than a Sherpa (it was a DC-7) by thunderstorm(s).

>Virginia., after a training mission at Hurlburt. President Bush
>issued a statement saying he was deeply saddened by news of the
>crash. "This tragic loss on a routine training mission reminds
>us of the sacrifices made each and every day by all of our men
>and women in uniform," Bush said in the statement. "The price of
>freedom is never free. Today's events remind us that it is
>sometimes unspeakably high.

Yep, and flying in nasty weather when the Bell Rings, or the
Horn goes off is one of them.

>Witnesses said the plane appeared to come down slowly and almost
>glide before crashing in a muddy field. Dennis Posey a farmer

Was it in a spin, or a spiral? big difference. Let alone
"gliding".

>described the sound of the plane coming down as "a scream." He
>heard a crash and Posey jumped in his pickup truck and drove a
>mile from his house, discovering a plane that was beyond hope.
>"It was engulfed. By that time, there was nothing anybody could
>do, I assure you," Posey said. "The impact was so great," he
>said. "I knew nobody could be alive when the plane hit the
>ground." He described the fuselage of the Army transport plane
>as compacted. "There was no way there was anybody left," he
>said. Posey said the plane apparently began to break apart
>before it crashed. A 4- or 5-foot piece of the tail section
>landed in a small pecan grove near the home of his father, D.E.
>Posey, about three-fourths of a mile from the crash site. A
>20-foot section of the plane's left wing hit the ground about a
>quarter-mile from the pecan grove, closer to the crash site.

>Posey said there were no burn marks on either of those pieces or
>a half-dozen other pieces of the plane scattered in the area.

I say they were in spiral, a condition in which the crew, for whatever reason Instrument failure, lack of training , or, airframe failure, unlikely in the Sherpa a Shorts Bros. product, built like (including rivets) like the QE-2. In a normal flight this is fine, but, in a spiral, especially with a failed attitude indicator(s) for whatever reason, speed will build up in a turn and the aircraft starts to spiral in the direction of what the pilot(s) perceive as straight and level. and the "G" forces build up and then there is structural failure (sometimes unbeknownst to the crew, until the fatal "crack!" is heard).

>Editor's Note: I have concerns that a UFO may have been involved
>in this crash. First, UFOs are frequently seen flying at low
>level in the general area. Second, the Sherpa is a slow flying
>aircraft and it is unlikely that both a wing and tail would have
>structural failure even if the craft had flown into bad weather.

Well, the Sherpa has a high wing loading, it is a derivative of the Shorts Skyvan and the Brueguet 396, all are have a narrow , high aspect ratio (take a sailplane for instance) but , unlike the Brueguet, the Shorts products had short, wings with flaps, spoilers, and slots to make it perform like a Dakota/DC-3/C-47/li-2 with just flaps. (and a reasonable wing.)

>Third, Similar crashes have occurred with unknown metals found
>on the tail structures and wings indicating a mid-air collision
>with an unidentified craft. Forth, The crew had no time to
issue >any warning or May Day indicating a collision of some
type. >Fifth, witnesses indicated there was no airborne
explosion. I

Yes, but if you are busy saying " what was that noise?" being too late at that point. and trying to figgure it out.

>freely admit this is a remote possibility, however it is time
>that all possibilities be considered in the tragic loss of life.
>UFOs are frequently sighted in the area of crashes. The
>extraordinary power and high speeds of UFOs may accidentally
>cause damage to our aircraft.

George, I respect you and the folks who died, but I think that this is a unfortunate training accident.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 02:00:36 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:21:59 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates

>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 09:21:12 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: About Whitley Strieber

>Hi to All,

>My twin interests in folklore and CEIII/IV narratives have drawn
>me to the books of Whitley Strieber many times. As I am
>fascinated by his remodelling of the Celtic fairy faith but
>unconvinced by the bulk of his allegedly auto- biographical
>anecdotes, I would like to receive comments from others with
>information regarding his work. (I am aware of the official and
>unofficial sites dealing with his writings.)

>One doubt that bugs me is his claim that he prophecied the
>depletion of the ozone layer in 1985 while co-writing the
>fictional novel Nature's End with Jim Kunetka. To my knowledge -
>and I'd like to be corrected if need be - Japanese scientists
>discovered the reality of the ozone problem in 1984, though in
>fact two other scientists, Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina,
>already predicted such an event in the 1970s.

The so called Antartica Ozone hole, and the one at the North Pole was discovered in 1958 by the US Navy. The flux of the Ozone hole opening big, closing etc has been monitored ever since then.

During the 70s a number of doom/gloom enviro's came out of the woodwork making all sorts of predictions like how the earth would run out of natural resources no later then 1975, global ice age was the big hyperboil back in the 70s and all so called scientific evidence pointed to the fact that the earth was going to turn into an ice cube so to speak.

In the 80s it was Global warming hype, i.e., all scientific evidence pointed to global warming not global cooling and how all previous scientific research (which pointed to global ice age) was bogus.

Now we seem to have notions and theorys abounding about how global warming is actual going to bring about global ice age, etc., etc.

Point being is the ozone problem and gloom and doom predictions have been around long before Whitley ever showed up.

>In 'The Secret School' Strieber writes that another imaginary
>glimpse of the future, a nuclear accident resembling Chernobyl,
>"was considered so improbable at the time that it was edited
>out of the published version of Nature's End" (page 192 of my
>now tatty paperback edition).

Isn't it interesting how these guys can look back and claim all sorts of things, but when they have to "look to the future" their predictions get problematic.

For example people look back in time so to speak and finger various events as fulfillment of this or that Nostradamus

pronouncement, _but_ when these same people look to the future, nothing came true.

You may recall that one that went something like "in the year 1999, in the 7th month... the great terror will come from the sky... and wars will begin... blah blah.

Never happened. But, it doesn't stop them.

I predict that Whitley will be more accurate looking back in time then forward in time.

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 23:00:00 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:24:06 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Hatch

>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:02:22 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>>If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
>>"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
>>that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

>>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

>How about trans-dimensional or trans-temporal phenomena? Surely
>you don't think that the ETH is the only possibility?

Hello Joe and Bob:

Yes, time and dimensional travel have been suggested from time
to time. While I don't personally favor either of these, we
definitely have more choices than Mork from Space and Deros from
a hollow Earth.

As for non-human craft without ETs, how about unmanned probes
from space? They could have machine intelligence roughly
equivalent to that of a human, perhaps superior in some
respects; fast logic or decision-making maybe.

This alleviates the tedium of space travel for living beings,
they can stay home and smell the gyrantheums, (or whatever
..burp!) It could solve other problems.

I guess you would call this ET without the ETs, as in living
natural beings.

Between advanced machine tech and genetic engineering, the clean
line between living and non-living entities could become a
complete blur in a super-advanced society. Heck, that could lay
in store for us here on Earth, without no outside intervention
at all.

Aside from certain cases where we may disagree, Bruce makes
sense to me.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:09:17 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:30:30 -0500
Subject: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?

Greetings List,

Those who are following the latest Rendlesham Forest mutterings, and who don't subscribe to Fortean Times (shame on you!) might be interested in the following from the Hierophant, and published in the current issue out today (10 March):

"There's nothing like a bit of controversy to get the cash tills ringing, a fact of which publishers Sidgwick & Jackson seem keenly aware. They recently loosed a book entitled "You Can't Tell the People" by Georgina Bruni - the usual mish-mash of UFO conspiracy bumpf plus an interview with a briefly-lucid Baroness Thatcher, all centred around the famous Rendlesham Forest 'incident'.

And what better way to drum up a little publicity than to have questions raised in Parliament?

The ever-reliable Admiral Lord Hill Norton obliged by posing a few queries in late January: whether the Ministry of Defence were aware that personnel from the Suffolk Constabulary were involved in investigating Rendlesham ("no"), and whether any official investigation was pending ("no").

Rivetting stuff, I'm sure you'll agree..."

Has the Hierophant been reading my postings on UFO UpDates?

Best wishes,

Dave Clarke

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Chris Carter Interview

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:02:46 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 19:04:55 -0500
Subject: Chris Carter Interview

Hi Folks

Since a rather tame mention of an Interview with X Files creator was mentioned a short while ago, seeing this I thought some might be interested.

<http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue202/interview.html>

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 10](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

From: Dave Bowden <grafikfx@lineone.net>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:48:55 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 19:08:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

<snip>

John and all,

It was of course a joke.

I remember an episode of the Simpsons where Bart saw an open umbrella blow past his bedroom window and started saying he saw a flying saucer.

There was a knock at the door, Lisa answered and was confronted with two military types.

"We didn't see a UFO!" says Lisa.

"Thats right young lady, you saw nothing" was their 'mysterious' reply.

Big yuks!

It was just a gag based on present day mythology.

I'm almost expecting a mail from someone who thinks 'Third rock from the Sun' has a hidden message ;)

But if you want to talk 'disturbing TV', check out the pre-school stuff.

The Telly Tubbies... now there's a genetic experiment gone horribly wrong.

Dave

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 11:07:40 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:27:16 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 13:40:11 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 19:17:09 -0600
>>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Does "skeptic" mean someone who twists other people's
>>>Donald Ledger a strawman that can be easily knocked down?

>>Lan:

>>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>>testimony or not?

>>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>>ETH, based upon belief or not?

>I don't know why you would ask Lan about my belief.

>But anyway, the answer to 1 depends upon what you mean by
>"supported." Certainly we have Arnold's testimony. There was
>also the testimony of Fred Johnson who claimed to have seen the
>same objects just after Arnold. (Johnson was south of Arnold in
>the Cascade Range at the time). And there was a report that a
>forest fire ranger in a lookout tower may have seen the same
>objects (I don't think there anyone located the person... don't
>recall now.) Moreover, Arnold's testimony is quite clear in
>terms of what he says he saw and there is no evidence that he
>was "out of his mind" (drunk, delusional, etc.)

<snip>

Hi Bruce,

I have this feeling that the skeptics believe the Arnold sighting is the Holy Grail of UFO sightings. Knock it down and the whole field will tumble after. To me it's just another case but with a great deal of integrity.

There is also a perception that astronomers somehow have an expertise in this thin line separating Earth and space called the atmosphere, that they do not. Atmospheric physicists and pilots do because it is the area they work in. Astronomers do not. Most astronomers [note I said most not all!] could care less about the first 60 miles between them and space and the universe except where it interferes with viewing conditions - or when a meteor or bolide passes through it. None-the-less they get dragged into the debate on many occasions with little or no experience or information on the phenomenon.

Careful attention should be paid to the NARCAP program. It has the potential to produce some results in swaying the "government" to address the phenomenon [if they aren't already] if for no other reason than for safety's sake.

Best,

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Ledger

From: dledger@ns.sympatico.ca
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 11:10:33 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:29:08 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Ledger

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article
>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 22:44:01 -0000

>I am pleased to report that 10 or 12 requests for my article
> already have been received from across three continents.

<snip>

Where can I get a copy Dick?

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 11:38:24 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:34:08 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:02:22 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>>If these "Other Intelligences/Non-Human Intelligences" are not
>>"Extraterrestrial", then what the heck are they? Maybe he thinks
>>that they come from the center of the Earth, like the old Deros?

>>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

>How about trans-dimensional or trans-temporal phenomena? Surely
>you don't think that the ETH is the only possibility?

Hi Joe,

It's a question of which is more likely to fit the bill isn't it. To me trans-dimensional or trans-temporal explanations are more off the wall than the ETH-but that's just my opinion. Who should care what Bruce believe's, that's his business, not ours. It doesn't interfere with his work in the field.

I know of one individual in this country -a politician - that ran as the leader for a party hoping to form the next federal government who has strong religious beliefs that include a literal belief in the Bible and all of the fairy tales it contains, including the belief in Adam and Eve and that the world began about six thousand years ago.

Now here would have been an individual whose childlike beliefs could have really screwed up our education systems where it was affected by government support or medical research and possibly dozens of other programs.

In that case we were asked to put aside a man's personal religious belief and vote for him.

I don't think so.

His belief could profoundly affect the way government is conducted.

As it turns out this turkey was abusing public funds anyway and likely due for political obscurity down the road.

But Bruce's is not a religious belief - it's a belief that seems to fit the bill and one I tend toward.

The resistance to the ETH seems to have roots in the early days of UFO research, where UFOs were to be studied but dropped like

a hot potato if someone mentioned occupants.

Don Ledger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 08:19:52 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:38:13 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gehrman

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 00:45:45 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Robert,

You asked:

>Did you ever get around to shipping Roger a VHS copy?

I never said that I intended to ship Roger a VHS copy of the AA.

Were you under the impression that I had?

All we have are the AA CDs, the copy of Flatland and the Fort Worth photos. Neither Neil nor I have a VHS to ship to anyone.

>I have seen the footage quite a number of times. It looks like
>a Hollywood FX job.

I have studied the AA footage many hours and there is absolutely nothing that looks like a "Hollywood FX job". Perhaps you could point out to the List the specific things you saw that indicated this to you.

>So how did you get it to CD in the first place? Of of what
>medium? Just curious

The AA CDs are digitized from a betacam version that was loaned to Neil. Few folks have seen this version but it is the same version that Theresa Carlson used for her research.

>Bottom line apparently is they think its a phony.

Theresa still thinks that its a wonderful fraud and Dennis doesn't quite know what to think. He hasn't viewed the new CDs and Theresa refused to look at our evidence.

>Again only one so called "trained metal worker." Now if you had
>a number of so called trained metal workers saying the same
>thing as the one dude, that would make it real interesting. I
>suspect that if you put this out to a group of trained metal
>workers they would disagree with your one guy.

You can "suspect" anything you wish but the tone of the above is insulting. How do you know what other metallurgists would say once they took a good look?

I have confidence in Dennis' abilities and therefore trust his judgment. If you can find someone to refute him, then fine; otherwise I suggest you take a good look for yourself.

It's easy to see what Dennis was describing about the characteristics of the debris, but you continue to refuse to look at the evidence.

Ed

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 12:07:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:39:51 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:14:21 -0000

>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

Yup.

Those who do not agree should have explanations at the ready
(explanations for UFO sightings, that is).

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 12:12:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:44:58 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 10:46:08 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 19:13:29 -0400
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>So what? It's up to you to disprove it-not the other way around.
>>Just sniping away, Bob, proves or disproves nothing.

>Hi, Don:

>Well, I beg to differ with you here. It is the responsibility of
>the proponent of a hypothesis to prove it, not the skeptics.

This is true, and it applies to the person(s) who propose one or more explanations for a particular sighting.

Sure, if one wishes to proposed an explanation for the general phenomenon first, such as "SOME UFO sightings are evidence of OI/NHI/ET craft or whatever, it is the burden on that person to prove.

Where the scoffers/debunkers have "gone wrong" is in failing to realize that the same burden falls equally on them when they propose explanations.

The true skeptic is skeptical of both positions regarding a particular UFO sighting: the claim of the observer or of the sighting analyst that a sighting cannot be explained AS WELL AS the claim by the scoffer/debunker/skeptic..whatever... who claims that some particular explanation convincingly explains the sighting.

The scientific method plays a LARGE role in arriving at an explanation or in determining that any particular explanation will not work. A prime example is one of the sections of the (formerly world famous) New Zealand movie (Dec. 31, 1978). This section shows a flashing light that changes color and shape and so on. No one can dispute what is shown on the film. Although it is possible to dispute exactly when the film was obtained, we can positively bracket the time. Then we can look for all possible known sources of light that could explain the film. After examining all known sources I declared the light unexplained.

Skeptic P. J. Klass thought differently. He observed that there was a red light on top of the aircraft (rotating beacon) which flashed at a rate compatible (when all technical details are taken into account) with the flash rate on the film. He therefore suggested (and published) the explanation that the light on top of the aircraft was what the cameraman (David Crockett!) had filmed.

Realizing that his explanation was not "totally transparent:" to the reader (the light was on top of the airplane; the top of the airplane was metal; no way to film looking from inside the airplane upward through the roof to the light), he conceived of a possible method for the cameraman to film the flashing light: have the camera turned to the right with the lens pointing out the right side window toward the propellor; red beacon light could then reflect off the propellor into the camera lens).

Without going into all the technical details of how this might work suffice it to say that P.J. K had realized that the burden of proof was on him to demonstrate how his hypothesis could explain the film images.

Unfortunately for PJK he did not test his hypothesis as thoroughly as he should have before he published his explanation and therefore he committed himself in print (in UFOS: The Public Deceived, published in 1983; aptly named because he deceived the public) to an explanation which is undoubtedly, indubitably, absolutely and unequivocally (this is based on optical physics and photography and has nothing to do the UFOS!) WRONG!,

We have recently had a long running discussion... some might say argument... over the Kenneth Arnold sighting. Although skeptics coming in from the outside may think that this is an argument over ET vs pelicans or whatever, at its most basic it is not.

Instead, it is fundamentally argument over specific explanations.

It is necessary to carry out this argument for all proposed explanations because it is only after ALL explanations have been rejected that we can then proposed something truly "new" like the ET. This is standard scientific process. You first try to explain some new phenomenon in terms of what is already known. Some scientists will be skeptical that the new phenomenon is truly new: they argue that "old" knowledge will explain it. They try all known explanations (applications of known theory to the phenomenon). Only if all explanations fail are they willing to admit that something new underlies the phenomenon.

>>Bruce's stated hypothesis, here, being that what Arnold saw were >>structured craft created by non-human intelligences, and that >>Arnold's testimony to their brightness and speed, alone, is >>sufficient to accept this hypothesis as proved.>

Semi-right.

Semi-wrong.

I was discussing one particular hypothesis when I mentioned brightness and speed. There were other "Candidate Explanatory Hypotheses" as well.

My argument is that Arnold's testimony, which includes information about brightness, speed, shape, where and at what time the observation took place, flight dynamics etc. is sufficient to reject all the explanations that have been proposed.

One proposed explanation was that by Easton, who did not provide any independent arguments about why the previous explanations were wrong, which they had to be if his were right. (The correct scientific method of providing and explanation for a phenomenon includes demonstrating why YOUR explanation is correct and explanations by others are wrong.)

Easton claimed that his analysis proved that pelicans could explain the sighting.

I (and numerous others) claimed that he was wrong (for the pelican explanation to work one has to ignore or "reinterpret" some of Arnold's observations).

Furthermore, having studied all the dozen or so explanations ;proposed over the years, I concluded that the sighting was unexplained, pelicans notwithstanding, and therefore claimed that the objects observed were true unknowns. Based on this I could legitimately then offer an explanation based on "unknown" (unaccepted by the scientific community) phenomena, namely OI/NHI (other intelligences.non-human intelligences) traveling

in metallic, semi-circular craft of some sort. Having made this proposition/hypothesis, I could then ask the questions, where did they come from, who are they? I have suggested that the "simplest" answer is that they are ET's from somewhere "out there" and they got here by traveling through space using means of which we are do not yet understand or perhaps we partially understand (but are not able to apply the understanding).

>There is a role for scoffing, skepticism or whatever you want to
>call it. Otherwise, any idea, no matter how outlandish or
>impossible, must be accepted until proven wrong. You might be
>confusing American-English criminal law, where one is presumed
>innocent until proven guilty, with science, where ideas are
>presumed to be false, unless their case is proven.

Yes, any idea, hypothesis, should be considered, no matter how outlandish or impossible. And any explanation should be considered "false" until proven correct.

(Example: The quantum hypothesis of Planck about 100 years ago, that energy in certain systems comes in steps rather than being continuous, was "outlandish" (which is based on the idea that people from another area/country are "weird" or unbelievable) but led to a revolution in our understanding of the physical universe.)

So, we consider the hypothesis of ice meteors for Arnold's sighting.

We consider motes in the eye for Arnold's sighting.

We consider water drops on the windshield.

We consider snow blowing from the top of Mt. Rainier.

And So On. through numerous "outlandish" explanations.

(Some are not so outlandish until you look more carefully at them. Some become reasonable if you ignore particular aspects of Arnold sighting information.)

My analysis led me to reject all the proposed explanations proposed as "outlandish" in the face of information presented by Arnold (and Fred Johnson).

I am therefore "allowed by science" to propose something else. However, there are some people who will not agree that Arnold's sighting is unexplained. It is the burden on each one of those people, therefore, to devise an explanation and defend it against attack by the skeptics.... in this case, those who are skeptical that the sighting can be explained.

Note that picking 2 or more explanations is "illegal:" a sighting has one explanation (which could be complicated), not two or more. (Menzel offered half a dozen when one should have been sufficient.)

Skeptics often act as if the more proposed explanations there are the more likely it is that a sighting has been explained.

I look at it the other way around: the more explanations that have been offered, the less likely it is that any one of the explanations is correct.

But, in any case an explanation must be able to stand or fall on its own.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Labels And Communication - Jones

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 15:53:40 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:46:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Labels And Communication - Jones

>Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 04:48:59 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Labels And Communication

Afternoon Roy

>I must agree with you on this one. I get the message from
>certain posts on this List, by sceptics' that those of us who
>happen to have a view on the possibility of ET visiting Earth,
>are nothing more than cranks, etc. And that they <sceptics>are
>here to rescue humanity from this dreaded clown parade, as they
>>wish to portray themselves to the public, as the sane and
>rational thinking ones, who are very steady human beings with
>full working perspectives on ET related events.

>And I suppose these sceptics never have arguments, never have
>failed marriages, never suffer from alcohol abuse, drug abuse,
>sexual adventures/affairs of the heart, all the things that make
>us humans who we are. Oh and parking tickets amongst others! And
>if they don't, then I guess we are looking at the wrong aliens!

>And are we to take it that sceptics represent the public in any
>way, like a good guy saving the day from the UFO nutters. If so
>who appointed them?

Methinks you misread what I said. If I understand you correctly,
you are saying that most sKeptics are boring squares with no
real life in them. On the contrary, using the same person, I
could say Andy Roberts is a skeptic, and far from _normal_.

I see these people as being like you or me, with a completely
different viewpoint. I have had raging rows with certain people
on this list (and off it for that matter) but I still respect
them as a person. And this is a free country, so is the USA as
far as I know <g> so we are all entitled to our opinions,
however far fetched _either_ extremes are.

I just might not respect their views <g>.

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Jones

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:46:19 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:53:01 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Jones

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article
>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 22:44:01 -0000

Afternoon Richard,

>I am pleased to report that 10 or 12 requests for my article
>already have been received from across three continents. Just
>think: When I first started seriously investigating UFOs there
>were no personal computers, no world wide web, and my electric
>typewriter at NICAP was "high tech."

>The space program had just begun and no one had been to the
>Moon, and no space probes to the planets and beyond. Major
>Keyhoe used a Dictaphone and the most common airliners were
>DC-6s or DC-7s.

We youngsters have no idea how hard things were, do we <g> we
will have to wait until our kids are all growed up before we can
say "back in our day we only had a screen for the Internet, we
didn't have a fully interactive 3D simulated world like you
young whipper-snappers have got.

Things change Richard, not always for the better.

>Anyway, those of you who spell things weirdly certainly may
>change "center" to "centre" and "skeptic" to "sceptic" if you
>wish. Also note that two-thirds of the way down page two I
>misspelled anthropologists as "anthopologists." Otherwise, I
>look forward to comment, feedback, and discussion.

Without wanting to seem picky, it is our English language, not
American English. We also have colour, not color, I could go on
but I am not going to. But I feel with the Internet and
computers, especially Billsoft (also known as Windoze) we will
all be speaking the same language, more or less, in a decade or
so.

Now to the point, your article. I nearly asked you for a copy,
but then I realised that many others would do so, and they did
what I would have done, post it on their websites for others to
see and read. I would ask though, why did you not just post it
here for comments?

The first thing that I would say about your article is that I
now further understand your terms of reference. It would appear
that what to me is a skeptic, you refer to as a "Scoffer", but we
both agree on what a sceptic is <g>. I have just checked my
dictionary and both are listed as the same by the way, so to
keep a clear understanding I will try and remember to use your
term of scoffer from now on.

Being one the middle of the road types that you mentioned,
everything that you said sounded reasonable, and also
idealistic. Jenny Randles has also suggested a council of
sixteen, with Greg Sandow suggesting the addition of a poet and
a philosopher. That too sounds to me as idealistic, therefore
unachievable.

Ufoology is further away from respectability than it was in the sixties and seventies. I say this because at least then there wasn't the Internet and mass media to publish any old crap that anyone wanted to publish/post/etc.

I agree with you, to get a scientific or peer review of the UFO phenomenon we and I use that term loosely, would have to get rid of all the wackos that infest sensible Ufology. There are many good people involved these days but for every one sensible and logical hard working researcher there are ten or even fifteen prats. It has been like this for as far back as I can remember and I have been in this game for several years now.

So to the point, how do we sensible hard working researchers divest ourselves of the radical extremes on both sides? To quote Kenny Everett, "round em all up, put them in a field and bomb the barstards!"

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Lowe

From: Adam Lowe <nicap@blueyonder.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 19:19:43 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:56:43 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Lowe

Hi Errol, list.

I'd just like to add the NICAP site to the list that has posted
Richard Hall's paper. The address:

<http://www.nicap.dabsol.co.uk/concept.htm>

Thanks,

Adam

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

CCCRN News: 'Ice Circles' Update - 03-10-01

From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:50:45 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:59:18 -0500
Subject: CCCRN News: 'Ice Circles' Update - 03-10-01

CCCRN NEWS

The E-News Service of the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

March 10, 2001

'ICE CIRCLES' UPDATE - MEDIA COVERAGE, REMOTE VIEWING REPORT
AND ANOTHER RING

A few more updates regarding the ice rings here in Canada.

Some very good recent media coverage of them this past week, and the just-released 2000 Summary Report in general, including 'Here and Now' (CBC Radio, Toronto), 'The Chat Room' (TalkTV, Toronto), The National Post, The Montreal Gazette, The Edmonton Journal, The Vancouver Sun and others. Thanks to Southam News reporter Jim Bronskill whose original article helped to generate a lot of interest! As coined by The National Post, perhaps they can now be referred to as UFOs (unidentified frozen objects)...

Links to available online versions of some of the news articles:

The National Post (March 8, 2001)

<http://www.nationalpost.com/news/national/story.html?f=/stories/20010308/494736.html>

The Edmonton Journal (March 8, 2001)

<http://www.edmontonjournal.com/news1/stories/010308/5062639.html>

If you know of any others (print or online), please advise and they will be added to the web site.

Other interviews scheduled for next week:

CHQR 77AM (Calgary, Alberta) - 'Calgary's Talk Radio Station'
'The QR77 Morning Show'
Taped Monday morning, to be broadcast at some point during The QR77 Morning Show program on Tuesday morning, 5:00 - 8:00 am MT

CHQR 77AM (Calgary, Alberta) - 'Calgary's Talk Radio Station'
'The Rutherford Show'
Live, 12:00 pm MT

For those not in the Calgary area, you can also listen live on the internet, with Windows Media Player at:

<http://www.qr77.com>.

The @Discovery.ca program on The Discovery Channel may also do an upcoming segment.

In addition, as a result of the newspaper article in the

Montreal Gazette, another ice ring was reported which we didn't know about previously. This one was found at St. Polycarpe, Quebec, in early November, 1996. Found on newly formed ice on the Deslisle river in back of the rural home of the Bruyere-Bergeron family. It reportedly again appeared overnight, lasting for a couple days until the ice melted. Photos and further details should be available soon.

Also, the Hawai'i Remote Viewers' Guild recently did a remote viewing session of the Delta, Ontario ice ring found last December and submitted their report to CCCRN, which can now be viewed on their web site:

<http://www.hrvq.org/newsletter/2001-03/ice.html>

While their findings are certainly possible, one of the key aspects of this ring, similar to others over the years, was the ice being apparently too thin for someone to stand on and make it, so it is left to everyone to reach their own conclusions. An interesting and well-presented report.

© Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, 2001

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:09:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 12:01:04 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Stacy

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Is the Arnold sighting based upon unsupported eyewitness
>>testimony or not?

>>Is Bruce's belief that Arnold's testimony, alone, proves the
>>ETH, based upon belief or not?

>Seems to be there's something very simple going on here.

>Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive
>evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks
>Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that
>-- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at
>least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what
>he thought he saw.

<snip>

Bob, Greg, Bruce et al,

A short while after his original sighting, Arnold reported a
second one with a flock of small UFOs that suspiciously
resembled geese.

Awhile later, he reported a third sighting in which he claimed
to have filmed two UFOs, one of which he could allegedly see
through.

Has anyone ever seen that film?

Dennis

<http://www.anomalist.com>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 23:27:38 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 12:04:41 -0500
Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology - Hall

>From: Jim Mortellaro Jsmortell@aol.com
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 18:44:21 EST
>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 07:46:20 -0600

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: The Paradox Of Ufology
>>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 22:58:48 -0000

><snip>

>>>As for what is "useful" or "serious" information about UFOs,
>>>perhaps you should define your terms rather than denigrating my
>>>comments, and then we might be able to discuss the issue
>>>rationality.

>
>>Where sir -- was my denigration? I merely pointed out complacent
>>assumptions you are making. I suspect that is what's jerked a
>>knot in your parochial tail. Moreover, our discussion will not
>>be rational if it restricts itself to the use of one tool, even
>>if it arguably is the sharpest one in the shed.

>>>My views are amply on record. I feel comfortable in
>>>commenting on it (not "pronouncing") because I have a long track
>>>record of serious-minded research and investigation.

>>A proud appeal to authority added to the heap of assumption and
>>fallacious thinking that seems to chronicle the insider approach.
>>It doesn't seem to have lessened the load of intellectual
>>discomfort that the field suffers... perhaps you should consider
>>evolving your paradigm.

>>>And what is your excuse?

>>I had a career inexplicably blow up over my very rational and
>>balanced ufological interests. It's costing me. I want some
>>freaking answers, sir, and get a little anxious when I see the
>>ufological insiders smirking at the rank and file while doing
>>_nothing_ whatsoever to ameliorate the mechanisms that keep them
>>ignorant in the first place. ...My excuse, such that it is.

>>On reflection, you fundamentalist science worshippers don't fill
>>the bill, I imagine, because you don't follow that one rule of
>>science to go where the evidence takes you. If that direction
>>heads off to the uncomfortable, inconvenient, or unprofitable
>>(?) then that direction is the direction generally not
>>traveled. Disturbed by the attitude of the insider and convinced
>>that the job is just not getting done in an intelligently
>>inclusive manner, I'm compelled to my own research,
>>investigation, and report.

>Dear Mr. Hall, Alfred and EBK, along with the rest of you
>guys...

>Mr. Lehmborg has indeed suffered the slings and arrows of his
>honesty. However what he did not report as significant, and it
>is with me, is the narrow minded silliness implied in some of
>the answers we hear from mainstream science. Often, the main
>stream paints a yellow trail in the snow.

>This, to one who has (or perceives he has) experienced what the
>expert researcher has prognosticated upon. It doesn't make any
>sense to listen to the opinions oft' expressed by UFO
>researchers. Because to the experiencer, not only does the
>opinion not explain anything, but it doesn't even address the
>issues which the experiencer considers relevant.

>In other words, nothing is revealed.

>In other words, "what he said."

Jim,

I appreciate what you are saying here, but...I also have
suffered greatly for my advocacy and, as a result, am still
hustling around at age 70 trying to survive financially.

Never did I claim that science has explained UFOs; science has
been totally in default. Hell, I'm getting tired of trying to
explain this, but wild-eyed speculations and New Age blatherings
are no substitute for science.

As Allen Hynek pointed out, "science is not necessarily what
scientists do" (or words to that effect). As far as those
"experiencers" who have felt the brunt of scientific default and
who have suffered, I have been their champion (rather
outspokenly for someone whose instincts are conservative) not
their adversary.

Please read my writings before you condemn me, and especially
what I say in The UFO Evidence: Volume II.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - Filer

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:32:44 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 12:10:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001 - Filer

>From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #10 -- March 5, 2001
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 20:32:00 -0800

>>Source: <http://filersfiles.com/>

>>Filer's Files #10 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>>March 5, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com
>>Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

><snip>

>>GEORGIA: WAS A UFO INVOLVED IN THE CRASH OF ARMY TRANSPORT?

>>MACON-- John Thompson an excellent UFO investigator sent me
>>information from the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. Writers Ron
>>Martz and Alan Judd report that 21 National Guard personnel died
>>in a farm field near this small Georgia town when a twin-engine
>>turboprop transport plane crashed and burst into flames March 3,
>>2001. The worst military aviation disaster in Georgia's history
>>involved the very reliable C-23 Sherpa troop and cargo carrying
>>aircraft. There were heavy rains and thunderstorms reported in
>>the general area. The Sherpa crashed about an hour after it took
>>off at 8:57 a.m. from Hurlburt Field, an Air Force installation
>>near Fort Walton Beach, Fla. The plane was en route to Oceana,

<snip>

>George, I respect you and the folks who died, but I think that
>this is a unfortunate training accident.

>GT McCoy

The bad weather did not occur until fifteen minutes later. Why
was the wing and tail sheared off from a fairly slow flying
aircraft?

They landed a mile away.

I've got 5000 hours flying time and even in a uncontrolled spin
its unusual for the plane to disintegrate. Witnesses claim there
was no engine trouble and it glided in slowly.

Video from the shuttle shows Southern Georgia is a high speed
UFO route.

Regards,

George Filer

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: Richard Hall "<hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 23:46:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 12:13:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:09:17 -0000

>Greetings List,

>Those who are following the latest Rendlesham Forest mutterings,
>and who _don't_ subscribe to Fortean Times (shame on you!) might
>be interested in the following from the Hierophant, and
>published in the current issue out today (10 March):

>"There's nothing like a bit of controversy to get the cash tills
>ringing, a fact of which publishers Sidgwick & Jackson seem
>keenly aware. They recently loosed a book entitled "You Can't
>Tell the People" by Georgina Bruni - the usual mish-mash of UFO
>conspiracy bumpf plus an interview with a briefly-lucid Baroness
>Thatcher, all centred around the famous Rendlesham Forest
>'incident'.

>And what better way to drum up a little publicity than to have
>questions raised in Parliament?

>The ever-reliable Admiral Lord Hill Norton obliged by posing a
>few queries in late January: whether the Ministry of Defence
>were aware that personnel from the Suffolk Constabulary were
>involved in investigating Rendlesham ("no"), and whether any
>official investigation was pending ("no").

>Rivetting stuff, I'm sure you'll agree..."

>Has the Hierophant been reading my postings on UFO UpDates?

Dave,

Well, that certainly sounds like highly reliable, scientifically oriented information!

Fortean Times and Bob Rickard, whom I actually used to know in person, face-to-face (nice, humorous fellow) are notoriously anti-UFO.

Their "coverage" of the topic proceeds from an extremely slanted and negative bias.

I would be delighted to debate him on the subject in the pages of FT.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Whitley Strieber's Cabin?

From: Scott Carr <sardy_2000@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:10:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 12:15:09 -0500
Subject: Whitley Strieber's Cabin?

Dear List,

Does anyone one know the street address of the cabin at which Whitley Strieber claims the bulk of his experiences (at least those depicted in Communion) took place?

I only ask because I am now living in Cragsmoor, NY (a very small community in the Hudson Valley, right next door to Pine Bush) and have it on good word that Strieber's old house is less than a mile from my own.

I'd be very curious to see it - not because I'm convinced of any of his claims - but because I'm fascinated with the ufological folklore and subculture of the area.

I do know that Whitley sold the cabin a while back and moved to Texas, so I don't see how disclosing the address could possible infringe anyone's privacy - but better to be safe than sorry. Please feel free to email me directly, rather than posting this info to the list.

Thanks!

Scott C. Carr
Editor, The Flying Saucer Gazette
www.erols.com/sardonica

sardy_2000@yahoo.com

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 20:14:07 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:18:25 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Fleming

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 23:27:57 -0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Hall

>I hadn't really been paying attention to this thread, since I
>have had it up to here with wild claims about "artifacts" on
>Mars, but when someone I admire (Josh Goldstein) alerted me to
>the Arthur Clarke image...Wow! This either has to be a fake
>photo or evidence of something profoundly important. I see no
>third alternative.

It may be profoundly important, but after seeing the image that Ted Toal wrote about a few days ago, I'm more inclined to think what that "something important" will turn out to be will concern the geology and climate history of Mars.

The message was at:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m06-021.shtml>

and the image in question is:

http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

This is a different "tunnel" than the one on Hoagland's web site, and I have a hard time pointing out any significant difference between the two, except for one thing: where the ravine is at its widest point in the image Ted referenced, the remarkable procession of crescent-shaped rib features, all with the same orientation to each other, changes abruptly into a rather less remarkable series of randomly-oriented and more subdued ridges.

I think this may have something to do with fluid dynamics. Wind or water is constrained to flow in a constant direction running through the narrower parts of the ravines, regardless of the directions of the winds outside of the ravines. But where the channels widen, the wind (or perhaps water) direction would be much less constant and the fluid flow would interact with the surface of the ravine floors in a much more random manner. I think the appearance of the subdued and randomly oriented ridges at the wide section in the ravine tends to confirm that this is basically the case.

These certainly aren't "ordinary" dunes; each one of them is definitely a convex, crescent-shaped, and sharply defined structure. But I think they most probably are still dunes, or something closely related to dunes in their formation. (Bob Young may not have been that much off the mark in his original assessment). I'd sure like to be proven wrong, because I agree they're one of the weirdest things I've seen in MGS images. It would be neat if these turned out to be giant worms or water mains built by the Cydonia Department of Public Utilities. I am a little puzzled as to why Malin hasn't commented on them, since I think he should have a good geological explanation if anyone does.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Mars 'Worm' - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 21:32:56 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:25:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Mars 'Worm' - Mortellaro

>Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 19:31:08 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Sean Liddle <gortrix@kos.net>
>Subject: Mars 'Worm'?

Dear Sean,

May I comment?

>On a whim, amazed and intrigued as I am, I asked a co-worker who
>is a specialist in geology and hydrogeology what his opinion was
>on the 'Mars Worm' photos. He was very, very interested in what
>he saw and after looking at Mac's site, found himself more
>interested than skeptical pertaining to the bizarre photos of
>late that have been popping up.

I am an expert in geology and androgeny and I am also interested
in tubes. So what? There is nothing more bizarre and septical
than worms in a tube. Continuing below...

>He came up with one suggestion as to a possible natural way in
>which such a 'worm' could have been formed.

I am not merely an androgenous geologist, I am also a
herpatologist. Wait'll you read the following...

>He suggested that a dry riverbed containing sub-surface
>sedimentary stratigraphy with a ribbed-topography could have
>existed, below which a sub-surface magma may have popped up. When
>it cooled and the sedimentary rock eroded, an obsidian like
>material could then have been exposed which, after natural
>polishing due to blowing sand, would keep the ribbed appearance
>of the former sedimentary rock yet reflect light

As I opined earlier, I cannot agree. A ribbed and androgenous
sedimentary and prehensile tube, below the sub sonic magnum,
will not pop up. It may work itself out, but it will never pop
up. Further, the obsequious but cool material when exposed, will
not support a tube, let alone a ribbed one. Instead of a tube, a
tool of oblivian may support the structure, but only in the
waning gibbous phase of Mars, during the reflected seminal light
of day.

>Sounds like he is stretching for an answer but, he did say it was
>the best he could come up with. :)

And, if this man has any sense whatever, he knows enough never
to stretch it. I rest my case.

I am certain that UpDates will never post anything I write again
as long as I live. And Frank, Lee, Errol, I wouldn't blame you.

Dr. J.J.G.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 23:33:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:27:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?! -

>From: Dave Bowden <grafikfx@lineone.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?!
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:48:55 -0000

>>Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2001 22:17:07 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Glenn On 'Frasier' Comedy or Confession!?!

><snip>

>John and all,

>It was of course a joke.

>I remember an episode of the Simpsons where Bart saw an open
>umbrella blow past his bedroom window and started saying he saw
>a flying saucer.

>There was a knock at the door, Lisa answered and was confronted
>with two military types.

>"We didn't see a UFO!" says Lisa.

>"Thats right young lady, you saw nothing" was their 'mysterious'
>reply.

>Big yuks!

Hi Dave,

You forgot to mention the guy in the lab coat (standing behind
the soldier) that was holding a syringe! <LOL>

>It was just a gag based on present day mythology.

Maybe so, but 'cutesy' writing anyway.

>I'm almost expecting a mail from someone who thinks 'Third rock
>from the Sun' has a hidden message ;)

That won't be me. It takes one of the original 7 Mercury
astronauts admitting to UFO sightings in space (regardless of
the 'setting') to get my attention. ;)

>But if you want to talk 'disturbing TV', check out the
>pre-school stuff.

>The Telly Tubbies... now there's a genetic experiment gone
>horribly wrong.

<LMAO>

Some of our homegrown 'televangelists' swear that "Tinky Winky"
(the purple one that wears the triangle) is Gay, and proactive
about it. Personally, I think they're wrong. Even if he tried
to be gay it wouldn't work out in the end. Anybody with a tinkie
winkie isn't going to get many 'second' dates. Gay or straight!

<LOL>

Regards,

John Velez ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 01:13:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:32:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive
>>evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks
>>Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that
>>-- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at
>>least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what
>>he thought he saw.

>>I take it, then, that if Bob was convinced Arnold did see what
>>he reported, that Bob, too, would be supporting the ETH.

>Hi, Greg:

>Yeah, right.

>Actually, no, not necessarily. Ignoring the problem of proving
>that what a now deceased person said they saw 50 years ago is
>actually what happened, there could be a number of possibilities
>that in my judgement would be more likely than non-ET craft
>created by non-human intelligences (Bruce's OI/NHIs):

>1) Mirages of snow-capped peaks. One of the oldest theories.
>Still a Menzelian best bet.

Don't think so. If so courtesy of the disinformation
department. Don't forget, this is later on not in 47.

>2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.

I know you had to mention this so as to not hurt Easton's
feelings. But no.

>3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
>put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities.).

Horizontal meteors? Travelling at only 1,200 mph?

>4) U.S. secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

No such animal. This one displays too much confidence in an as
yet fledgling aeronautical engineering capability. Had to use a
rocket to get through the sound barrier, don't forget.

>4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose
>distance Arnold had misjudged.

Would have been close enough to identify then.

>4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

Yeah right-over Washington state??

>5) Canadian secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.
>(Sorry EBK, guys, I must assign this a somewhat lower
>probability, principally for technical reasons, such as
>economics.)

Wrong. Economics were not a problem then but still, despite a rather kick-ass program were not able to go supersonic.

>6) Nazi secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation (with
>ex-nazis or other non-OI/NHIs piloting).

Myth of course.

>7) Nine genuine ET craft, ET piloted or robotically controlled.

Occum's razor??

>Since within 21 years, we had a human-piloted spacecraft
>circumnavigate the Moon, someone else might be around. Note
>that this is assigned the lowest probability, although it is
>still given a higher marking than Bruce's OI/NHIs. This is also
>principally for technical reasons, such as I haven't the
>slightest idea what he is getting at, unless it's,

>8) Angels, Seriphim, Apollo in his Sun chariot pulled by nine
>horses, or nine other OI/NHIs, etc.

>Well, that's it, Greg. I would even go for ETs before the
>rapture.

A wise move Bob.

>May there always be Clear, Cloudless Skies and a Temperature
>Inversion over the Cascades in July,

As you know an inversion would not work here due to Arnold's altitude and the respective altitude of the craft. Depressed angle. Stable air that day with cold air up to higher altitudes. To high for temp inversion.

More likely swamp gas refracted through a spurious alpha ray originating from Mars affected by the magnetic influence of Jupiter and the socio-economic climate created in Jamaica during their rum making ceremonies. Blame it on Captain Morgan.

Hope this helps.

My best to Larry, it's been a rough night.

Donald

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Pelicans Redux [was: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact]

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 05:53:52 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:37:09 -0500
Subject: Pelicans Redux [was: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact]

Regarding:

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Bob,

Re your comments...

If those nine objects were so incredibly reflective, the last person to consider whether they might be birds would be Arnold himself.

Conversely, if Arnold did wonder whether they might be birds, then he was satisfied that even taking into account their reflective capabilities, it was a conceivable explanation.

Arnold did in fact confirm:

"I, at first, thought they were geese because it flew like geese..."

This is from Arnold's early interview, with KWRC radio, on 26 June and unambiguous. At first Arnold thought the objects were birds.

In Bill Bequette's formative article for the 'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian', on June 26, 1947, he wrote [of Arnold]:

When first sighted, he thought the objects were snow geese.

"But geese don't fly that high -- and, anyway, what would geese be doing going south for this time of year?"

Next he thought they were jet planes. He said he had heard so many stories of the speed of this type of craft traveled so he determined to clock them.

However, he quickly realized "their motion was wrong for jet jobs."

"I guess I don't know what they were -- unless they were guided missiles," he said.
[END]

This motion, which so puzzled Arnold and indicated these couldn't be jets, was of course how those nine objects flew in an echelon formation which undulated. As Arnold attempted to describe, their flight characteristics resembled a "speed boat on rough water", or 'like a saucer would if you skipped it across the water'.

In his appearance at the 'First International UFO Congress in Chicago' circa 24 June, 1977, Arnold confirmed, "they sort of undulated, if you want to call it that, as they flew.

When I first researched Arnold's reported sighting, I concluded that despite startling similarities between some of his sketches and contemporary, tail-less, 'flying wing' aircraft, this explanation could be ruled out. It was the same conclusion others had come to, realising there was available evidence which confirmed why few 'flying wings' were operational on 24 June and none in that area, let alone nine of them.

One other logical probability seemed to be that a formation of nine aerial objects might be birds, although it seemed unlikely Geese or even Swans could be responsible, given the evidence as we then understood it.

However, as apparently no-one had ever asked the experts, I took the enquiry to Pacific North-west ornithologists and detailing Arnold's descriptions, asked if there might be any candidates implied therein.

It was a considerable surprise when those with relevant expertise recognised Arnold was describing characteristics, including that specularity, which were unique to American White Pelicans.

Like most people, I was only aware of those prehistoric looking Pelicans I had seen in a Zoo, or on TV.

Surely these ungainly birds couldn't be responsible for Arnold's UFOs.

I was, in truth, highly skeptical.

Still, it was a new lead and required to be followed up. Ultimately, it's only facts which have substance, whether we're skeptical or otherwise.

We've come a long way since then and what continually became evident was that we should forget what we think we know about Pelicans.

None of us - as 'ufologists' - realised that when they are airborne, American White Pelicans are so unique, formidable and distinctive, they are frequently referenced in treatises about bird flight.

There's nothing like them, except Snow Geese and Swans and that's essentially only because they all fly in an echelon formation.

Aside from that, it's characteristically Pelicans which adopt an undulating, gliding flight, interspersed by almost synchronised flapping.

One attribute which perplexed Arnold, he described in 'The Coming of the Saucers', "Another characteristic of these craft that made a tremendous impression on me was how they fluttered and sailed...".

The alternating fluttering and gliding which is unique to White Pelicans is featured in 'The Life of Birds', by Sir David Attenborough [pages 47-48]. Discussing 'The Mastery of Flight', he writes:

"Beating wings demands such energy that it is clearly valuable to do it in as economical a way as possible. One simple method of achieving that is to stop every now and then...".

"Even a big bird can economise on its wing beats. If it stops flapping with its wings not closed but open, their surface area is big enough to impede its fall and it will glide. Pelicans regularly do this. How long they can glide depends on how high above the ground they are, how much height they can afford to lose, and how fast they are travelling".

Bruce Maccabee used to challenge, "INVENT SHINY PELICANS".

As I responded, there was no need to imagine them; it's documented by ornithologists that they exist and did so even before 'flying saucers' were mis-invented by the media!

'National Geographical' magazine from November, 1943 contains an

article entitled 'Pelican Profiles' and the author writes:

"...a companion and I, sight-seeing among the bubbling mud geysers on the eastern side of the [Salton] sea, observed a hundred white birds manoeuvring majestically in the sky.

Then they soared into the blue until only the sun, glinting on white feathers, flashed their location".

"As they alighted on the water, their identity became apparent. White Pelicans, sublime in flight, seemed ridiculous on foot. Glossy-white wings, stretching eight to almost ten feet, were tipped with black".
[END OF EXTRACT]

As I wrote to Bruce:

A cursory glance at my word processor's dictionary, reaffirms that "Glossy", means, "surface shine, lustre, shiny finish, polish, shine, sheen".

Why is their plumage glossy? Perhaps because "pelicans anoint themselves with oil that they squeeze from a gland in the skin at the base of their tail".

Source: 'The Life of Birds', by Sir David Attenborough, [page 53].

Also possibly a factor:

"The surface structure of the feathers may affect a bird's appearance in other ways. In certain birds, including pelicans, terns and petrels, some black pigmented feathers in the wings may in fact have a silvery appearance. The silver gleam is caused by light reflected from very long, fine, non-pigmented fibres in the feathers".

Source: 'Collins Encyclopaedia of Animals', [p 438].

It should now be clear why ornithologist Michael Price first suggested:

"There's another possible candidate species in the area at that time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high altitude would even more produce *every* detail of the phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-breeder southbound White Pelicans. They'd have been large enough to visible for a good distance, they fly in formation, and if the light were reflecting just right off a large nearby glaciated peak, their comparatively vast white underwing area would reflect a *ton* of light in exactly the pattern described by Arnold".
[END OF EXTRACT]

Bruce doesn't mention 'SHINY PELICANS' anymore.

Recently, I've been able to watch some further film of White Pelicans at high altitude and also Snow Geese ['The Flight of the Snow Geese', narrated by Sir Peter Scott].

This latter video is helpful as it contains considerable footage of Snow Geese [around half the size of White Pelicans] filmed from an aircraft. It's surprising how far distant they can be seen, however, even from afar, there's no mistaking these are birds as they flap continuously.

Conversely, the White Pelicans do not resemble birds.

What we see are a number of fixed-wing objects coming into view and which look like aircraft. Then, they seem to flutter in unison for a few seconds, before returning to a rigid, undulating - like a roller coaster - echelon formation for a much longer period.

Quite unique and so clearly matching what Arnold described.

Keep in mind that, as Attenborough notes, "How long they can glide depends on how high above the ground they are, how much height they can afford to lose, and how fast they are

travelling".

Evidently, the higher their altitude, the more they are likely to remain gliding, or sailing, for longer periods and any observation would primarily be of fixed-wing objects, similar to aircraft.

If that's what Arnold encountered and he had never come across this strange, exceptional, sighting before - almost certainly the case, or he should have confirmed that he ruled this out in preference to Snow Geese - we can understand why he thought they might be aircraft, despite the 'fluttering and sailing' which so baffled him.

UK subscribers can find some footage of White Pelicans on the three-part, BBC video release 'The Life of Birds' - Sir David Attenborough's TV series [it's on the video-tape which features 'The Mastery of Flight'].

Obviously, anyone has to judge this for themselves.

Incidentally, unless the filming is at relatively close range, the normally prominent [to say the least] Pelican beak/bill isn't discernible.

For Arnold's nine, formation flying, undulating, fluttering and gliding objects to be White Pelicans [no other species is a candidate], there had to be some blatant reason why he was mistaken about their speed.

The key to Arnold's determination about their airspeed occurred in the early stage of his observation, as related in his book:

"I determined my distance from their pathway to be in the vicinity of twenty-three miles because I knew where I was and they revealed their true position by disappearing from my sight momentarily behind a jagged peak that juts out from the base of Mount Rainier proper".

I have previously explained:

In an attempt to clarify this geographical conundrum, I again took the query to people with good local knowledge. David Basset, a mountaineer with vast experience of Mt. Rainier and surrounding peaks, responded: "The jagged peak you are referring to is clearly Little Tahoma. It is jagged because it is unglaciated and very steep. It rises from the base of Mt. Rainier on the East or Southeast side. You said the observation was taken from the west or southwest. This might be troubling because it is on the other side of the mountain, but rest assured, Little Tahoma is the peak. It stands out, being much higher than any other mountain close to Rainier."

Located at Mt. Rainier National Park, Park Guide Chris Trotter, and Douglas Kraus, the Park Naturalist, confirmed: "The consensus from my co-workers is that the 'jagged peak' is Little Tahoma. This peak can be seen from many areas around the mountain."
[END OF EXTRACT]

To appreciate the significance of Arnold's perception, it's necessary to understand where Little Tahoma is located in relation to Mount Rainier itself.

In a previous publication, I wrote:

As we know, the extraordinary conjecture that these were ET spaceships grew, primarily in later years, out of Kenneth Arnold's story of large, far-off objects which went from Mt Rainier to Mt Adams in a short time, which he 'clocked'.

Arnold claimed that he could be sure they were so far away because they fleetingly disappeared behind a "jagged projection" or "sharp peak" on Mt. Rainier and he knew this was some 25 miles distant.

Following my recent enquiries of local expertise, we now also know that he was evidently mistaken about this and fundamentally so. The 'jagged peak' has been identified as almost certainly

'Little Tahoma' - looks like there aren't any alternative candidates - and as it's on the far side of Mt. Rainier from Arnold's location, they couldn't have travelled behind the peak without also having disappeared behind the mountain for some time. As Arnold claimed the objects flew between his position and the mountain, something is terribly amiss.

The default answer is that Arnold was in error and against the snow-covered backdrop, misperceived the objects momentarily passing behind Little Tahoma when they absolutely must have been somewhere in front of it. If Little Tahoma is 'Arnold's peak' - as UFO historian Brad Sparks was adamant it had to be and before I obtained confirmation from expert sources - then Arnold's perceptions of speed and distance must be regarded as comprehensively unreliable.

Outwith considerable discussions which have taken place on the 'UFO Research List' - all material there is 'list only' unless otherwise designated - Brad has expressed his conviction that Arnold's sighting remains a highly credible UFO case and proposes an alternative scenario; the trajectory of Arnold's objects did take them behind Mt. Rainier. As I've pointed out, however, Arnold confirmed on many occasions that the objects were visible against the background of Mt. Rainier and that's how he could make out some detail about their shape.

An aerial photograph of Mt. Rainier, which seems to have been taken from the same perspective (although closer to Rainier) as Arnold's location over Mineral, Washington, can be seen at:

<http://mt.rainier.tribnet.com/photogallery/detail.asp?id=29>

The jagged peak to the right of Mt. Rainier is Little Tahoma.

Some further photos illustrating Little Tahoma:

<http://www.physics.georgetown.edu/~porezag/rainier98/rainier98-82.jpg>

[This URL might 'wrap around']

<http://www.nwlink.com/~dognose/rtahom.htm>

If this crucial evidential anomaly can't therefore be reconciled, then it remains a major factor in any premise why Arnold's objects could have been a formation of White Pelicans.

Other aspects which cast doubt on the unusual nature of these objects have previously been highlighted (see the aforementioned material on my web site) and especially relevant is Arnold's later aerial encounter with up to twenty-five, 3 or 4 foot diameter, brass-coloured objects which "looked like ducks" and "had the same flight characteristics of the large objects I had observed on June 24". Arnold believed this, the second of some 8 'UFO' sightings he had, was also of enigmatic, unidentified objects.
[END OF EXTRACT]

So far as I'm aware, no factual evidence has ever been offered to refute the identification of 'Little Tahoma'.

This breakthrough effectively destroyed any trustworthiness whatsoever concerning Arnold's 'speed calculations' and other distance perceptions.

I understand that, in later years, James McDonald spent time with Arnold in an effort to identify the 'jagged peak'. Arnold couldn't do so.

There are, understandably, several discrepancies in Arnold's various accounts of his sighting, particularly where he was located and in which direction he was heading when the incident occurred. We also know Arnold mentions turning his aircraft 'around' at some point during the brief observation, however, he never explained when this happened, how long it took and where he ended up in context.

His story concerning a 'flash of light' which initially drew attention to the objects is especially one which can be

demonstrated as untenable - although there's no reason not to accept there was some bright reflection from the objects.

In his book, Arnold claimed a "tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces of my aircraft" and that "I spent the next twenty to thirty seconds urgently searching the sky all around--to the sides, above and below me--in an attempt to determine where the flash of light had come from".

Then, "the flash happened again. This time I caught the direction from which it had come. I observed, far to my left and to the north, a formation of very bright objects coming from the vicinity of Mount Baker, flying very close to the mountain tops and traveling at tremendous speed. At first I couldn't make out their shapes as they were still at a distance of over a hundred miles....".

It's a somewhat different recollection - albeit this is now some five years afterwards - to how at first he thought the objects were Snow Geese. It's also patently absurd, as Arnold is claiming the first 'flash' came from objects which were travelling at over 1,000 mph, yet 30 seconds later were still over 100 miles away.

By the time Arnold gave his talk at the 'UFO Congress', this initial flash from objects well over 100 miles distant had not only lit-up the surface of his aircraft, but also, "even it seemed the cockpit of the airplane".

Obvious nonsense in relation to the fact that almost immediately after the incident, Arnold told KWRC radio. "I, at first, thought they were geese" and the same day is quoted as rationalising why the unidentified objects couldn't be Snow Geese as they wouldn't fly so high, or be travelling south for the winter!

An arguably more crucial discrepancy exists and it's one which few seem to realise. In his official report to the Air Force, Arnold wrote:

"I could safely assume that the chain of these saucer like objects were at least five miles long...".

Although these objects have been reported by many other observers throughout the United States, there have been six or seven other accounts written by some of these observers that I can truthfully say must have observed the same thing that I did; particularly, the descriptions of the three Western [Cedar City, Utah] Air Lines employees, the gentleman [pilot] from Oklahoma City and the locomotive engineer from Illinois, plus Capt Smith and Co-Pilot Stevens of United Air Lines.

Some descriptions could not be very accurate taken from the ground unless these saucer-like disks were at a great height..."
[END OF EXTRACT]

Yet, Arnold had initially described the objects differently, as he told KWRC:

"I could see them only plainly when they seemed to tip their wing, or whatever it was, and the sun flashed on them. They looked something like a pie plate that was cut in half with a sort of a convex triangle in the rear".

Arnold knew the popularised 'saucer' depiction originated from a misunderstanding of his comments about the undulating flight. Yet, he never explained this to the Air Force and instead, propagated the 'flying saucer' mythology.

In 'The Coming of the Saucers' - published in 1952 - Arnold wrote:

They flew in a definite formation, but erratically. As I described them at the time, their flight was like speed boats on rough water or similar to the tail of a Chinese kite that I once saw blowing in the wind. Or maybe it would be best to describe their flight characteristics as very similar to a formation of geese, in a rather diagonal chain-like line, as if they were linked together. As I put it to newsmen in Pendleton, Oregon, they flew like a saucer would if you skipped it across the water.
[END OF EXTRACT]

However, it was some two years previous that Arnold publicly revealed the 'flying saucer' faux pas.

The following is from the transcript of a telephone conversation between Ed Murrow -a distinguished news commentator of the time - and Arnold, broadcast on 7 April, 1950:

ARNOLD: I never could understand at that time why the world got so upset about 9 disks, as these things didn't seem to be a menace. I believed that they had something to do with our Army and Air Force.

MURROW: On three different occasions, Mr. Arnold was questioned by military intelligence. They expressed doubt as to the accuracy of some of his reported observations...

ARNOLD: That's right. Now of course some of the reports they did take from newspapers which did not quote me properly. Now, when I told the press, they misquoted me, and in the excitement of it all, one newspaper and another on got it as ensnarled up that nobody knew just exactly what they were talking about, I guess.

MURROW: Here's how the name "flying saucer" was born...

ARNOLD: These objects more or less fluttered like they were, oh, I'd say, boats on very rough water or very rough air of some type, and when I described how they flew, I said that they flew like they take a saucer and throw it across the water. Most of the newspapers misunderstood and misquoted that too. They said that I said that they were saucer-like; I said that they flew in a saucer-like fashion.

MURROW: That was an historic misquote. While Mr. Arnold's original explanation has been forgotten, the term "flying saucer" has become a household word. Few people realize that Mr. Arnold has reported seeing these same strange objects in the sky on three other occasions....
[END OF EXTRACT]

If there's any record of Arnold having acknowledging the true 'saucer' origins before this date, I would be interested to know.

Arnold complains, "They said that I said that they were saucer-like; I said that they flew in a saucer-like fashion".

However, it was Arnold himself who told the Air Force of his encounter with "these saucer like objects" and spoke of "saucer-like disks".

If, instead, he had acknowledged this 'historic misquote' and how those objects were in fact, "something like a pie plate that was cut in half with a sort of a convex triangle in the rear", it would doubtless have been no less a mystery, although it would surely have affected the government and military's understanding of a perceived 'flying saucer' threat.

Yet, Arnold had revealed the misunderstanding on a popular radio program and Murrow even highlighted it. Didn't anyone from the government, military, or media follow this up and ask - if we're all futilely chasing 'flying saucers', what exactly did those objects look like?

Presumably by this time, 'flying saucers' were so well established as 'real' that it actually didn't matter what Arnold had seen, or even if he personally hadn't seen anything at all!

We can assuredly say that Arnold's enigmatic nine objects were not aircraft, or mirages, or meteors.

They were either a small formation of White Pelicans, or inexplicable objects which did a remarkable impression of these birds in key respects. This extends to Arnold's sketch on my web site, the original source of which still hasn't been identified - see:

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/saucers.htm>

There's one final and significant detail about White Pelicans - the largest bird in North America and with a massive 10 foot (3 meter) wing-span.

Although I was able to locate published citations which confirmed the astonishing altitude and speed capabilities of these birds and that, whilst a rare sighting, they have long been indigenous to the locale, I couldn't find one item in particular.

The proposition was missing a published reference that this species are known to migrate at altitudes comparable with Arnold's observation, near the summit of Mount Rainier.

I'm now able to rectify this and it comes from 'A New Dictionary of Birds', edited by Sir A. Landsborough Thomson [page 608], which states:

"The White or rough-billed Pelican (*p. erythrorhynchos*) breeds from western Canada (as far north as Great Slave Lake) to southern Texas.

Part of its migration (during which flocks will fly over deserts and even mountain tops) takes a diagonal course to the Gulf of Mexico and Florida; some birds even reach central America.
[END]

An additional new reference was found in 'Bird Families of the World', edited by Dr. CJO Harrison [page 40]:

"Pelicans are light, having numerous air spaces beneath the skin and in the bones, and are magnificent flyers, capable of sustained soaring flight over great distances".
[END]

So, for the record, it has been documented how these magnificent aviators can, if necessary, cross over mountain ranges when migrating.

James Easton.
E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes'

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 22:49:12 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:40:29 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes'

3-11-01

The Cydonian Imperative

Martian "Tubes" Go Down The... You Know What
by Mac Tonnies

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

After perusing a great deal of high-resolution MGS data and looking at Richard Hoagland's proposed "tubes" in a geological context (rather than the isolated image currently featured on this site), I've "defected" to JPL's interpretation that these are natural formations, and no longer consider them in the running as potential artifacts. Their sheer meandering profusion on the Martian landscape detracts from a functional/artificial interpretation.

The hypothesis that these are transportation conduits, while worthy of examination, is made untenable, in part, by their nonuniform appearance: some appear shallow, others deep; the spacing and uniformity of the "arches" differs noticeably--not traits expected of an intelligently designed tunnel system.

A great deal of the confusion is the issue of perspective: Are we looking at concave or convex features? If actually arch-shaped, then a non-natural explanation would appear more attractive. But a close look at the many alleged "tubes" seen in context with the fractured Martian surface reveals that the bright "dune" or "arch" formations appear to descend into their respective ravines. (Click here for more Martian "tubes.")

While these features are strange and deserve to be studied, I am of the opinion that they represent a geological phenomenon probably related to sand deposition (i.e. the ravines channeling Martian dust in "ripples" not unlike waves in an ocean). And after viewing countless similar bright "ripples" throughout Mars, I am less certain in my assessment that these might be artificial glass structures, as posed in the previous article (see above).

But what of the seeming "glassy" texture seen in the image on the previous page and discussed at length by Richard Hoagland? While I profess no certainty, this "translucent" aspect seems to be unique to the formation isolated for study and not an intrinsic feature of the rest of the "tubes." I think the striking tunnel-like appearance probably stems from the anomalous bright reflection that Hoagland and others (myself included) have equated to a "sphere" or other object lodged in the "tube's" hollow throat, coupled by the eye-fooling orientation of the image.

While I don't pretend to have a definitive geological explanation, I consider it a safe bet that we are misinterpreting an essentially two-dimensional series of "ripples," and that the specular "sphere" is in fact a basically two-dimensional formation whose brightness has obscured the detail necessary for a conclusive study.

Then again, maybe I'm wrong. Whether the Martian "tubes" are interesting examples of Martian geology or the crumbling ruins of a megascale construction project, they have certainly served to focus our attention on the anomalies present in MSSS' vast catalogue of Mars imagery.

I don't think Hoagland's Enterprise Mission or anyone else has necessarily played fast and loose with the supposed "tubes." But I personally feel confident when I predict these features will turn out to have a prosaic explanation.

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

-end-

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:32:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:45:55 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500

>>Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive
>>evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks
>>Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that
>>-- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at
>>least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what
>>he thought he saw.

>>I take it, then, that if Bob was convinced Arnold did see what
>>he reported, that Bob, too, would be supporting the ETH.

>Hi, Greg:

>Yeah, right.

>Actually, no, not necessarily. Ignoring the problem of proving
>that what a now deceased person said they saw 50 years ago is
>actually what happened, there could be a number of possibilities
>that in my judgement would be more likely than non-ET craft
>created by non-human intelligences (Bruce's OI/NHIs):

>1) Mirages of snow-capped peaks. One of the oldest theories.
>Still a Menzelian best bet.

>2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.

>3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
>put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities.).

>4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose
>distance Arnold had misjudged.

>4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

>5) Canadian secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.
>(Sorry EBK, guys, I must assign this a somewhat lower
>probability, principally for technical reasons, such as
>economics.)>

>6) Nazi secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation (with
>ex-nazis or other non-OI/NHIs piloting).

>7) Nine genuine ET craft, ET piloted or robotically controlled.
>Since within 21 years, we had a human-piloted spacecraft
>circumnavigate the Moon, someone else might be around. Note
>that this is assigned the lowest probability, although it is
>still given a higher marking than Bruce's OI/NHIs. This is also
>principally for technical reasons, such as I haven't the

>slightest idea what he is getting at, unless it's,
>8) Angels, Seriphim, Apollo in his Sun chariot pulled by nine
>horses, or nine other OI/NHIs, etc.
>Well, that's it, Greg. I would even go for ETs before the
>rapture.

To borrow a phrase from Reagan vs. Carter:

There you go again!

Listing a bunch of proposed explanations (you didn't list all that were proposed) without having the conviction to pick one and say "that's it."

One of my complaints against the skeptics/scoffers/debunkers is the impression they give that the more explanation can be proposed the more likely it is that a sighting is explained. My counterargument is that only one explanation is correct and if you can't decide which, then either you mark the case as "insufficient information" and go do something else or you pick one and defend it "to the death."

Mirage, for example makes no sense unless Arnold was completely wrong in thinking that the objects were first north of Mt. Rainier, then between him and the flank of Mt Rainier, then south of Mt Rainier, etc. Had you read my paper on the subject you would see that Arnold would also have had to be wrong in thinking they were "about" at his altitude and hence many thousand feet below the top of Mt. Rainier. A mountain top mirage appears ABOVE the mountain top, not below it. Try again.

As for OI/NHI/... this is simply my shorthand for "creatures" that are not human and come from somewhere. Certainly the ET hypothesis would be consistent with my claim that OI/NHI are here.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

American White Pelicans

From: Jim Klotz <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 09:56:49 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:49:37 -0500
Subject: American White Pelicans

Dear List members,

A while back when the 'Pelican Theory' for the 1947 Arnold sighting was being discussed on the list, I looked at the web sites cited re Pelican behavior, and also searched a bit on my own. When I didn't find very much that directly spoke to the issues in question, I decided to pose a question directly to the US Forest and Wildlife Service here in Washington State (where I live). As I see that American White Pelicans are again being discussed, I'm posting (with permission) the reply I received to my query.

Please be aware that the western and eastern parts of Washington State, divided by the Cascade Mountains, have many differences, including amount of rainfall, temperatures, type and amount of foliage, population, etc.

Also please note that I am not taking a position on this, just making this available.

- Jim Klotz

= = = = begin included messages = = = =
[my first message to USFWS:]

I've been looking at many web pages including USFWS pages looking for specific information about American White Pelicans in Washington State... populations, migratory habits and routes, flying behavior, etc.

Specifically how likely would it be for a pilot to see a flock of these birds at 10,000 feet very near Mount Rainier.

Can't seem to find the specific info I need.

Thanks, Jim Klotz

= = = = = = = =

Jim Klotz:

In response to your question, it is unlikely, although not impossible, I suppose, that white pelicans would be found at that altitude over Mt. Rainier. They are typically found on the east side and only rarely on the west side of Washington in very small numbers, and typically fly quite low. A more likely species is the snow goose, which is also a large white bird with black wingtips. They are frequently reported in flocks at 5,000 to 10,000 ft. and have been observed by pilots infrequently to 12,000 ft., even 20,000 ft. on one occasion.

John Grettenberger
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Endangered Species Division
Consultation and Technical
Assistance Branch
= = = = = = = =

John,

Thank you.

Then it IS possible that a flock of Snow Geese could be encountered at 8-10,000 ft near Mt Rainier?

Do I have permission to post your reply to an email list whose members have an interest in this information?

Thanks again, Jim Klotz

= = = = = = =

Jim,

I certainly think so. You can post my reply. The reference I was looking at was Bellrose's "Ducks, Geese and Swans of North America" dated 1976, so there is probably even better documentation now. I didn't ask the date of the sighting, but spring and fall would be the likely time to see snow geese at that location. They are not present here in the summer. I also was just looking at reports of white pelicans west of the Cascades and almost all are of one or two individuals, so I think white pelicans are highly unlikely.

John Grettenberger
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Endangered Species Division
Consultation and Technical
Assistance Branch
510 Desmond Dr. SE, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503

(360) 753-6044
FAX (360) 753-9518

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: 11 Mar 2001 18:38:04 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:06:19 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - McGonagle

>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 11:38:24 -0400
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

<snip>

Hello, Don, List

I think a distinction needs to be made between a belief, and acceptance of a possibility. The politician you used as an example held fixed beliefs concerning religion. That is vastly different to accepting the possibility of a scenario (until the possibility is disproved, or becomes a certainty).

One problem with the various hypotheses, and trying to rate them in order of likelihood, is that we don't know how likely inter-dimensional or time travel are...at this moment in time, both are impossible, but that could simply be due to the limits of human conceptualisation, and nothing to do with probability or science. It is relatively easy to understand the concept of space travel in conventional human terms, but personally, I am unable to conceptualise a fourth (or greater) dimension, let alone assess if it would be possible (or even necessary-perhaps it is the norm) to move from a 4 dimensional environment to a 3 dimensional one.

Humans are by their nature quite lazy, and inclined to take the easiest option, in this case, the ETH. Not because it is any more likely than many other hypotheses, but because it is easily conceptualised.

Of course, there are people with good reason to firmly believe in the ETH, particularly experiencees who have had knowledge of the ETH as a fact given to them by entities claiming to be from another planet, or have received such knowledge via telepathic means. This doesn't make their belief right, but they have good reason to hold their belief. Unfortunately, many of them can't understand why sceptics don't accept what they tell us at face value, it seems tantamount to calling them liars, frauds, or nutcases.

In one respect, such experiencees are fortunate, they have no doubt that the ETH is fact, it has been proved to them beyond any shade of a doubt. On the other hand, imagine how frustrating it must be for them, trying to convince other people of the reality of what they know to be true, but getting consistently knocked back.

The way I look at it, believers could possibly be right, but I am not yet convinced that they are. I don't mean only believers in the ETH, but the same applies to religious believers etc. as well.

Having said that, some beliefs are such obvious delusions, that there is no point in treating the beliefs as valid possibilities. I have met someone who genuinely believes that the Babylon 5 science fiction series is factual, as an example.

I suppose different people will define their own individual limits as to what they regard a valid possibilities, or delusion, and who are we to say that they are wrong, because their limits of acceptance are different to our own?

This difference of acceptance is probably the root cause of discord in the UFO community, the only way to make progress in my view is to be more tolerant, and ignore (not confront) what falls outside your own definition of acceptability.

The exception to that attitude is of course when you can totally disprove what someone presents as factual. Again, there is no need to do so in a hostile fashion, a simple statement of the facts is enough, without any baiting.

I have to confess that I do not live up to all of what I have written above, I tend to lose patience with people that hold widely different acceptance levels from my own. I shall endeavour to adopt a more tolerant attitude!

Anyway, this posting is much longer than I intended it to be, so I shall shut up.

Regards, Joe

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 18:48:47 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:28:49 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article - Hall

>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 16:46:19 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: 'Conceptualizing UFOs' - Hall Article
>>Date: Thu, 08 Mar 2001 22:44:01 -0000

>Afternoon Richard,

>Now to the point, your article. I nearly asked you for a copy,
>but then I realised that many others would do so, and they did
>what I would have done, post it on their websites for others to
>see and read. I would ask though, why did you not just post it
>here for comments?

Then it wouldn't have gotten on all those web sites, would it?
Besides, I wasn't sure of the ground rules about posting such
things.

>The first thing that I would say about your article is that I
>now further understand your terms of reference. It would appear
>that what to me is a skeptic, you refer to as a "Scoffer", but we
>both agree on what a sceptic is <g>. I have just checked my
>dictionary and both are listed as the same by the way, so to
>keep a clear understanding I will try and remember to use your
>term of scoffer from now on.

That's not skoffer, is it? Thanks for the feedback.

>Being one the middle of the road types that you mentioned,
>everything that you said sounded reasonable, and also
>idealistic. Jenny Randles has also suggested a council of
>sixteen, with Greg Sandow suggesting the addition of a poet and
>a philosopher. That too sounds to me as idealistic, therefore
>unachievable.

I agree that our hopes and dreams that maybe we can work
together and accomplish something worthwhile are idealistic. The
council idea I also tend to think is impractical, because it
would require a lot of effort, cooperation, and information
sharing, and who has the time (not to mention the interest)? In
principle, it is a good idea.

>Ufoology is further away from respectability than it was in the
>sixties and seventies. I say this because at least then there
>wasn't the Internet and mass media to publish any old crap that
>anyone wanted to publish/post/etc.

Yes, all too true.

>I agree with you, to get a scientific or peer review of the UFO
>phenomenon we and I use that term loosely, would have to get
>rid of all the wackos that infest sensible Ufology. There are
>many good people involved these days but for every one sensible
>and logical hard working researcher there are ten or even fifteen
>prats. It has been like this for as far back as I can remember

>and I have been in this game for several years now.

>So to the point, how do we sensible hard working researchers
>divest ourselves of the radical extremes on both sides? To quote
>Kenny Everett, "round em all up, put them in a field and bomb
>the barstards!"

This wonderful solution not being practical, I suggest instead
that we expose the whackiness at every opportunity, boycott
programs and publications that give them a platform, and
constantly differentiate ourselves from them at all times by
pointing out that they represent the fringe, not the mainstream.

That is my policy.

Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: **Georgina Bruni** <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 19:05:12 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:31:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:09:17 -0000

>Has the Hierophant been reading my postings on UFO UpDates?

>Best wishes,

>Dave Clarke

I hate to bruise your ego old chap, but I think it's probably the press releases that have captured their imagination. It's called PR!

Nothing like a bit of controversy to get the sceptic journals talking, and our dear Hierophant knows not to upset the Hot Gossip Editor in Chief too much, or I might just reveal true identity!

Georgina Bruni

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 11](#)

JPL Explanation Of Mars' 'Tubes'

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto**
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:35:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:35:36 -0500
Subject: JPL Explanation Of Mars' 'Tubes'

Source: Rense.com

<http://rense.com/general9/jpl.htm>

JPL Scientist's Explanation Of The 'Tubes' On Mars

From Robert Collins
rcollins632@earthlink.net

3-10-01

Subject: More handwaving?
Date: 3-9-01
From: Dave Pieri
To: rcollins

Dear Robert

This is a professional interpretation based on having labored over literally thousands of Viking Mars Orbiter Images, hundreds of Mars Observer images, many, many, many Landsat, ASTER, and airphotos of the earth, having studied aeolian and fluvial geomorphology at the graduate level at two universities, and well over 20 years of aerial and orbital photointerpretation and optical and radar remote sensing here at JPL/Caltech--and years of field experience in a range of climatic zones from desert to arctic. Also, the subject of my Ph.D. thesis was (the first) systematic global study of martian valley networks, in which I looked at thousands of features, such as the one in the MGS image, over a period of years.

<http://mars.jpl.nasa.gov/mgs/>

Realize one critical fact--these are not "tubes"...the positive relief is an ILLUSION--the area is crossed by concave valleys. The transverse dune trains are emplaced on the valley floors--this is not new, either on Mars or the Earth. It even occurred at very small scale in the Viking Lander 1 site in Chryse Planitia...not all that far away from where this MGS picture was taken.

Look carefully at how the craters in the larger reference image are lit. Then look at the valley wall shadows. Seeing inverted relief is an easy mistake to make, even by an experienced photointerpreter--at first glance. That's why it's always important to check one's first impression against obvious features in the landscape to get oriented properly.

Also, the picture on the "Enterprise" web site is hopeless.

<http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

Way overstretched, saturated, and doesn't show other relevant parts of the scene. I downloaded the original data at full resolution from Mike Malin's web site in La Jolla, then used a square-root stretch to even out the contrast. It's clear that these crescentic dune-lets populate the landscape--and occur in

all the low troughs or valleys throughout the image (take a look at the subscene attachment). They are a variety of sief and nearly barchan dunes--dead ringer analogs to those in terrestrial deserts. Turn the image 180 degrees (vs. the "Enterprise" picture) so that valleys look like valleys and craters look like craters, not bumps. The 3D striated "glass worm" illusion vanishes, and we're left with a fairly mundane image, exciting only to those of us who have studied the morphology of the valley networks on Mars.

Dunes follow aerodynamic principles--therefore they DO often line up in really precise, repetitive ways related to aero/hydrodynamic streamlines and standing wave resonances.

***** David C. Pieri, Ph.D. Earth and Space Sciences
Division Mail Stop 183-501 Jet Propulsion Laboratory 4800
Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91109 USA FAX:
818-354-0966 VOICE: 818-354-6299
dave@lithos.jpl.nasa.gov dave@aster2.jpl.nasa.gov

MainPage: <http://www.rense.com>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [dave](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

The Watchdog - 03-12-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 04:38:44 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 10:36:00 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-12-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

EXCLUSIVE

UFOWATCHDOG.COM will be reporting on the announcement concerning the alleged Roswell metal material being touted as extraterrestrial in origin.

The story was originally scheduled to appear on 11-MARCH-2001 but has been delayed as UFOWATCHDOG.COM is attempting to obtain pictures of the alleged material and more information so you can be brought the full story.

UFOWATCHDOG.COM would like to take this opportunity to apologize for the delay and this story is now scheduled to be posted no later than 12-MARCH-2001 at 9"PM (PST).

Thank you for your patience and you will be notified as soon as the story is posted to the website.

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:04:16 +1300
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 11:14:35 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

Hi Listpersons

Having now viewed the AA CDs and read the Flatland articles. I have to say what a difference it makes when you can view the reels with "stop motion and "capture" various images.

Tho I'm not equipped with any expertese to study the footage in a scientific manner. Using an objective, open frame of mind, plus ample time :-). I found myself seeing more and more details I hadn't seen before on the TV shows, or my own home recorded video of them.

Having only had a cursory look so far, a couple of questions beg to be asked and perhaps Neil among others can help.

1. In the AA the surgeon is often seen to write notes on a clipboard. When his actions are advanced slowly, there are times when you can get fairly clear views of the words written. Can the software that helped with the Ft Worth enlargements be utilised here to get some ideas of what these notes say

2. Using the same techniques can the words following the "DANGER....." sign above and to the left of the phone be deciphered?

and

In reel 7"... while the surgeon is working cutting open the skull, his associate is holding, the cheek area. His thumb is pressing near what would be the cheekbone quite firmly, giving the definite impression of skin pressing up against bone. Try it yourself in a mirror.

Press your thumb up and against the lower part of your cheekbone and look at the fold of skin above it. This is exactly what we see, not once but numerous times.

The skin has a definite elasticity, not at all what you'd think you'd see if rigor-mortis had set in.

It leaves me concluding that if the alien is made out of rubber, clay or other materials, the sort of exercise depicted, would leave indents or even break holes in it.

If the film is a hoax, such an innocuous exercise could easily have been avoided, without stopping the filming, fixing up the dummy and continuing shooting again and again and again

These are just some of the details this naieve Kiwi picks up. in a first viewing of the CDs :-)

It excites me to think of what some of our more enlightened well-trained (and not) Listmembers can come up with. Pro and Con of course.

Regards as Always

William

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

An Interview with a Black Pelican

From: **Jim Mortellaro** <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 14:16:28 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 11:19:12 -0500
Subject: An Interview with a Black Pelican

This interview took place on yesterday, on a roost in Washington State. The interview was conducted by Dr. J. Jaime Gesundt of the Canal Street UFO Illogical Group. The interviewee was Bart Pelican, a pelican of the black persuasion.

This is the substance of this interview was to determine what if any, differences may exhibit between the two pelican races, relative to the ability to fly at altitudes which may cause these birds to be mistaken for UFOs. Here is the interview in it's entirety.

G = Gesundt H = Black Pelican (his name is Harvey)

G: Harvey, how high can black pelicans fly?
H: At least fifty-thousand feet.

G: Fifty-thousand feet? That's impossible, how can you breathe?
H: It is not impossible and we can breathe very well, thank you.

G: Well, that is astounding. Tell me, Harvey, are white pelicans able to fly that high?
H: Honky pelicans may not reach 5 or six thousand feet.

G: Why is that?
H: They are inferior and besides, we have much larger lungs, among other accouterments.

G: Oh. Uh, does that mean that... (Harvey interrupts the question)

H: That means that white pelicans cannot aspire to great heights and that they may not be mistaken for UFO's. It also means that black (superior) pelicans, may not be mistaken for UFO's primarily because they are BLACK and as a consequence, do not reflect the light of the sun. Cogito, ergo ... them UFO's were not pelicans.

Gesundt in conclusion:

There you have it. Unequivocal evidence, straight from the pelican's mouth... beak. Those white thingies which for years have been assigned the moniker of UFOs, were UFOs. Not pelicans. Now, please, may we get on with some real research - please! ?

Huh?

J.J.G.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Larry Warren On 'You Can'T Tell The People'

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 21:48:14 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 11:21:53 -0500
Subject: Larry Warren On 'You Can'T Tell The People'

At:

www.hullufosociety.moonfruit.com

Larry poses 21 "questions" to Georgina. I used the quote marks, because some of them are repetitions, vitriolic comments, or direct refutations of what she wrote.

Only 10 of the 21 questions relate directly to the book, the other 11 are criticisms of her honesty, repetitions, etc.

I certainly recommend visiting the site, even with the annoying Macro-don't-needya stuff (it is really slow to load the page) It will be interesting to see the response (if any) from Georgina - it certainly looks like she ought to respond to defend her position.

Regards,

Joe

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 18:36:37 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:06:32 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 08:19:52 -0800

>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 00:45:45 EST
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Robert,

>You asked:

>>Did you ever get around to shipping Roger a VHS copy?

>I never said that I intended to ship Roger a VHS copy of the AA.

>Were you under the impression that I had?

>All we have are the AA CDs, the copy of Flatland and the Fort
>Worth photos. Neither Neil nor I have a VHS to ship to anyone.

My mistake...you never had a VHS in the first place.

>>I have seen the footage quite a number of times. It looks like
>>a Hollywood FX job.

>I have studied the AA footage many hours and there is absolutely
>nothing that looks like a "Hollywood FX job". Perhaps you could
>point out to the List the specific things you saw that indicated
>this to you.

To you it is obviously the most real footage you have ever seen
in your life.

I look at Jurassic Park, see the splashes made when TRex steps
in water, see the dust raised by Dinos and gee the film looks
very real. But we both know it was totally phony.

As I have observed many times if the film creator has done his
or her job correctly you the audience will not be able to tell
the difference between reality and a movie makers fantasy.

>>So how did you get it to CD in the first place? Of of what
>>medium? Just curious

>The AA CDs are digitized from a betacam version that was loaned
>to Neil. Few folks have seen this version but it is the same
>version that Theresa Carlson used for her research.

>>Bottom line apparently is they think its a phony.

>Theresa still thinks that its a wonderful fraud and Dennis
>doesn't quite know what to think. He hasn't viewed the new CDs
>and Theresa refused to look at our evidence.

Like I said they have seen the footage and think its phony. You
look at the footage and thinks its absolutle reality, never to

be doubted.

You also have the cameraman who unloaded hoax footage on Ray along with the real stuff.

>>Again only one so called "trained metal worker." Now if you had
>>a number of so called trained metal workers saying the same
>>thing as the one dude, that would make it real interesting. I
>>suspect that if you put this out to a group of trained metal
>>workers they would disagree with your one guy.

>You can "suspect" anything you wish but the tone of the above is
>insulting. How do you know what other metallurgists would say
>once they took a good look?

I would think that would have been one of the things you would have done is put it before a group of experts and see what they have to say about it. Of course you may not want to hear what a group of "expert metallurgists" would say about the same footage your guy looked at.

>I have confidence in Dennis' abilities and therefore trust his
>judgment. If you can find someone to refute him, then fine;
>otherwise I suggest you take a good look for yourself.

Its not about confidence in abilities. You relying upon this one guy reminds me of arm chair skeptics who trot out "Phil Klass said..." and we have faith and trust in whatever Phil Klass said so therefore.....

Who knows the answer may be to read Phil Klass' book endlessly, over and over..... :)

Cheers,

Robert

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 18:44:25 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:09:39 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Sandow

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Thanks for your more or less thoughtful reply.

>>Bruce (hi, Bruce) thinks the Arnold sighting is suggestive
>>evidence that something Not Ours is flying around. Bob thinks
>>Arnold's sighting isn't enough to demonstrate anything like that
>>-- but in order to argue his point, he has to assume (or at
>>least think it's very likely) that Arnold didn't really see what
>>he thought he saw.

>>I take it, then, that if Bob was convinced Arnold did see what
>>he reported, that Bob, too, would be supporting the ETH.

>Hi, Greg:

>Yeah, right.

>Actually, no, not necessarily. Ignoring the problem of proving
>that what a now deceased person said they saw 50 years ago is
>actually what happened, there could be a number of
possibilities

Just a momentary aside, here. I wish we could separate the many threads of these ongoing arguments. Whether Arnold saw exactly what he reported is one discussion. What the likely explanation would be -- if he did see what he reported -- is a second discussion. I was trying to engage in discussion two. No need, I think, to reiterate points from discussion one.

>that in my judgement would be more likely than non-ET craft
>created by non-human intelligences (Bruce's OI/NHIs):

>1) Mirages of snow-capped peaks. One of the oldest theories.
>Still a Menzelian best bet.

>2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.

>3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
>put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities.).

I suspect these explanations require Arnold not to have seen what he reported (especially the distance and speed he claimed were reasonable deductions from what he said he saw). So I wonder if these three hypotheses are more bleedthrough from the other discussion.

>4) U.S. secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

With this, and other explanations on your list, Bob, we enter interesting territory.

I can agree that, if we're simply theorizing, we ought to accept a mundane explanation sooner than an extraterrestrial one. And secret US aircraft are, at least in theory, a plausible mundane

explanation. As James Easton noted, Arnold himself thought the objects he said he saw might be some of those new-fangled jets. (My language, that "new-fangled," not James's.)

But there's a little more than theory going on here. You're proposing a flight of secret American aircraft, nine of them, apparently in close formation, flying through the mountains in 1947. So it's fair to move beyond theory, and start looking at history. Were there any American aircraft being tested in 1947 that Arnold might have seen? And, if the answer should be yes, were nine of them flying near Mt. Rainier that day?

I'll bet the answer to question one is "no." Or, at least, no, as far as we know." I'll bet, too, that the book on secret American aircraft in 1947 is pretty well open by now. So when you invoke "U.S. secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation." as a far more likely explanation than ET craft, you really should be more specific: "U.S. secret supersonic aircraft that to this day remain unknown to historians." I won't try to measure how likely it is that such aircraft should exist, and still not be known. Nor will I try to say whether it's more or less likely than the arrival of ETs. But I do think you're loading the dice in your favor, by typing "U.S. secret supersonic aircraft" as if we all knew such things existed.

>4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose >distance Arnold had misjudged.

More bleedthrough from the other discussion.

>4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

Can't wait to read the NY Times headlines. "Soviets Flew Secret Flights Over US, KGB Archives Reveal." The scholar who unearths this one will probably win the Pulitzer Prize.

Oh, and let's not forget the subhead: "Russians Tested Advanced Supersonic Planes." I can just imagine a quote from the article: "The secret program was directed by General Vladimir Osipov, who now lives in retirement in Moscow. 'Our planes were so good,' General Osipov recalled, over a dinner of thin gruel and potatoes, 'that we got bored testing them over Kazakhstan, where they were developed So we decided to fly them over America. That wasn't any problem, because they had a range of 14,000 miles. They'd take off from an airport near Alma-Ata, fly over Siberia and the Bering Straits, and head for Chicago, via Seattle and Mt. Ranier. Then they'd head back, doing loops the whole way. Stalin gave us all medals.'"

You really think something like this happened (minus the range of 14,000 miles)? You think it's even remotely conceivable?

>5) Canadian secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation. >(Sorry EBK, guys, I must assign this a somewhat lower >probability, principally for technical reasons, such as >economics.)

>6) Nazi secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation (with >ex-nazis or other non-OI/NHIs piloting).

Nah. Probably Portuguese. Or Albanian.

If you think Nazis are more likely than ETs, I've got some dot.com stock I'd love to sell you. We can travel into space, as Bruce points out, so it's not crazy to imagine someone flying into space and finding us. But these Nazis of yours don't seem to have left any trace. Until you can show me some evidence that they existed -- I mean an organized Nazi group with the resources to fly nine supersonic planes in formation over the US in 1947 -- I'd suggest we leave fables like this for movies like "Marathon Man."

Greg Sandow

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Magonia Supplement no.34

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:47:37 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:22:57 -0500
Subject: Magonia Supplement no.34

MAGONIA Supplement
No. 34 4 March 2001

EDITORIAL

A question often asked in discussions on UFOs is: If the US Air Force (or any other agency of any government) had in its possession crashed saucers and the bodies of their ET pilots, how could they keep this secret for many years? This question is invariably answered by giving examples of military projects, spying activities, etc., successfully kept under wraps for long periods. What the ET believers always fail to realise - or choose to ignore - is the fact that government agencies can keep secrets only concerning matters which they control. If some UFOs are ET visitors then earthly governments have no control over them, as they can appear anywhere at any time, and convincing evidence of their physical reality could fall into the hands of any organisation or individual, anywhere on Earth. They could no more be kept secret than could volcanic eruptions or meteor showers.

So this is the question that we intend to keep asking until we get a sensible answer: How does a government agency hush up something which it can neither predict nor control?

RENDLESHAM REMEMBERED

Kevin McClure

I've always been rather embarrassed about the Rendlesham case. Way back in 1981 I'd not long since become an accredited UFOIN investigator (mostly on the strength of my 'Egryn Lights' research), and, insofar as investigation can be conducted over the telephone, I was the first person to start to put together the facts concerning the reports about Rendlesham. Because I made such a dog's breakfast of the task (particularly in losing my notes, and not even writing them up properly before I lost them), I've never bothered to read much about the case, knowing that the greater part of what I was reading seemed to have been spun together since the events, and did not represent the facts of what had happened as they were conveyed to me.

However, I never expected my role in the case, known only to a few others as far as I'm aware, to be played by one 'Bob Easton'. This, however, is what has happened in the strange new book by Georgina Bruni, *You Can't Tell The People - The Definitive Account of the Rendlesham Forest UFO Mystery*.

The title of the book comes, apparently, from a conversation Bruni had with Margaret Thatcher in 1997. Much is made of the position in society which facilitated Bruni's meeting with Thatcher who, other issues aside, may not have been at the peak of either her intellect or her sobriety by 1997. While aware of my tendency to discount the probity of statements made by self-pronounced supporters of the appalling Pinochet, I am concerned by the absence of provenance for this conversation. We

aren't told exactly where or when it took place, or what witnesses were present. Why such a supposedly important comment was withheld until it became a book title, and a hook on which to hang publicity, is probably more easily explained: Bruni is an ardent apologist for Nick Pope, who writes the introduction to the book. She has afforded the fragility of Pope's claims to access to official secrets considerable help, and continues to do so.

The sequence of events was pretty much as Bruni sets it out in her chapter 'The Early Years'. Because, living in Leicestershire, I was apparently the nearest UFOIN investigator to the case, Jenny Randles asked me to call Paul Begg (a contact which I maintained because he was an interesting and perceptive chap and a very thorough researcher and which, incidentally, led to him making a rare personal appearance at an ASSAP event which I organised the following year). From Paul I gained some idea of what was said to have happened, and he gave me a number for 'David Potts'.

I rang this number and spoke to Paul's informant, who confirmed that he was a radar operator. I don't recall where he was located (not, I think, anywhere near Rendlesham), but he did tell me that the USAAF had requested the recordings for the one night on which the mysterious events occurred: I don't think he had been aware of anything unusual appearing on screen, and he certainly didn't mention any account of vehicle interference.

Here, I get even vaguer. I spoke to somebody else between 'Potts' and, a day or two later, Dot Street and Brenda Butler, but I don't remember who. This person purported, I'm fairly confident, to have been present at the 'event', but only peripherally. He explained some confusion over the night on which it had taken place in terms of there being a 'false alarm' a day or two later, when staff again went out into the forest. There was no suggestion of there being events on three nights.

Of most interest, I guess, is the description I was given of what was seen. This amounts, I think, to something solid, light, reflective, possibly burning, even, appearing to be in a tree. It was clearly of unusual size and appearance to attract the attention it did, but there was no suggestion that it actually did anything at all except glow and, maybe, burn. I understood that its position was such that men were standing around the tree watching it. Certainly, I never took the 'lighthouse' theory for the cause of the original 'event' seriously, because it just didn't sound anything like what had been described to me. Though I really didn't take much interest in the information I was given, my conclusions at the time tended towards the cause being debris which had fallen into the tree and was in some way alight. It seemed reasonable to suppose that the specific nature of such debris could account for the level of official interest.

Having been given a phone number by Jenny I phoned Street and Butler, and they called me on several occasions, usually early in the evening. I would then call Jenny and keep her updated. I only remember two points distinctly from those conversations. One, that whenever either of them saw a US serviceman in the street, they would approach him and ask him what he knew about the event. The other was their account of the chase through the forest, which had clearly been very exciting, but rather lacking in any deeper significance. I know that my calls mostly entailed listening.

I wrote to Lucius Farish regarding the serviceman who said he had returned to the US for mysterious reasons, and I recall that, not long after, Farish sent me the details of this person on a postcard, which I think I passed on to Jenny to investigate further.

We moved house shortly afterwards, and I never again found my notes of the various conversations I had. It had been an interesting few days, but at the time there seemed to be a viable, conventional, if unusual explanation for what was clearly a one-off event that happened to take place near a US base. I assumed that if it had happened somewhere else - at sea, or in another area where it went unwitnessed - nothing would have been lost by nobody having heard of it. As it was, nobody was much interested in the case at the time.

That was, of course, long before the commercial potential of

Rendlesham had even begun to be recognised or - as it has turned out - mercilessly exploited. My own failure to maintain, and look after, proper records of the matter annoys me, and has taught me much about the need to investigate cases thoroughly, aggressively even, from the outset. And that if that wasn't done, then at the least to revisit cases that are highly implausible, and show every sign of being built on accrued speculation rather than facts.

For what it's worth, I suspect that the huge majority of explanations for Rendlesham, whether sceptical or belief-based, result from incorrect conclusions as to fact, and are irrevocably tainted by individual beliefs and preconceptions. Consequently, I tend to reject almost all of what Bruni has written, but I can at least be quite sure that 'Bob Easton' did not do what she says he did, and that this is not the "definitive account" that it purports to be. If Bruni had wanted to establish the facts about the early investigation of Rendlesham, she should either have found me and asked what I knew - which I'd have been happy to tell her - or have acknowledged that she didn't know who was involved at that stage. That she has, instead, attributed my actions to the mysterious 'Bob Easton' suggests that she preferred not to approach me, and created an unacknowledged fiction instead. Just what else about this book is not "definitive" remains to be seen.

LETTER

Peter Rogerson's comments on Moody's Last Laugh started a train of thought which I've travelled on briefly before but never stayed on till the terminus. It has always surprised me somewhat that American UFO conferences invariably incorporate a 'feast' (which generally falls somewhat short of what I understand by the term) and a 'show' which can include songs, music of a popular nature and comic sketches whose theatrical quality is on the level of family charades at Christmas. I was also reminded of that delightful anecdote in Vallee's journals, when he learns that Hynek, in Europe to meet fellow-students of the UFO phenomenon, cuts short a meeting with a group of them because he needs to get to the airport in time to purchase his duty-free entitlement. Another straw in the same wind is the need, felt by the authors of even the most serious American UFO books, to put in comic-strip or cartoon illustrations: you will recall that Lynn Catoe's 1969 bibliography, published by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, no less, had nine pages of saucerian jokes.

It's interesting, too, to note the different tones of voice in the letters section of Jim Moseley's Saucer Smear. If it's Chris Allan, or Tim Good, or Jenny, then the subject is likely to be something at least halfway serious: whereas the majority of the American letters are not about UFOs but about personalities, calling names, slinging mud, using d*rty w*rds.

Another indicator which has often given me food for wonder is the extraordinary nomenclature Hynek chose when, like Adam in Eden, he named the beasts - 'of the third kind': what sort of scientific classification is that? It is almost as though he knew it would one day be used to title a Hollywood movie. And, of course, their childlike jubilation when they are invited to appear as a guest of Oprah or one of those other shows which, for many Americans, take the place of religious devotion.

Peter's point about the inappropriateness of calling in the FBI to investigate Witnessed is well made. It is my practice, when I come up against a serious challenge to my incredulity, to make an annotated evaluation - I did this for Missing Time, for instance, and later for Corso's amazing fantasy. But when it came to Witnessed, I was positively embarrassed to list the absurdities: how could a person whom I know to be intelligent and rational put out a scenario so barmy that no science fiction author would consider it for a moment?

And yet these same people are ready to take one another's books seriously. Even books as bonkers as Jacobs's The Threat, Strieber's Communion or Mack's Abducted are given a solemn hearing, with never a hint that their basic premises may be so fundamentally flawed that belief is out of the question. When one opens Sturrock's The UFO Enigma to find the wretched

Trans-en-Provence 'case' given 40 pages of sage consideration as one of the most significant UFO events ever, one wonders if these people lack all sense of proportion?

If there was a positive side to this game-playing, we might find it easier to forgive. If there was even one major American UFO author who could stand back and see the UFO phenomenon steadily and see it whole, for the extraordinary mixture of sense and nonsense that it is! Keel came closest, but one has the impression that most American ufologists are embarrassed at having let his Trojan Horse through their gates. Bullard, bless him, generally gets matters into something approaching a balanced perspective, even if we shake our heads at his ability not to draw the conclusions that seem to impose themselves.

But how one longs for someone over there to stand up and say, openly and outright, that if Left at East Gate is to be taken seriously, then its author should be rushed into psychiatric treatment: that nobody could have written The day after Roswell unless he was suffering from megalomania, or Communion unless he was in line for testing for paranoia.

Are these people writing fun books, for entertainment only? Or seriously, to work something out of their system? Or simply to make a quick buck? Sometimes I find myself hoping that it's the last of these alternatives

Hilary Evans, London

HOAX!

Magonia is planning to publish articles on UFO hoaxes in future issues. The Editor would like to hear from anyone who has anything interesting or informative to say about them. Please send all communications on this topic to John Rimmer: magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk

Magonia Supplement. All issues are available on the Magonia web site: www.magonia.demon.co.uk. Letters and short articles welcome. All contributions should be sent to the Editor: John Harney - harney@harneyj.freemove.co.uk

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 02:55:34 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:19:41 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Easton

Regarding:

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 18:09:33 -0600

Dennis wrote:

>A short while after his original sighting, Arnold reported a second one
>with a flock of small UFOs that suspiciously resembled geese.

>Awhile later, he reported a third sighting in which he claimed to have
>filmed two UFOs, one of which he could allegedly see through.

>Has anyone ever seen that film?

Dennis,

Are you aware of the following?:

<http://www.bigbangco.com/ufomag/legendpress/htm/index.htm>

Until circa June of last year, 'Legend Press' had a web site, hosted by AOL. Although it's not been operational since then, the directory can still be accessed at:

<http://members.aol.com/lgendpress/>

Click on saucer.htm for further background info.

When this site was active, it contained some interesting content which is no longer there.

Fortunately, I can reveal what this featured, as on 30 April, 2000 I wrote to Legend Press about it:

Dear Sirs,

Regarding:

[Begin]
Other items coming soon:

Audio cassette of Armstrong Circle Theatre broadcast "Enigma of the Skies." with Kenneth Arnold's explanation of why he walked off the set because he was not allowed to tell what he saw. (first time released)

16mm movie film taken and explained by Kenneth Arnold. (first time released)

Ray Palmer's library of Amazing Stories magazine's (approx. 100 issues), rare flying saucer books 1940-60's (approx. 300 books), Occult books (approx 100 books) and other misc. books (approx.100 books). [End]

I would be grateful if you could confirm whether this material remains available.

Yours sincerely,

[etc.]

[END]

Despite further enquiries, I never received a response and it's uncertain to what extent 'Legend Press' were ever actually in business.

Two points of appreciable interest; one of those stated as being involved with the company was Ray Palmer Jnr. Presumably that's why part/all of Ray Palmer's library was being advertised for sale.

The other is of course this claim that Arnold's film was available and never before released.

The company's address on that AOL site was stated as:

LEGEND PRESS 9533 Clinton Road, Amherst, WI 54406

The address for orders via:

<http://www.bigbangco.com/ufomag/legendpress/htm/index.htm>

is given as:

285, 295 Midpark Way S.E.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2X 2A8
Phone: (403) 254-6685
Fax: (403) 254-6683 V.1

If we shorten the URL to:

<http://www.bigbangco.com/ufomag/>

it automatically defaults to:

<http://www.bigbangco.com/ufomag/default.CFM>

which is a 'UFO Magazine' web site, although different from their main site.

The URL:

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

is a portal for BBI Internet Publications Inc.

This links to three publications:

'FITforeGOLF', 'UFO Magazine' and 'HyWay Driving'!

A cursory enquiry shows that 'bigbangco.com' is registered to:

Big Bang Company
35 Crystelridge Way
Okotoks, AB T0L 1T2
CA

The domain billing is addressed to:

BBI Internet Publications Inc.
285 295 Midpark Way S.E.
Calgary
AB
T2X 2A8
CA
+1 (403) 254-6685 (FAX) +1 (403) 254-6683

So what's the connection with 'BBI' and 'Legend Press'?

Perhaps Don Ecker might be able to clarify this and whether the stated 16mm Arnold film, apparently never released, is known to

be still available.

From my notes, on the now apparently defunct 'Northwest Mysteries' web site, Greg Long highlighted two 'anniversary' articles in the local press about Arnold's sighting:

Northwest Mysteries - July 1, 1997 - "Kenneth Arnold: 50 Years of Flying Saucers "

Northwest Mysteries - June 24, 1997 - the 50th Anniversary of "Flying Saucers" [End]

I recall that in one of these, Mrs Arnold spoke about the 'flying saucer' misperception and how her late husband had commissioned a necklace/pendant which symbolised the actual object(s) believed to have been observed.

Are these articles still available online, or can anyone confirm where they were originally published?

James Easton

E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Barwood On KTAR 620 AM

From: Frances Emma Barwood <fbarwood@primenet.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 20:10:51 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:27:15 -0500
Subject: Barwood On KTAR 620 AM

I will be on with Preston Westmoreland on Tuesday, March 13, the 4th Anniversary of the 1997 Phoenix lights, on Phoenix station KTAR 620 AM.

You can hear us via their website if you are not local:

<http://www.ktar620.com>

2:20 pm - 3 pm

Let me know what you thought of it.

Thanks,

Frances

Retired Phoenix Vice Mayor/Councilwoman,
fbarwood@primenet.com** P.O. BOX 550, DEWEY, AZ 86327-0550
>>Book on The Phoenix Lights coming soon!!!<<<
(** A CELLULAR modem SO PLEASE, NO LISTS! Only PERSONAL or EMERGENCY issues)
Cellular phones 520-899-1907 (Mon. to Fri.)
520-899-4285 (Sat. & Sun. free minutes) (also faxline but call first)
"People can lie, cheat, steal and murder in this world and they may get away with it, but we are all going to judgment and that is all that matters". John Leissner Koch 1955

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

UFOs Over Ball Field, Fillmore California

From: Dan Geib <DanGeib@ArtGomperz.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 18:49:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:35:19 -0500
Subject: UFOs Over Ball Field, Fillmore California

I have some photos that were sent to me recently of UFOs at a junior high school ball field in Fillmore California.

They are at UFO Folklore:

<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/a2001/mar/ufo.htm>

Dan

--

FREE Music Win PRIZES
Art Gomperz Bluegrass & Rockabilly
<http://www.artGomperz.com/>

UFO Folklore!
<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/framemst.html>

Dan's Flatpicking in Michigan
<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/flatpicking.htm>

Dan's Magic in Michigan!
<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/magician>

Dantronix!
<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/testwave.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 22:46:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:49:20 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 15:41:16 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 13:40:11 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Nobody ever mentions the abductees or their claims when they
>profess their belief that the UFO phenomenon is real. (Whatever
>its source.)

>Bruce although this (includes) you, it is not aimed 'at' you. ;)

>I've said this before, one day the reality of this UFO business
>will all be a matter of 'common knowledge.' Whether it be by our
>own investigative efforts or intercession by the "aliens"
>themselves.

>We have touched and been touched by this "unknown." (that is not
>so "unknown" to some of us, and that some of you are convinced
>is real.) Yet few seem willing to take any kind of a stand on
>our behalf. Bright, educated, open-minded guys like Bruce can do
>all the math when it comes to working out the sizes, distances,
>and vectors of a UFO sighting, but seem unable to give equal
>time (or consideration) to the 'human side' of the equation.>

>There is a human toll being taken by this phenomenon that nobody
>seems willing to acknowledge. People are so focused on the
>"knife," (UFOs) they can't see the guy standing next them who is
>bleeding to death from a cut received from that same blade.
>(Abductees)

Before you die of a thousand cuts I would like to mention that
my next book, publication will be soon... I hope.... tackles
this problem... in fact both problems (UFO reality and
abductions) in a way never presented before..... in a novel with
a fact book built into it.>

So, whereas I seldom appeal to abduction stories to mount
evidence for TRUFO/OI/NHI/ET.. whatever... reality, I haven't
forgotten you guys.

Get "Abduction In My Life".... as soon as it is published.
Whenever that is! (Hold up at the publishers... was supposed
to be out last November.)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:37:43 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:51:07 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 23:00:00 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 02:02:22 -0000

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<Snip>

>As for non-human craft without ETs, how about unmanned probes
>from space? They could have machine intelligence roughly
>equivalent to that of a human, perhaps superior in some
>respects; fast logic or decision-making maybe.

<snip>

>I guess you would call this ET without the ETs, as in living
>natural beings.

>Between advanced machine tech and genetic engineering, the clean
>line between living and non-living entities could become a
>complete blur in a super-advanced society.

Hi, Larry, Joe, et. al.,

Yes, I think that something like this would be a better bet than
ET's in person for travel between stars.

>Heck, that could lay in store for us here on Earth, without no
>outside intervention at all

But, then, they would still be outside intervention - in
ambush. Still ETI.

And still no proof (other than that 'ol 101 Wild Turkey).

Clear skies,

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Pelicans Redux [was: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact]
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 05:53:52 -0000

>Regarding:

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Bob,

>Re your comments...

>If those nine objects were so incredibly reflective, the last
>person to consider whether they might be birds would be Arnold
>himself.

>Conversely, if Arnold did wonder whether they might be birds,
>then he was satisfied that even taking into account their
>reflective capabilities, it was a conceivable explanation.

Easton has returned on the backs of the pelicans. At one point he says I no longer mention brightness of reflection as an argument against pelicans.

Wrong. So far as I know, no ornithologist or glider pilot or whatever has compared the reflection from a pelican to the brightness of a welder's arc.

Easton uses the term "specularity" to refer to the reflectivity of the pelican's feathers. Apparently he hasn't learned despite approximately a zillion emails with analysis over the last several years that specular is a term applied to reflectivity from polished or smooth surfaces such as metal, glass, plastic.

A specular reflection causes the light to be reflected according to the reflection rule: angle of reflection = angle of incidence. For a specular reflector all the light that is reflected obeys that rule. The opposite is a diffuse reflector: the light which is reflected goes in all directions (over a hemisphere) equally. Any real reflecting surface is a combination of the two, with polished metal being mostly specular and white paper... or pelican feathers... being mostly diffuse.

However, he has pointed out that ornithologists and bird watchers have referred to bright reflections from pelicans. How can this be? Any diffuse reflecting surface can have a "glint" which is a brighter than normal reflection when the light source is almost aligned with the surface. In this case it means that the pelican is nearly between the observer and the sun so the sunlight causes a grazing reflection from the pelican feathers. In the case of Arnold this does not apply: the sun was to the west of Arnold and the UFOs were to the east (Easton has not

disputer this.... yet...) so any reflection off the pelicans would be the normal diffuse reflection. They would have appeared no brighter than the snow reflection ...and ,in fact may well had been less bright than the reflection from snow on Mt. Rainier.

Arnold's initial impression that he was looking at geese was likely not related to the obvious reflectivity, but rather to the flight pattern. He apparently rejected the geese explanation for reasons related to bird characteristics.... but he also could have rejected it based on reflectivity.

Finally, without parsing Easton's statement.... again.... (see a zillion emails in the archive from years ago)...let me reiterate my Pelican Mantra:

Draw A Map.

For those newcomers, this refers to drawing a reasonable map showing how Arnold could have been flying in a plane at 100-110 mph and have a flock of pelicans pass his plane going from north to south without him realizing that he was gaining on th birds... i.e., traveling faster than they were.

I have watched large birds (geese and others) fly in formation and have noted that they are spaced by a few feet to perhaps 20 ft. They do this, presumably, so that one bird can "ride the the wave" produced by a bird just ahead of it. (The lead bird has the roughest flight). So 9 in a line might cover a distance less than 200 ft. Arnold claimed that the string of objects was about comparable in length to a ridgeline about 5 miles long. From his position the distance to that ridgeline was about 25 miles. So the angle subtended by the length of the chain of objects was about 1/5 radian. If they were pelicans they were only about 2 miles away or less, say 10,000 ft. Now. 1/5 of 10,000 is 2000 ft.... ten times larger than the spacing of birds. Another reason to reject birds?

Draw A Map.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 00:04:10 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:14:16 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 12:07:19 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

>Yup.

>Those who do not agree should have explanations at the ready
>(explanations for UFO sightings, that is).

Bruce:

OK, I'll start with Donald Menzel's list of 110 explanations of
UFO sightings, circa 1969, or so.

Could you match me with one, that's just one, proven OI/NHI
(Non-ET craft created by non-human intelligences)? Is it
possible for List Members to go someplace to see it? Other than
Gulf Breeze, that is?

Cause otherwise, you're asking me to prove your hypothesis.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms 3.11.01

From: Stephen MILES Lewis <elfis@austin.rr.com>
Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:55:55 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:20:07 -0500
Subject: ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms 3.11.01

ELFIS LIVES! Journal of Possible Paradigms 3/11/01

<http://www.elfis.net/journal/jrnl031101.htm>

Elfis has been resurrected! What a long strange trip it's been... and it just keeps getting stranger!

Elfis is beginning anew in an effort to fulfill its original sub-title as a "Journal of Possible Paradigms." With this issue of Elfis (numero 10) I've started a continuing Journal entry series that will keep you informed of all things Elfis. There are many exciting things happening here at the Elfis Ranch, and you'll want to hear about every little detail. And you will HEAR as well as see all things Elfis as we have just recently launched our new multi-media syndicate: Radio-Free-Elfis. But more on that in a minute.

First off, let's play catch-up since it's been so long since we last did anything official on the site...

Way back in September of 1999, before attending the 36th annual NUFOC in San Antonio, I posted an Elfis Hiatus message to the web site. While at the conference I met many fans of Elfis whom I'd never had the pleasure of meeting face to face. When informed of the hiatus they implored me to "continue no matter what it takes." Little did I know, that my attendance at that strange conflagration known as the National UFO Conference would ultimately lead to me HOSTING NUFOC 38!

TIME FOR A NUFOC!

Yes, you heard correctly; Elfis is hosting this year's 38th Annual National UFO Conference here in good ole Austin, Texas. So far it is shaping up to be one of the most unique and memorable conferences in recent ufological history.

For more on this event scheduled for September 14-15-16 (just one week shy of the 40th anniversary of the Betty/Barney Hill Abduction Case) please see the official web site:

<http://www.nufoc.net>

You should also visit the HISTORY section for a brief timeline provided by none other than permanent NUFOC chairperson and Saucer Smear Supreme Commander, James Moseley.

For future NUFOC updates please send an email request to:
nufoc@elfis.net

ELFIS.NETWORK
Portal to Possible Paradigms
CommUnity thru Anomaly!

Elfis is fast becoming the best Anomaly Portal on the net. Beginning in 2000, Elfis began hosting several web sites devoted to a variety of anomalous phenomena.

You probably already knew about our hosting of the Austin MUFON web site...

<http://www.elfis.net/austin/mufon/>

As well as the AusTex Anomalous web site...

<http://www.elfis.net/austin/>

And the Austin Remote Viewing Center site...

<http://www.elfis.net/austin/remoterviewingcenter/>

(Recently UpDated with New On-Line Targets for you to GROK!)

But did you also know that we host such illustrious sites as...

The Excluded Middle magazine:

Weirdness Dissected & Decoded

<http://www.excludedmiddle.com>

EMF Interface: Health Effects Associated with ElectroMagnetics & Beyond

<http://www.emfinterface.com>

And of course the aforementioned official

National UFO Conference site...

<http://www.nufoc.net>

Oh, and my good friends at...

INACS

The Institute for Neuroscience And Consciousness Studies

Within a few months of attending the 36th NUFOC in San Antonio I was lucky to encounter a local consciousness research group: the Institute for Neuroscience And Consciousness Studies. By the beginning of 2000 I was there official webmaster and librarian. Since our first meeting we've moved forward with the website as well as public meetings featuring our Director of Research, Bob Price who has pioneered lucid dream induction research. Among the many wonderful people populating our Board of Directors/Board of Advisors are veteran consciousness researchers Hal Puthoff and Stanley Krippner.

INACS is starting a distinguished speakers series this April beginning with a lecture and workshop by Stanley Krippner:

"Finding Your Personal Myths Through Dreams and Anomalous Healing Experiences"

For more information on INACS and the Krippner event see the links below:

<http://www.inacs.org>

and

<http://www.inacs.org/krippner.htm>

RADIO-FREE-ELFIS

Radio-Free-Elfis will allow the Elfis Network to reach more people in a new and engaging way. Starting in 1998 I began making web radio appearances on a friend's show called Cartoon Pleroma. This wonderful show hosted by Excluded Middler Robert Larson has featured many ParaUfological luminaries such as Terence McKenna, Michael Lindemann, Fred Alan Wolf, Paul David Pursglove and many many others. Not long after I appeared on the premiere show (Good Friday 1998) I offered to host the Cartoon Pleroma audio archives within Elfis. Well it may have taken a couple of years but its finally about to happen.

Robert Larson's
CARTOON PLEROMA

<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/>

First Show: 4.10.98
Featuring SMiles Lewis
On all things Elfis!

7.9.98
Featuring Dr. William Cone
One of the authors of the highly controversial book, The
Abduction Enigma (with co-authors Kevin Randle & Russ Estes)
and author of Alien Rape, speaking on his work and research
with people he believes suffer from sleep paralysis but who
believe themselves to be abductees.

HOLOGRAPHIC UNIVERSE 8.23.98
Guest hosted by Robert Larson & Greg Bishop
Featuring SMiles Lewis
Discussing everything from Parapsychology to Parapolitics,
Mind to UFOs

9.3.98
Featuring SMiles Lewis
On Dreams, Lucidity, Altered States of Consciousness,
Psychedelics, Sleep Paralysis, Out of Body/Astral Voyages,
Dream Swapping, Shared Near Death Experiences,
Parapsychology and Much More

MORE INTERVIEWS
COMING SOON!

Featuring:
-Terence McKenna
-Fred Alan Wolf
-Michael Lindemann
-Mack White
-David Pursglove
& Many Many More!!!

Radio-Free-Elfis has begun weekly live shows. So far all but one
of the shows has been on Monday nights around 7pm CST. The home
page for Radio-Free-Elfis which will soon feature archives of
the live show is...

Archives are here...
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/>

You can access the looping radio streams at the URL below. It
already features several past episodes of the above mentioned
Cartoon Pleroma radio show, the most recent Radio:Free:Elfis
shows as well as a multitude of "Songs about UFOs, Flying Saucer
Rock n Roll", rare interviews and much more.

<http://www.live365.com/cgi-bin/directory.cgi?autostart=elfisnet1>

First "official" show THIS MONDAY (3.12.01) featuring...
-Mack White, underground comics artist
& conspiracy researcher

<http://www.mackwhite.com>

-John Carter, author of Sex & Rockets:
The occult world of Jack Parsons

<http://www.excludedmiddle.com/sexnrkts.htm>

Continuing to chart the ECCO of VALIS!

Its been well over a year since I last updated my database of
what books, magazines and research papers I've accumulated here
in the AusTex Anomaly Archives. At last count I had over 500
ufo/mind/parapsychology books. Now, after initial counts, it
lookes like I've added over 200 books.

Though these most recent additions haven't yet been added to the
online listings you can still take a peek to see what was
already in our archive.

<http://www.elfis.net/eccoofvalis/arcbklst.htm>

ELFIS WEB BOARDS

This is our new message board community which I hope will begin to take off with conversation very soon.

But we need your help. Visit the url below often and add your thoughts on any of the areas ELFIS covers: from strict Ufological pursuits to Parapsychological research to Mind Kontrol rumors and beyond.

<http://elfis.community.everyone.net/>

Well, that's it for now. That should be enough to keep you busy for a while..

More content is coming soon the the Elfis Network.
So stay tuned!

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 01:57:06 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 15:06:24 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 01:13:31 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.

>I know you had to mention this so as to not hurt Easton's
>feelings. But no.

Hi, Don,

Hey, gotta cover for my wing-man.

>>3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
>>put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities.).

>Horizontal meteors? Traveling at only 1,200 mph?

If the meteor is at typical altitude for a fireball (>20 miles)
it would be much further away and the speed would be
proportionately greater.

>>4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose
>>distance Arnold had misjudged.

>Would have been close enough to identify then.

How far away were the mountain peaks? A 30-foot long aircraft
would have cut a very small figure. Isn't one of the problems
that no one knows precisely where Arnold was?

>>4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

>Yeah right-over Washington state??

Yes, clearly disinformation.

>>7) Nine genuine ET craft, ET piloted or robotically controlled.

>Occum's razor??

Appropriately placed near the very end, so as not to cut _my_
throat.

>>8) Angels, Seraphim, Apollo in his Sun chariot pulled by nine
>>horses, or nine other OI/NHIs, etc.

>>Well, that's it, Greg. I would even go for ETs before the
>>rapture.

>A wise move Bob.

Didn't mean prior to the rapture.

>>May there always be Clear, Cloudless Skies and a Temperature
>>Inversion over the Cascades in July,

>As you know an inversion would not work here due to Arnold's
>altitude and the respective altitude of the craft. Depressed
>angle. Stable air that day with cold air up to higher
>altitudes. To high for temp inversion.

Yes, you are right. This was a hastily chosen sign-off. The inversion was in the valley in front of or behind the peaks, thus possibly causing a superior mirage of peaks over the horizon. Of course, Arnold's altitude matters, but then no one knows what it was, or how far away from the peaks he was, or exactly where he was, or exactly which peaks he meant.

Clear skies, wherever you are,

Bob Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 01:57:06 EST
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 01:13:31 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>2) Birds, pelican or otherwise.

>I know you had to mention this so as to not hurt Easton's
>feelings. But no.

Hi, Don,

Hey, gotta cover for my wing-man.

>>3) A bright, daytime, fragmenting meteor. The newest theory -
>>put forth recently by Uncle Phil Klass. Has possibilities..).

>Horizontal meteors? Traveling at only 1,200 mph?

If the meteor is at typical altitude for a fireball (>20 miles) it would be much further away and the speed would be proportionately greater.

>>4) U.S. secret sub-sonic aircraft flying in formation, whose
>>distance Arnold had misjudged.

>Would have been close enough to identify then.

How far away were the mountain peaks? A 30-foot long aircraft would have cut a very small figure. Isn't one of the problems that no one knows precisely where Arnold was?

>>4) Soviet secret supersonic aircraft flying in formation.

>Yeah right-over Washington state??

Yes, clearly disinformation.

>>7) Nine genuine ET craft, ET piloted or robotically controlled.

>Occum's razor??

Appropriately placed near the very end, so as not to cut my throat.

>>8) Angels, Seraphim, Apollo in his Sun chariot pulled by nine
>>horses, or nine other OI/NHIs, etc.

>>Well, that's it, Greg. I would even go for ETs before the
>>rapture.

>A wise move Bob.

Didn't mean prior to the rapture.

>>May there always be Clear, Cloudless Skies and a Temperature
>>Inversion over the Cascades in July,

>As you know an inversion would not work here due to Arnold's
>altitude and the respective altitude of the craft. Depressed
>angle. Stable air that day with cold air up to higher
>altitudes. To high for temp inversion.

Yes, you are right. This was a hastily chosen sign-off. The
inversion was in the valley in front of or behind the peaks,
thus possibly causing a superior mirage of peaks over the
horizon. Of course, Arnold's altitude matters, but then no one
knows what it was, or how far away from the peaks he was, or
exactly where he was, or exactly which peaks he meant.

Clear skies, wherever you are,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Questions For Georgina Bruni

From: Sean Tierney <sean@vic.karoo.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 10:45:28 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 15:38:40 -0500
Subject: Questions For Georgina Bruni

Hi All,

Here is a transcript I typed up for Larry, seen as he is not on the internet, in response to Georgina's book!

See Ya!

Sean

Remember: Look Up To The Skies, See Something, Report It!!!

Sean Tierney

sean@vic.karoo.co.uk

www.hullufosociety.moonfruit.com

http://beehive.thisishull.co.uk/hull_ufo_society

Questions For Georgina Bruni Concerning The Book

"You Can't Tell The People"

© Copyright Larry Warren

Since the November 2000, publication of Ms Bruni's book, I've been asked by many interested parties for a reaction to the claims the author, Bruni, makes with regard to both myself and the Bentwaters/Woodbridge UFO incident or Rendlesham Forest as it is known in Britain.

The author Bruni, did in fact send me a complementary copy of her book as she had promised she would, and after three careful reads of it, I found that I had some very serious issues with either the author's research methods, her ethics, her general truthfulness, and lastly, Ms Bruni's claim that her book is both the "True" and "Definitive" account of the very complex Bentwaters case. Initially, I had noted over one hundred and ninety seven problems with her "definitive" account, soon that number rose to a staggering 407 problems some of course, more major than others, but just the same, these problems exist and must be addressed.

I can assure you, this will be an interesting insight into the "agenda driven UFO researchers out there; and the UFO community can draw their own conclusions on just what agendas drove Ms Bruni "to write" and "not write" what she did in "You Can't Tell The People"

Back in December 2000, Ms Bruni was told that I had 197 issues with her book - she wrote to the Hull based UFO researcher, Sean Tierney, that I could not have "10" issues, let alone 197 issues with her "factual" research on Bentwaters.

She made this claim via the Internet and added some rather insulting commentary as well.

Ms Bruni has avoided a few invitations to debate these problems in a public forum with me, (She was very busy), and seems more comfortable with spin and distortion, mixed with a heavy dose of hype, in her bizarre online battles with veteran Bentwaters researcher, Jenny Randles. That fight has been conducted on the UFO UpDates Mailing List!

Lastly, on that matter, Jenny Randles made a complete fool of the author Bruni, who's response to Jenny looked a bit self deluded and desperate, in my opinion of course, but Bruni did little to establish herself as an "investigative journalist" and showed a complete lack of professionalism.

Ms Bruni has made the task at hand a bit simpler for me by claiming that I could not put 10 questions to her with regard to her "excellent research!"

So Ms Bruni, here are twenty questions concerning your "definitive" book "You Can't Tell The People!" (Let's start with easy ones!)

Q#1 - Ms Bruni, Why does the fact that you edit an online "Gossip Magazine" entitled "Hot Gossip" not mentioned in the text of your book? Sure, your dust jacket states that you edit an "on-line magazine", but again I ask you, why is the keyword "Gossip" omitted from the jacket text, I'mean, it is true right?

Q#2 - Ms Bruni, Did you read the book, "Left At East Gate"? If so, as a researcher "Trained In Investigation", did you note the on "Record interviews" with other witnesses circa 1984 and published in East Gate, and then compared the statements from that time with the alleged statements given to you during the course of your "Definitive Research" by those same individuals?

Q#3 - Ms Bruni, On page 29, 2nd paragraph of the chapter, you title "American Pie", you write, "Both police squadrons carried weapons such as the M-16, and a weapon capable of shooting down a helicopter" end quote, my question is this, you claim to have interviewed numerous witnesses from 81st SPS cir 1980, myself included. You claim to be a trained investigative journalist as well, that said, in 1980 the 81st Security Police - was in fact made up of two separate disciplines. Law Enforcement Police carried a Colt 38, 6 shot revolver, a night stick, a Motorola 4 band radio and hand cuffs. L.E. Did not carry an M-16 rifle, as you write in your book.

Security Specialist - (Me) carried these weapons depending on assignment.

A Colt M-16 Rifle that fired 7.6 NATO Rounds.

A Colt G.U.A. Short Stock 16 - Same NATO Rounds.

An M-60 - Heavy Cal, Sub Machine Gun.

An M-203 - Combo 16/203 Mil, Grenade Launcher - (note, a surface to surface weapon)

Handcuffs and a Motorola 4Ch Radio

My point is simple - you are claiming in your "Factual Book" that we were armed with "surface to air" weapons - as you now know, this is not true - Whom told you this "fact?" Who told you that L.E. Carried M-16 s?

As an investigative journalist did you do any background research on the security police and the jobs role in Europe circa 1980?

Did you contact the USAF Security police Museum in San Antonio, Texas?

One would think you would as it was Security Police whom are your primary witnesses to the UFO incident! Or as you like to say, was this information something you were told or something you knew?

Q#4 - Ms Bruni, In the current issue of UFO Magazine (UK), I notice on the top of page 13 - the banner headline "MOD Warned America About UFO Book!" This refers only to the point that the MOD sent a rather bland memo to USAFE Mildenhall, Norfolk

(Likely to public affairs) informing USAF to expect queries concerning your book - Of course this happened as far back as 1984 with the book "Skycrash" except at that time, memos of this nature would have gone to Bentwaters Public Affairs - Mildenhall is now the administrative centre for the USAF in Britain. I see nothing strange with this. So I ask you, is the banner headline simply hype and more creative marketing?

Or do you really believe that you are the only person to publish a book on the case? And that America was really "warned" about your book? Books on this subject are NOT reviewed by the government before being published in America, as we have freedom of speech and expression.

Q#5 - Ms Bruni, Is your book available in book stores in America?

Q#6 - Ms Bruni, of course you have shown the lighthouse theory to be the joke it always was - you are not the first to do so. Why did you not choose to vent some of your spite at the idiots (Like Easton and Ridpath, etc.) Who promote the lighthouse theory, instead of on some of the witnesses to the incident.

Did you ever visit the forest at night?

Or for that matter, Did you ever visit Caple Green?

As a trained investigator, I'd have thought you would have addressed the debunkers by name and theory and then laid waste to them with your "Definitive Research"? Ignoring them is not balanced research is it?

Q#7 - Ms Bruni, On page 33 in the New UFO Magazine, we see you have been invited to speak at the 20th Leeds UFO Conference in September - I can tell you that I'm sure you will enjoy it! Baring another petrol strike.

I notice that in your brief bio, you are identified as being a "Best Selling Author" Congratulations!!! That's super. Peter and myself were in the British Top 10 Best Sellers List in the summer of 1997, in fact two lists. (In Britain, one must sell over 5,000 Hard Back copies of ones book without returns, to get there!)

Could you let me know on what list your book has qualified as a "Best Seller" or is the claim more hype and creative marketing?

It is hard work to get a true best seller (A major book tour can help), but UFO books are not doing well these days and it would be insulting to authors that are Best Selling authors, to have authors who are not, saying that they are! What do you say? (In your defence, John Mack is NOT a "Former" Pulitzer Prize Winner, he is one!)

Q#8 - Ms Bruni, In your book you state that I "more than once contemplated suicide" Based on what source do you conclude this?

First it is bull, second, it is legally actionable, and third, - Did you read East Gate?

Had you done so, why did you not report accurately what happened to me 14 years ago and why?

Why was it necessary to write this inaccurate and slanderous statement at all? Please don't tell me that I told you that! Because I will then ask you to produce the audio tape of me doing so, OK! So please answer why you tried to create such an inaccurate and unstable picture of Larry Warren?

In fact, you put more effort into slandering me then resolving the case, Why?

Q#9 - Ms Bruni, During our 5 or 6 telephone conversations from March 1999 to the late Spring of 2000, you often asked me if I was recording you? You also stated more than once that you NEVER recorded your interviews! In the State Of Vermont, one can record any telephone call without the other party knowing it, for legal purposes and for the record. When we did speak, I was living in Vermont, and I did in fact record all of your phone calls, (For legal purposes) as it was my right to do so. However you eventually told my wife that you reordered all of your

conversations and did not admit as much to the people you spoke too. "As A Professional Trained Researcher", Why did not have the professional courtesy to ask for permission to record your "sources" all good researchers do, why not you?

Q#10 - Ms Bruni, On Page 71, You state that "Busty Bustinza" cannot recall the names of the men he picked up that night, (3rd UFO Incident) I ask again, have you read his previous interviews by Larry Faucett, Ray Bouche, Chuck Decaro, etc. If so, then why did you not question the man, because he knew whom he had picked up in 1984 when he was first interviewed, What is your agenda?

Q#11 - Ms Bruni, Did you tell researcher, Brenda Butler that Larry Warren and Peter Robbins "made up" the other witness supportive statements in "Left At East Gate", and that we made up the supportive statements from witnesses that came after our books publication.

Ref: P. Robbins lecture at Leeds 1998

Ref: Info that was offered to you by me and Peter that you had no interest in?

Brenda said this to more than just myself.

Q#12 - Ms Bruni, On page 72 of your book, you write "Larry Warren claims to have seen three aeronaut entities communicating with Gordon Williams." Please show me where, in the last 20 years, that I have used the term "Aeronaut" to describe the phenomena we observed, I mean you say that I "claim" that. What is your source?

On communication with Williams, I've never once said that definite communication took place with Williams, I say it could have - Please explain yourself?

Your book clearly places Williams on site, but with so many agendas going on at once, you might have missed it?

Q#13 - Ms Bruni, Why do you write that I saw a "huge machine land"? I've never said that, and it wasn't "huge", I also never saw the machine land! So what is your purpose for attributing that description to me as if you are quoting me?

Again, I ask did you really read "Left At East Gate"?

Q#14 - Ms Bruni, Have you watched the 3 part CNN broadcast from 1985? If so, why did you mention it only in passing in your book, and on top of this describe it inaccurately. Example, "Capt Mike Verrano doesn't just "claim" to have driven Williams to a jet with film of the UFO," He did!

You also write that Larry Warren was "surprised to recognise Verrano on the show," How do you conclude this? I worked with Chuck Decaro from beginning to end on that program and had spoken to most of the participants before it was broadcast in February 1985. Why the surprise? I was the first person interviewed by CNN in September 1984 as well.

Q#15 - Ms Bruni, On page 74 you write that I was "upset" and "paranoid" after the UFO incident and that Bustinza tried to "calm me down." You also write that Bustinza remembers walking down the hall while I wonder if cameras were watching us? In reality, Bustinza asked to talk to me! Why did he not paint me as a paranoid in 1984, your information is false.

You also state that Larry Warren was talking to "everyone about the UFO", again, not true! Cookie (Belinda) Vaughn was my girlfriend at that time, as you know, from speaking to her yourself! I never told her about it! You have your facts ass backwards again! And you seem to be hell-bent to create an untrue picture of me. Please explain your research methods of this issue? Check out Cookie's recollection's from that time on your own website, or have you removed it? Because it's another contradiction? Let me add, that Cookie was not a security police woman.

Q#16 - Ms Bruni, After two letters and verbal requests for you to return my photographs and documents, you finally did, via your "man servant" Nick pope, at last September's Leeds Conference. Thank you, however you seem to have forgotten to

enclose that yellow piece paper from Bustinza's girlfriend, Cindy Schultz, telling me that Busty wanted to talk!

You must remember that one? It had text from Bentwaters all-ranks club on the reverse and a picture of a mule. As you know, that is the actual note that Busty had slipped under my door that initiated our first discussions about our experiences. You can read the true version in "Left At East Gate" if you like. I do have a copy of the note, I sent you the original (Silly Me) and it kind of blows your version of events out of the water that I refer to in question 15. You know you have it, why did you not explore, "if indeed he was accurately quoted by you" this fact with Bustinza.

Please explain, and please return the note, ta!

Q#17 - Ms Bruni, on page 73 of your book, you write that "I was convinced Gordon Williams communicated with the crew of an "Alien Spaceship"" Again on page 73, you state that "No one else puts Williams at the landing sites"!

On the first point, (Again) I've never in 20 years described the phenomena we saw as one "Alien" nor have I ever described the machine we saw on Capel Green, as a "Spaceship"! (I mean, how would I know?) If you had read "Left At East Gate" you would have noticed that I do not believe the object came from "Space" at all. I believe it was from the future! I also expressed this opinion to you on the phone as well (Check your "research tapes") on the first point again, I never said that "definite" communication with the "crew" (Another description I've never ever used!) Took place with Williams, I say, some form of communication could have taken place, with Williams. Once again, please describe your research methods on these points, if any were used?

As for others placing Williams on site, you write that "no one else does!" Halt has, the interviews with participants conducted by Ray Bouche confirms that "fact" as well, and was published in a MUFON journal and "Left At East Gate! Your book goes to great lengths to remove Williams from the incident, however your writing, and the man's own actions and words indite him as having been involved.

He was!

This is a bit more complex then the previous questions, but do give it the old college try. I will simplify it, why did you ignore established facts? (And please, no Spin!)

Q#18 - Ms Bruni, In your book you claim the following (false) information.

Larry Warren was never cleared to work in the WSA "Did you really and truly read my book?"

Did you review my existing military records, (published in the appendix) or did we make these records up as well?

Had you done so, you knew before you published your book, that on 11th Dec 80, I was posted to D flight with my security clearance (intact), on the 15th Dec 80, I received my (PRP) which is clearance to work with nuclear weapons, (in the WSA). I did so twice before the UFO incident. I believe that you knew that too!

From where I stand, I don't see a hint of "investigative journalism" skills on your part!" Please explain why you make blanket statements that are clearly false.

Q#19 - Ms Bruni, On page 77 in your book you tell the "hopefully" true account of a Bruce Tyler, who describes a similar film to the one we were shown within hours of the UFO incident! You then write that this film was, quote "probably the exact same film that Larry and the other witnesses were shown" end quote.

Perhaps it was? Big deal, why in one sentence do you back up events that did happen to me and in the next write falsehoods and slander about me. That is a tactic you seem to use throughout your book Why?

Q#20 - Ms Bruni, In a recent issue of UFO Magazine (UK) you know, the one with your interview and the pain you direct at me. Well in that issue, it was announced that we had sold the option for a film treatment of "Left At East Gate", this may or may not pan out, but that's show biz right! (Although things do look good, folks)

Ms Bruni you claim to have extensive background in public relations (I do) and are now an author right, so please explain your reasons for contacting "Fast Carrier Pictures" President Steve Rubin, (The man who bought the film option on Left At East Gate) (Smart Guy!) And then trying to flog your book to him, (as if the company would drop us) First I suggest that you get your own dramatic literary agent, (you need one, as the movie business does not accept unsolicited material.) As a PR you should have known this!

What is your version of this "fact"?

Q#21 - A bonus question should you be up for it? (I can't resist)

Ms Bruni, In your book you refer to a conversation with researcher Brenda Butler, you write that at some point Brenda offered me false information (Perhaps back in 1983?) "And he (Me) took the bait!" But worse you write that you ask me about the aforementioned crap and then attribute a false quote, by me in response as if I am a stuttering idiot!

Look, you know, that I know, that you know, I never said what you wrote, and further, the inflection and style of speech is not mine. Perhaps yours? If you have it on tape, produce it!

Brenda tells me that you misquoted her? So either you or she speaks with forked tongue?

Well, if you do well with these I have another 385 for you!

Of those we can discuss the "pictures" and many other "fun facts"

To all that have read this,

I'm not the sort that likes to put people on the spot, nor do I like to be perceived as a bully.

Ms. Bruni has chosen to include information in her book that she knows is false, she also spun statements about me to fit her agenda, never in 20 years has anyone done this, (Not even the debunkers!) I wanted to take legal action but reminded myself that the many thousands of intelligent people the world over, who have read my book, will find the problems that I have with Ms. Bruni's book to be self evident. Read her book by all means, but you won't find anything to be "Definitive" or with regard to Larry Warren, "True" at all.

I hope she answers these questions, as I'm a major focus of her Warren Commission style take on the Bentwaters case.

Should she choose not too, that will be self evident as well. It's a lousy position to be in. As I've fought hard for twenty years to get this case into the wider public eye and she has put great effort in confusing it rather than resolving it.

You be the judge!

A lengthy overview of her book is on the way, and many "issues and facts" in Bruni's book need to be addressed.

Larry Warren

PS If Ms Bruni has nothing to hide, I d rather debate these issues in a public forum, she can even have Nick Pope on stage with her for moral support!

Larry asked, having read her book, does this e-mail dated from when her manuscript was in the can, make sense to any of you or do you smell agenda?

X-Sender: georgina@*****

Mime-Version: 1.0

Date: Tues, 29 Sept 1998 01:52:50 +100

To: Peter Robbins <****@*****>

From: georgina@*****

Subject Re: HOT GOSSIP UK - SEPT

Hi Peter

Sorry for the delay. It that time of month again - uploading the magazine

Good news!!!!!! I got the book deal with a nice advance too. It's being published by Sidgwick & Jackson - Macmillan. Signing next week.

You are one of the first to know.

Nick says he and Bridgette had a great time in NY.

I d be honoured to be mentioned on your site Peter and I ll russle up a brief thingie. How many words do you want?

Thanks for answering those questions. Hope Larry is well. Please tell him about my book deal and the fact that my research has uncovered enough to completely confirm that he was there. It's not looking good for Halt though.

Hugs

Georgina

© Copyright Larry Warren

11.03.2001

See Ya!

Sean

Remember:
Look Up To The Skies,
See Something,
Report It!!!

Sean Tierney

sean@vic.karoo.co.uk

www.hullufosociety.moonfruit.com

http://beehive.thisishull.co.uk/hull_ufo_society

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 15:41:11 -0500
Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

Hello Everyone,

One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims involves the sound of nine knocks in three series of three. Strieber associates the sounds he heard in 1986 with his own abductions and presents several cases in which the nine knocks form part of other people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough and The Communion Letters).

We know from his early fiction and from interviews that Strieber is erudite in fields such as folklore and esoteric tradition. It comes as something of a surprise, therefore, to find that no mention is made in his books to phenomena of a similar kind reported in non-ufological contexts. A brief historical survey of the 'knocking' phenomenon would have at once supported his case and illustrated the point that the 'visitor' experience has accompanied humanity for centuries, albeit in different guises.

The most obvious non-UFO area featuring the knocks is that of poltergeist 'rappings.' One instance of 'nine ghostly raps' which comes to my mind dates to December 1716, but there are others. Raps often came in threes and were often heard on the outsides of a house in unreachable spots, just as Strieber describes.

I can provide examples of cases that involve neither ghosts nor UFOs. Consider the following anecdote, undated but from before 1935:

"I had a neighbour that heard three raps at her door for three nights straight. Each night she went to the door and no one was there. On the third night, just as she started to open the door, a big star appear[ed] on the door, then she knew it was death. Her mother died out in California just about the same time the star appear[ed] on her door."

Death, of course, is one of Strieber's favourite subjects and this story would have fit very well into one of his books. However, it was published in a rare tome that he was unlikely to see.

On the basis of my research into folklore and pre- 1947 incidents I feel unable to reject Strieber's claim about the 'nine knocks' as preposterous or without precedence because it really is supported by independent testimonies. Indeed, exactly eighteen months after Strieber's alleged experience a large but unspecified number of people in Glenrock, Wyoming, were woken up "by a series of nine knocks in three groups of three on their cars, on the sides or roofs of their houses, or on their doors." Strieber's account had still not been published when this occurred, and a report in The Glenrock Independent (Thursday, March 3, 1988) predated the publication of his book by weeks. According to the article, "the three part series of three dull thuds" was heard by everyone at the same time on Sunday morning at 2:45am. The police received calls from people worried about prowlers, but residents "discounted the possibility of a hoax being performed on a seemingly random number of houses. The

residents quickly either looked outside or physically inspected their property." To top it all, a UFO was also seen in the vicinity, and mentioned in the newspaper report.

Does this necessarily indicate that Strieber was telling the truth? It would help if some independent research was done to verify the Glenrock incident. I don't know of any except what was done by Ed Conroy on Strieber's behalf.

My opinion of Whitley Strieber's books is that whether or not he truly did undergo a strange experience in the 1980s, he has since let his astonishing imagination build on the standard abduction scenario using folklore as a source of inspiration. It is curious to see that whereas in *Communion and Transformation* Strieber made liberal comparisons between his contact with aliens and ancient tradition, he has subsequently downplayed any similarities in other books. I believe this has been one half of a strategy to distract readers from a blatantly obvious fact: that his enthusiasm for folklore and mythology predates his abduction claims. The second part of his strategy has been to claim that the fairy-like beings in his earlier novels were subconscious memories of alien visitors (actually the reverse could be more justifiably regarded as true).

It would be interesting to hear from anyone else who has experienced the 'nine knocks' phenomenon. In view of claims involving raps and thuds throughout history, any banging noises that manifest in threes whether they total nine or not could be relevant to this study.

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 12 Mar 2001 07:04:43 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 15:44:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:08:05 EST
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>>>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>>>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>>>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>>>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>>>1994, according to local media.

><snip>

>>This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does
>>not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous

>Hi, Gary, Scott:

>Unless these are just airplanes and helicopters flying over to
>check out the volcano's caldera. I'll bet it's a pretty sight.

According to the images captured around Mount Popocatepetl by
Jaime Maussan's crew of videographers, the white objects around
the volcanic smoke appear to be perfect spheres.

The images are quite clear on that.

These spheres either maintain static positions or sometimes move
about.

Smokey skies,

Bill Hamilton

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 12](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 17:14:13 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:04:16 +1300

>Hi Listpersons

>Having now viewed the AA CDs and read the Flatland articles. I
>have to say what a difference it makes when you can view the
>reels with "stop motion and "capture" various images.

William,

Thanks for looking...

>Tho I'm not equipped with any expertese to study the footage in
>a scientific manner. Using an objective, open frame of mind,
>plus ample time :-). I found myself seeing more and more details
>I hadn't seen before on the TV shows, or my own home recorded
>video of them.

>Having only had a cursory look so far, a couple of questions beg
>to be asked and perhaps Neil among others can help.

>1. In the AA the surgeon is often seen to write notes on a
>clipboard. When his actions are advanced slowly, there are times
>when you can get fairly clear views of the words written. Can
>the software that helped with the Ft Worth enlargements be
>utilised here to get some ideas of what these notes say

I've tried a couple of "tweaks" on that, but other than seeing a
clear number "6" I'm sorry to say there was very little else to see
other than the general layout of the text and hand written notes.

>2. Using the same techniques can the words following the
>"DANGER....." sign above and to the left of the phone be
>deciphered?

The sign says

```
DANGER
Maximum Working
Time 1 Hours
***** <- tiny line of print
```

The number 1 is a white letter on a black square, from the bad
grammar "1 hours" this would indicate it's a general purpose
sign where the number of hours could be changed.

I have an enhanced image illustrating this and can post it if
anyone would like to see it for themselves. Contact me directly.

Neil.

--
*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1 1
Univ of Manchester 0 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0 0
Manchester. 1 1
M13.9PL. UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011011110101011010/

Radio Callsign G8KOQ
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

* * * * *

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/12/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 10:49:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 03:51:33 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/12/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 12, 2001

**AVNER COHEN AND ISRAELI NUCLEAR SECRECY
**CIA DECLASSIFIES SOVIET ANALYSES

AVNER COHEN AND ISRAELI NUCLEAR SECRECY

Nuclear weapons are a sensitive topic the world over, nowhere more so than in the volatile Middle East. While there is room for debate about the proper limits of disclosure on nuclear matters, it seems clear that the Government of Israel has overreacted to the writings of Avner Cohen, an Israeli researcher who has specialized in the history of Israel's nuclear weapons program.

Cohen, lately a senior fellow at the National Security Archive in Washington, DC, is the author of the well-received book "Israel and the Bomb" (Columbia University Press, 1998), a political history of the Israeli nuclear program up to 1970.

For his efforts, says Cohen, he has been subjected to a campaign of intimidation at the hands of the office of the Chief of Security at the Israeli Ministry of Defense (MALMAB), a little-known but powerful security unit headed by Mr. Yehiel Horev. Upon his return to Israel, Cohen has been advised, it is possible that he could be arrested on unspecified charges.

Avner Cohen is not a whistleblower or even an opponent of Israel's nuclear program. His research is based entirely on open sources, including declassified documents and interviews with program participants.

As such, his story exemplifies the ongoing erosion of traditional secrecy worldwide, as well as the anxiety that this erosion provokes among those who would preserve the increasingly untenable status quo.

Today Cohen returns to Israel for the first time since 1998, to present the keynote speech to the annual meeting of the Israel Society for the History and Philosophy of Science on March 14. Interestingly, the respondent to his speech will be Yuval Ne'eman, who is the Israeli equivalent, roughly speaking, of Edward Teller, i.e., a nuclear pioneer on the political far right -- and a defender of Cohen's historical research.

"When all factual discourse regarding nuclear issues is simply not allowed publicly, citizens cannot have even a semblance of an informed discussion. And informed discussion is the essence of democracy," Cohen wrote in a March 8 letter to colleagues. "I am convinced that the time has come to update the unwritten contract that Israelis signed with nuclear secrecy some two generations ago." See his letter here:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2001/03/cohen.html>

Cohen's case was described in the Washington Post yesterday in

an article by Jonathan Broder here:

<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A50043-2001Mar10.html>

Cohen took exception to parts of Broder's account in a letter to the editor today:

<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A55512-2001Mar11.html>

CIA DECLASSIFIES SOVIET ANALYSES

The Central Intelligence Agency on Friday released hundreds of declassified reports totaling some 19,000 pages, reflecting CIA analysis of the Soviet Union from 1947 to 1991.

Depending on point of view, the release either demonstrated the Agency's commitment to declassification and scholarly research, or it was a rather cynical exercise in orchestrating public access to documents that were unilaterally selected, declassified and packaged by the Agency. Or some combination of the two.

At least a couple of the newly released documents are pertinent to larger issues of classification and declassification policy.

A partially declassified October 1991 report on "The Soviet Space Nuclear Power Program" shows the CIA's difficulty, even today, in moving beyond cold war secrecy. Remarkably, the heavily redacted report provides less information about Soviet space nuclear power programs than is available in the public domain. In fact, more unclassified information was publicly available even before the CIA report was written, following a 1991 technical conference on space nuclear power hosted by the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy in Obninsk, which also offered tours of space reactor development and test facilities. The aggressive censorship of the CIA report suggests either reflexive secrecy, bad faith or simple ignorance of the information publicly disclosed by the Russians.

Another declassified report on "US Stealth Programs and Technology: Soviet Exploitation of the Western Press" (1988) provides a rare assessment of the damage that may be caused by news media reports on national security matters, including "leaks" of classified information. While the Soviets did apparently benefit from the Western press, news reports on Stealth also included plenty of errors and "perpetuate[d] false rumors about Stealth technology," thereby "complicat[ing] the job faced by those Soviet analysts struggling to determine the capabilities of US Stealth systems." This is an important observation because it implies that prosecuting those who leak classified information to the press -- a measure supported by some in Congress -- could have the unintended effect of officially validating genuine leaks and distinguishing them from errors or fabrications.

A list of the CIA documents that were released last week is posted here:

http://www.foia.ucia.gov/net_princeton.htm

The text of the documents may be accessed, with some difficulty, by searching for the document title under "A Full Text Search" here:

<http://www.foia.ucia.gov/search2.htm>

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html>

Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: American White Pelicans - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:26:57 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 03:54:26 -0500
Subject: Re: American White Pelicans - Easton

Regarding:

>From: Jim Klotz <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 09:56:49 -0800
>Fwd Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 13:49:37 -0500
>Subject: American White Pelicans

Jim wrote:

>A while back when the 'Pelican Theory' for the 1947 Arnold
>sighting was being discussed on the list...

>As I see that American White Pelicans are again being discussed,
>I'm posting (with permission) the reply I received to my query.

Jim,

Thanks for the research contribution.

John Grettenberger wrote to you:

>In response to your question, it is unlikely, although not
>impossible, I suppose, that white pelicans would be found at
>that altitude over Mt. Rainier.

So long as it could be possible, that's all the confirmation we
would need, although this has of course been thoroughly verified
already.

>They are typically found on the east side and only rarely on the
>west side of Washington in very small numbers, and typically fly
>quite low.

Grettenberger seems unaware of the documented reference I have
just (coincidentally) provided, confirming it is known that
migrating White Pelicans are capable of flying over mountain
tops - see:

http://debunk.listbot.com/cgi-bin/subscriber?Act=view_message&list_id=debunk&msg_num=387&start_num=

I did realise that White Pelicans are much more common in
eastern Washington, particularly the Columbia river basin.

However, there are frequent sightings in western Washington, for
example, at 'Ocean Shores'.

The 'Grays Harbour Audobon Society' documents some of these on
their web site, at:

<http://www.ghas.org/sightings0899.html>

See also the recorded sightings referenced at:

<http://www.birdtreks.com/itin/wapn010808.html>

and

<http://www.birdware.com/lists/rba/us/wa/statewide/B0001069810.MS>

G.htm

I have always said that if Arnold came across a small formation of these enormous, gliding birds, it would have been an exceptional encounter. As I wrote in the 'Fortean Times' article:

"Sightings in the Cascade Mountains would be rare enough for Arnold to be unfamiliar with them; nevertheless they continue to be recorded in the vicinity as high altitude migrants".

One example I have long had on file is the following:

"A flock of fourteen overflew TRS 4 Aug 89 (D.Thrall, R.Belloir), headed slowly northward several thousand feet above the station. This may represent the only record for the Western Cascades away from reservoirs in e. Jackson Co. in recent years."

This report can be confirmed at:

<http://www.orst.edu/pubs/birds/county/doug/dlrd/nopass.htm>

Bear in mind that recorded sightings may only be a small percentage of the actual activity, especially if the birds were at extreme altitude. They also migrate at night and on the CompuServe 'birding' forum, Ann Johnson commented how she could, "attest to the reflectiveness", explaining, "When we were in South Texas last spring, a small flock was migrating after dark. The gleam in the moonlight was most evident".

Bottom line; White Pelicans do migrate both east and west of the Cascades, have been recorded at "several thousand feet" on the western side and it's documented they are able to fly over mountains.

I see that Ann Johnson's remarks are dated November 1997. During my three year's plus research, in addition to discussing the evidence with Pacific North-west ornithologists, I have sought the advice of experts concerning a number of aspects. When that extensive research and the references had been triple-checked, then I went back to those with relevant expertise and the Pacific North-west ornithologists and even the 'Pacific North-west Skeptics'. I asked... is there anything here which your specialised/local knowledge indicates might be a factual error or oversight, etc.

Aside from whatever conclusions anyone reaches about the evidence, that factual research should be watertight.

I certainly wouldn't have missed such a fundamental problem that our prime 'UFO' candidates would not actually be found in the vicinity!!! Neither would any of the local ornithologists I spoke with, or any of those who subscribed to local 'birders' forums where this was discussed.

>A more likely species is the snow goose, which is also a large
>white bird with black wingtips. They are frequently reported in
>flocks at 5,000 to 10,000 ft. and have been observed by pilots
>infrequently to 12,000 ft., even 20,000 ft. on one occasion.

Appreciating you kept enquiries to a minimum, if Grettenberger had been provided with more information, it's almost certain he would not have concluded that Snow Geese seemed more likely.

On the basis of the available data and his own understandings, then fine... his conclusion is sound. Indeed, it was Arnold himself who, at first, thought the objects were Snow Geese.

However, if Grettenberger is made aware of the flight characteristics which Arnold reported, I'm sure he will then understand our proverbial full picture.

I don't know what specific experience Grettenberger has regarding White Pelicans, however, I did know someone who was familiar with this species - Peter Kingsmill, Director General of The Redberry Pelican Project (Canada) Foundation.

When several Pacific North-west ornithologists told me, individually, that they recognised what Arnold was possibly describing, I contacted Peter Kingsmill.

Explaining the nature of this 'unusual' enquiry and what had been deduced, I asked if he could please offer an informed judgement.

As published in the 'Fortean Times' article, he responded:

"Everything in Arnold's description [...] points to the strong possibility he saw a flock of American White Pelicans, the formation, the allusion to the tail of a Chinese kite, etc. I have also been baffled by optical illusions of distance when these birds are against a backdrop of hills."

It wasn't mentioned in the article that he added, "Incidentally, your contact from the Pacific Northwest has made a pretty accurate assessment".

When I later summarised the research conclusions, I again contacted Peter Kingsmill.

He wrote, "VERY interesting stuff, which I feel very possible (unexaggerated)".

Could John Grettenberger please be informed about the overall context, either by forwarding a copy of this response or the actual article which was published. A transcript is on my web site, at:

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/saucers.htm>

His comments now, when armed with all the facts, would be of great interest.

Could these please be requested?

Does he still maintain the premise is unlikely, or will he alter his opinion and if so, why?. Perhaps, once he appreciates the entire perspective, he can even offer some informative insight.

Jim, your own comments would also of course be welcome.

Has this clarified at least these issues for you?

James Easton.

E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

This message was sent by Easymail - <http://www.easynet.co.uk/>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 13:37:07 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 03:56:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 21:48:14 -0000

>At:

>www.hullufosociety.moonfruit.com

>Larry poses 21 "questions" to Georgina. I used the quote marks,
>because some of them are repetitions, vitriolic comments, or
>direct refutations of what she wrote.

Good Morning all -

I looked at the page as well and have to agree that it was certainly repetitious and that many of the comments were over the top. I found Warren's claim that Georgina Bruni didn't understand the weapons of his unit funny. He mentioned that they didn't carry the M-16 which chambered the NATO round of 7.6. Actually, the NATO standard was 7.62 mm or about .30 caliber which is unimportant here because the M-16 is 5.56 mm or about .223 caliber. And the M-60 is not considered a "heavy" machine gun. Anyway, in this nitpicking world, I thought that before Warren picked the nits, he should get the nits right.

KRandle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:40:24 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:01:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:47:37 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Magonia Supplement no.34

>RENDLESHAM REMEMBERED

>Kevin McClure

>I've always been rather embarrassed about the Rendlesham case.
>Way back in 1981 I'd not long since become an accredited UFOIN
>investigator (mostly on the strength of my 'Egryn Lights'
>research), and, insofar as investigation can be conducted over
>the telephone, I was the first person to start to put together
>the facts concerning the reports about Rendlesham. Because I
>made such a dog's breakfast of the task (particularly in losing
>my notes, and not even writing them up properly before I lost
>them), I've never bothered to read much about the case, knowing
>that the greater part of what I was reading seemed to have been
>spun together since the events, and did not represent the facts
>of what had happened as they were conveyed to me.

>However, I never expected my role in the case, known only to a
>few others as far as I'm aware, to be played by one 'Bob
>Easton'. This, however, is what has happened in the strange new
>book by Georgina Bruni, You Can't Tell The People - The
>Definitive Account of the Rendlesham Forest UFO Mystery.

<snip>

>The sequence of events was pretty much as Bruni sets it out in
>her chapter 'The Early Years'. Because, living in
>Leicestershire, I was apparently the nearest UFOIN investigator
>to the case, Jenny Randles asked me to call Paul Begg (a contact
>which I maintained because he was an interesting and perceptive
>chap and a very thorough researcher and which, incidentally, led
>to him making a rare personal appearance at an ASSAP event which
>I organised the following year). From Paul I gained some idea of
>what was said to have happened, and he gave me a number for
>'David Potts'.

>For what it's worth, I suspect that the huge majority of
>explanations for Rendlesham, whether sceptical or belief-based,
>result from incorrect conclusions as to fact, and are
>irrevocably tainted by individual beliefs and preconceptions.
>Consequently, I tend to reject almost all of what Bruni has
>written, but I can at least be quite sure that 'Bob Easton' did
>not do what she says he did, and that this is not the
>"definitive account" that it purports to be. If Bruni had wanted
>to establish the facts about the early investigation of
>Rendlesham, she should either have found me and asked what I
>knew - which I'd have been happy to tell her - or have
>acknowledged that she didn't know who was involved at that
>stage. That she has, instead, attributed my actions to the
>mysterious 'Bob Easton' suggests that she preferred not to
>approach me, and created an unacknowledged fiction instead. Just
>what else about this book is not "definitive" remains to be
>seen.

At least now I know why it was not possible to find Bob Easton, if that was a pseudonym. This was the name given in Skycrash and the name eventually referred to by Jenny Randles. I did manage to find the real Steve Roberts, who claimed to be a witness. But quite frankly, Bob Easton was not that important considering he had not done much research, as Kevin now admits to. The only information I had to go on was from Skycrash, Street, Butler and Randles and Randles wasn't giving much away.

You need to ask yourself why your real name was not used by those who were supposedly working with you.

To dismiss the book because you were not named, is just a nonsense, but that's what I'd expect from Magonia.

Georgina Bruni

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:40:28 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:04:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

>From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 21:48:14 -0000

>Larry poses 21 "questions" to Georgina. I used the quote marks,
>because some of them are repetitions, vitriolic comments, or
>direct refutations of what she wrote.

>Only 10 of the 21 questions relate directly to the book, the
>other 11 are criticisms of her honesty, repetitions, etc.

>I certainly recommend visiting the site, even with the annoying
>Macro-don't-needya stuff (it is really slow to load the page)
>It will be interesting to see the response (if any) from
>Georgina - it certainly looks like she ought to respond to
>defend her position.

Hi Joe

I am happy to respond publicly to these questions. However,
I have written the following to the person responsible for the
Hull site and for publicly posting this letter:

Sean

Larry will be receiving a private reply to his public letter in
due time. Meanwhile, I suggest you do not publish this libellous
letter and contact Larry immediately concerning the following
statement, which is extremely libellous.

'To all that have read this, I'm not the sort that likes to put
people on the spot, nor do I like to be perceived as a bully. Ms.
Bruni has chosen to include information in her book that she
knows is false, she also spun statements about me to fit her
agenda, never in 20 years has anyone done this, (Not even the
debunkers!) I wanted to take legal action but reminded myself
that the many thousands of intelligent people the world over,
who have read my book, will find the problems that I have with
Ms. Bruni's book to be self evident. Read her book by all means,
but you won't find anything to be "Definitive" or with regard to
Larry Warren, "True" at all,

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: UFO Flies Over Oxkutzcab, Yucatán

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:05:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:06:25 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Flies Over Oxkutzcab, Yucatán

SOURCE: Diario de Yucatan (Merida)
DATE: Friday, March 9, 2001

UFO FLIES OVER OXKUTZCAB

OXKUTZCAB, March 8-- In a case similar to one which occurred less than a month ago, hundreds of residents of Oxkutzcab witnessed last night the maneuvers of a strange luminous object that flew over the city for some 40 minutes.

The unidentified flying object was observed at around 9 o'clock at night. Its appearance caused a variety of reactions among the townspeople, many of whom screamed in excitement.

It was the shouts and cries of these individuals which caused other residents to step out of their homes to see the UFO. Some even climbed on their rooftops. Although some persons pointed out that it could be a kite, the majority agrees that it wasn't, due to the object's movements and the light issuing from it.

Furthermore, at the time in which the luminous object flew over the city, there was no wind whatsoever and no explanation could be found for its changing lights. It was first seen in the North, then later in the West, and finally in the center of the town. The sighting had a duration of 40 minutes.

On February 3 of this year, as we reported, two brothers of this city were on their way to the town of Maní when they saw a UFO.

####

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Ing. David A. Triay Lucatero

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

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:49:44 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:09:00 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 02:00:36 EST
>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>The so called Antartica Ozone hole, and the one at the North
>Pole was discovered in 1958 by the US Navy. The flux of the
>Ozone hole opening big, closing etc has been monitored ever
>since then.
>...

Robert,

Do you have any reference to this 1958 discovery by the Navy,
which you could disclose to us? Or is this date not a typo?
Scientists didn't become aware of the problem until the 1970s.

And, there's as yet no ozone hole over the Arctic, just a
thinning in recent years.

Jim Deardorff

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Serious Research

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:20:27 -0500
Subject: Serious Research

I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online "council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in serious research) working together to resolve the controversy. We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how a Council could work in practical terms.

Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well that it all comes down to individual cases and their investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be the focus. I reject outright the idea that the truth or falsity of UFO reality can be divined by deduction from scientific theory and generalizations about human perception.

Given that we may fizzle out and get nowhere, I still think it is worth a try to have some serious, scientific dialogue in which we debate and discuss the factual evidence and whether or not it points (a) to an unexplained phenomenon and (b) to a nonearthly origin. Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and proponents be asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to focus on. Then all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the nominated cases.

Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air Balloonism, which has amounted more to constant restating of scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission of where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

James Easton's latest posting about pelicans sounded well researched and reasonable and had relevant information to offer, but how definitive is it? Bruce Maccabee already has disputed some of Easton's statements with some equally relevant considerations. Anyway, let's leave Arnold out of this since none of us considers it to be among the strongest evidential cases.

I still believe a case study effort is worth a try, if for no other reason than to expose the pro and con reasoning to general scrutiny. Something combining a "debate" format and a "jury" judgment might prove to be interesting. I am willing to nominate cases and to debate their merits.

Dick Hall

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 22:01:19 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:42:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 23:46:39 -0000

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:09:17 -0000

Hi Dick,

You wrote:

>Fortean Times and Bob Rickard, whom I actually used to know in
>person, face-to-face (nice, humorous fellow) are notoriously
>anti-UFO.

>Their "coverage" of the topic proceeds from an extremely slanted
>and negative bias.

So anti-UFO and slanted in their coverage that Fortean Times organised two UFO-orientated un conventions in the mid-90s, attended by such luminaries at Budd Hopkins, Phil Klass, Dennis Stacy and even the esteemed Jerome Clark, I believe. A mixture of opposing viewpoints which one is unlikely to find at any ufological revival meeting on the other side of the Atlantic, I'll wager.

So slanted and anti-UFO that they managed to produce one of the finest part-contributed works on the subject of the 90s (UFO 1947-97, edited by Evans and Stacy), which contained an article 'Bridging 50 years of UFO history' by one Richard Hall, can't think who he may be!

I think you should replace "negative" with "objective" - an adjective one does not associate with the credulous nonsense which fills so many so-called journals of ufological record.

>I would be delighted to debate him on the subject in the pages
>of FT.

I look forward to it. While I'm sure Bob would never describe himself as an expert on matters strictly ufological, that's no bad thing. What this subject needs are people with knowledge of other traditions of belief, who can see outside the blinkered, hermetically sealed world which ufology has become.

The lack of even basic acquaintance with other systems of supernatural belief was displayed on this list only recently, when someone who will remain nameless dismissed the study of fairy traditions as a joke - while at the same time expecting us to accept stories of time-travelling aliens dropping in on a USAF base as a serious theory!

Give me fairy stories any day!

Best

Dave Clarke

"...The Skeptick doth neither affirm, neither denie any
position: but doubteth of it." --- Sir Walter Raleigh.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 22:01:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:44:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 19:05:12 -0000

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 14:09:17 -0000

>>Has the Hierophant been reading my postings on UFO UpDates?

Hi Georgina, so I guess we're talking again?

>I hate to bruise your ego old chap, but I think it's probably
>the press releases that have captured their imagination. It's
>called PR!

I've got to hand it to you - no one can beat you on PR spin!

>Nothing like a bit of controversy to get the sceptic journals
>talking, and our dear Hierophant knows not to upset the Hot
>Gossip Editor in Chief too much, or I might just reveal
>>true identity!

Go on - reveal it, I'm sure no one on this list will tell!

Best wishes

Dave Clarke

"...The Skeptick doth neither affirm, neither denie any
position: but doubteth of it." --- Sir Walter Raleigh.

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:52:45 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:51:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>Hello Everyone,

>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims involves the
>sound of nine knocks in three series of three. Strieber
>associates the sounds he heard in 1986 with his own abductions
>and presents several cases in which the nine knocks form part of
>other people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough and
>The Communion Letters).

<snip>

Chris,

Excellent post! I've always wondered if there were any folkloric parallels re. the "nine knocks," and it's most interesting to find that there are.

Strieber is a difficult case for readers who have followed his works critically. There are numerous strange, subtle discrepancies in his testimony that suggest that some of his experiences have been heavily tainted by confabulation or his own understandable eagerness to interpret the phenomenon.

For example, he now remembers that his original 1985 abduction involved a (deceased) friend who worked in an intelligence capacity for the government. What are we to make of this? According to Strieber, the material was simply too strange to report in "Communion."

Beginning with "The Secret School," Strieber's claims became more difficult for me to accept literally. And my own correspondence with him re. "The Key" was nothing less than disillusioning.

That said, I would be surprised if Strieber's "visitor" experiences turned out to be pure fiction. I'm convinced something extremely puzzling indeed happened to him. He's one of those people I'd love to sit down and talk with.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:53:35 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:04:16 +1300

Previously, William asked:

>>1. In the AA the surgeon is often seen to write notes on a
>>clipboard. When his actions are advanced slowly, there are times
>>when you can get fairly clear views of the words written. Can
>>the software that helped with the Ft Worth enlargements be
>>utilised here to get some ideas of what these notes say

>>2. Using the same techniques can the words following the
>>"DANGER....." sign above and to the left of the phone be
>>deciphered?

Neil replied:

>The sign says

> DANGER
> Maximum Working
> Time 1 Hours

Hi, Neil!

At the risk of seeming more nit picky than I usually am, doesn't this seem a little out of place? I mean, in the past it has been your position that none of the situations in AA were "ideal"; that this was all a very hurried and spontaneous event. Given that context, don't you find it odd that they not only had the contamination suits at the ready, but also had a room complete with a warning sign about how long they were safe to be in there?

If this were the first AA then how would they know? And if the sign didn't apply to them, then what was it meant for? Also, according to the clock, do the doctors stay in there more than an hour? If they do, then it would seem that rules and regulations aren't as severe as some suggest. On the other hand, if they only stay an hour, then that would indicate they had prior knowledge of how much exposure to an alien corpse was considered "safe".

Does any of this seem odd to you?

Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than

anything on disc. I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and grab frames for work in Photoshop.

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:14:41 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:54:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Deardorff

>From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami@prodigy.net>
>To: UFO UpDates <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Wendelle C. Stevens?
>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 13:45:05 -0600

>Need Help!!!

>I need to get in touch with Col. Wendell C. Stevens. Does anyone
>know his e-mail, address or phone number?

Hi Virgilio,

Has someone already sent you this information? I've been away
for a week and am now just trying to catch up on e-mail.

Jim

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Losthaven Updated

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 02:20:26 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:04:15 -0500
Subject: Losthaven Updated

Dear Colleagues,

Just to inform you that I have added three new articles to my site, which can be found at the following.

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/StarKids.html>

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/HybridPuzzle.html>

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/AncientVisitors.html>

Please remember if you write anything on the UFO subject, and would like it to be seen by many people around the UK & World, then drop me a line: royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk with UFO article in the subject header.

Best Regards,

Roy Hale

Editor Down To Earth Magazine on the Net

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:09:41 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:09:48 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

>>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:04:16 +1300

>>Hi Listpersons

>>Having now viewed the AA CDs and read the Flatland articles. I
>>have to say what a difference it makes when you can view the
>>reels with "stop motion and "capture" various images.

>William,

>Thanks for looking...

>>Tho I'm not equipped with any expertese to study the footage in
>>a scientific manner. Using an objective, open frame of mind,
>>plus ample time :-). I found myself seeing more and more details
>>I hadn't seen before on the TV shows, or my own home recorded
>>video of them.

>>Having only had a cursory look so far, a couple of questions beg
>>to be asked and perhaps Neil among others can help.

>>1. In the AA the surgeon is often seen to write notes on a
>>clipboard. When his actions are advanced slowly, there are times
>>when you can get fairly clear views of the words written. Can
>>the software that helped with the Ft Worth enlargements be
>>utilised here to get some ideas of what these notes say

>I've tried a couple of "tweaks" on that, but other than seeing a
>clear number "6" I'm sorry to say there was very little else to see
>other than the general layout of the text and hand written notes.

>>2. Using the same techniques can the words following the
>>"DANGER....." sign above and to the left of the phone be
>>deciphered?
>The sign says

```
> DANGER
>Maximum Working
>Time 1 Hours
> ***** <- tiny line of print
```

>The number 1 is a white letter on a black square, from the bad
>grammer "1 hours" this would indicate it's a general purpose
>sign where the number of hours could be changed.

>I have an enhanced image illustrating this and can post it if
>anyone would like to see it for themselves. Contact me directly.

Hi Neil, plus "wondering" William, "galloping" Ed Gehrman, and

all other Listerions,

Note: No pun, nothing but fun meant in the above or below.
Brits, I like my humor wet with no ice or lemon.

Neil, I see you state above that computer programmers "DO IT with BITS of BYTES". You are a computer programmer. I've never written program. I am the kind of guy who prefers to DO IT using my girlfriend's special software to download my stored genetic memory through my HARD DRIVE into her lovely ZIP DRIVE. -Of course we can't make floppies any more and we are glad they are grown and gone. Now it is just us and a cable that keeps us together.

My work is in music recording engineering, music production, and artist management. I work with a different medium so I know nothing about what I will first ask you below.

I appreciate you providing an enhanced image, especially of the clipboard. Thanks for "tweaking it". I wonder to what extent you tweaked it? What software, etc.? If we could get a better "tweaking" perhaps it would help define whether the person was writing autopsy notes or something like: Call after film shoot - Ray Santilli - Will Volker pay for extra scenes? If I remember correctly there were several people on the list who had "tweaked" the Ramey message. I wonder if there is any software or technique that could bring more out?

William, a recent post of yours caused me to wonder something and become "wondering" Josh. I don't know when you folks first became interested in the alleged AA autopsy. Until this thread started I hadn't given much thought to it for a while because for some time things had reached a standstill until some new and proven evidence would perhaps appear. Shortly after the AA film was shown in London for the first time I was able through MUFON to look at a video of all the scenes, long before it was sold as a home video. I remember when Bob Shell first got involved and I remember it making the rounds of film directors and special effects people, including some of the best in effects, Stan Winston and Dennis Muren (sic). It also made the rounds of some forensic pathologists, including the noted Cyril Wecht. I know there have been others who have looked at it since then. Recently there was a post regarding the texture of the facial structure and it caused me to wonder something else.

Neil, I'm wondering if with your new evidence you are trying to get the opinions of any experts in their fields? I've seen the attempts of you and Roger to get to the point of him seeing the CD. There are many other, more noted filmmakers than Roger (sorry Rog). Have you consulted any of them? Special effects, forensic pathologists, or whatever people are needed to evaluate your new evidence? I would rather read that on the list than jawbone speculations.

Speaking for myself, I don't have the ability to analyze it and at this point I won't spend anything on the AA Autopsy for entertainment (I've still got my VHS tapes). If I see an expert evaluation of your evidence, not just an opinion here and there, I may think twice about getting the CD. If I see a professional evaluation by experts in the areas of your evidence that may validate all this I won't think twice about getting the CD. If I know beforehand that it factually advances this case to final resolution, you've got an order.

Tweak tweak,

"wondering" Josh

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: American White Pelicans - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 20:24:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:14:57 -0500
Subject: Re: American White Pelicans - McCoy

Hello all, Jim and Pelicanists whoever you are.

>From: Jim Klotz <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>
>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: American White Pelicans
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 09:56:49 -0800

I have had a bad day at work so I hope it doesn't carry through.

>Dear List members,

>A while back when the 'Pelican Theory' for the 1947 Arnold
>sighting was being discussed on the list, I looked at the web
>sites cited re Pelican behavior, and also searched a bit on my
>own. When I didn't find very much that directly spoke to the
>issues in question, I decided to pose a question directly to the
>US Forest and Wildlife Service here in Washington State (where I
>live). As I see that American White Pelicans are again being
>discussed, I'm posting (with permission) the reply I received to
>my query.

Bravo! Jim, however it won't do one bit of good, to the
Pelicanists out there.

>Please be aware that the western and eastern parts of Washington
>State, divided by the Cascade Mountains, have many differences,
>including amount of rainfall, temperatures, type and amount of
>foliage, population, etc.

>Also please note that I am not taking a position on this, just
>making this available.

>- Jim Klotz

Yes, but you have people with actual experience and
even degrees in Science who are about to, dispute
Pelicanist theroy.

>= = = = begin included messages = = = =
>[my first message to USFWS:]

>I've been looking at many web pages including USFWS pages
>looking for specific information about American White Pelicans
>in Washington State... populations, migratory habits and routes,
>flying behavior, etc.

>Specifically how likely would it be for a pilot to see a flock
>of these birds at 10,000 feet very near Mount Rainier.

>Can't seem to find the specific info I need.

>Thanks, Jim Klotz

>= = = = = = = =

>In response to your question, it is unlikely, although not
>impossible, I suppose, that white pelicans would be found at

Unlikely in the early summer if not year 'round.

>that altitude over Mt. Rainier. They are typically found on
>the east side and only rarely on the west side of Washington in
>very small numbers, and typically fly quite low. A more likely
>species is the snow goose, which is also a large white bird with
>black wingtips. They are frequently reported in flocks at 5,000
>to 10,000 ft. and have been observed by pilots infrequently to
>12,000 ft., even 20,000 ft. on one occasion.

Snow Geese, are marathon flyers, like Canada Geese, and they
migrate not -in late June.

>John Grettenberger
>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
>Endangered Species Division
>Consultation and Technical
> Assistance Branch
>= = = = =

>John,

<snip>

>Do I have permission to post your reply to an email list whose
>members have an interest in this information?

>Jim,

>I certainly think so. You can post my reply. The reference I was
>looking at was Bellrose's "Ducks, Geese and Swans of North
>America" dated 1976, so there is probably even better
>documentation now. I didn't ask the date of the sighting, but
>spring and fall would be the likely time to see snow geese at
>that location. They are not present here in the summer. I also

"they are not present here in the summer'-(late june?) gee, this
sounds familiar.

>was just looking at reports of white pelicans west of the
>Cascades and almost all are of one or two individuals, so I
>think white pelicans are highly unlikely.

Gee, an expert, how about that.

>John Grettenberger
>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
>Endangered Species Division
>Consultation and Technical
> Assistance Branch
>510 Desmond Dr. SE, Suite 102
>Lacey, WA 98503
>
>(360) 753-6044
>FAX (360) 753-9518

Okay, as much as I didn't want to put my webbed Oregon duck foot
in this battle over the Holy Pelican grail, again and state the
things that I have said, before, the AWP argument is well, just
that, an argument. Sometime I feel like my tale is; "One told by
an idiot , full of sound and fury,signifying
nothing''-Shakespeare .

Mr, Grettenberger was accurate, now there could be flocking
Pelicans in late june, they are not birds that well, fly high
and tend to be (as I have pointed out earlier) bird that follow
streams, or lakes.

Snow Geese are migratory waterfowl that are among the earliest
migrators, Late June over the area of MT, Rainier- unlikely.

Oh, in a previous post, Mr. Easton had a link to a photo of Two
WW2 Bombers (The B-17 nine-0-nine and the B-24 All American).
Neither of the two aircraft were WW2 vets, the B-24 was an ex-
Indian Airforce Bomber used (and good use for a B-24) as a long
range Patrol Bomber. The B-17 is an PBJ-a B-17 air rescue patrol
plane (and later a Fire Bomber.) of interest it the photo was
taken oh about ,75 miles closer than Arnold was. How about that?

Re: American White Pelicans - McCoy

this is a goodly change in Perspective.

Answers anyone?

GT McCoy
Drooling Idiot

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes' -

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 23:28:03 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:17:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01 - No 'Tubes' -

>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 22:49:12 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Cydonian Imperative - 3-11-01
>To: UFO UpDates <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>Martian "Tubes" Go Down The... You Know What
>by Mac Tonnies

><http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

>After perusing a great deal of high-resolution MGS data and
>looking at Richard Hoagland's proposed "tubes" in a geological
>context (rather than the isolated image currently featured on
>this site), I've "defected" to JPL's interpretation that these
>are natural formations, and no longer consider them in the
>running as potential artifacts. Their sheer meandering profusion
>on the Martian landscape detracts from a functional/artificial
>interpretation.

Hi Mac!

Sand dunes are not permanent features. Further images of Richard Hoagland's so called glass tunnel, tube or worm on Mars taken with the Mars Global Surveyor (or a future spacecraft) will tell us if the ribbed patterns within the tube change with time or not. The different viewing and solar illumination angles in these later images should also allow us get a better feel for what we are really looking at and to determine if the alleged reflection off a suspected sphere within the tunnel is anything other than just a bright surface feature such as a crater. Until then we only have opinions.

Arthur Clarke stated in a recent interview that he was fairly convinced that we have discovered life on Mars and that some incredible photographs taken with our spacecraft presented convincing evidence for the existence of large forms of life on this other world. I agree with Arthur Clarke and I suspect so would Carl Sagan who postulated that these "macrobes" could be spotted from Mars orbiting spacecraft. Carl Sagan even suggested that some of these may even resemble bushes. It is interesting that the opening sentence in a June 2000 'Spaceflight Now' news story about some very unusual surface images of Mars stated "They look like bushes!".

<http://spaceflightnow.com/news/n0006/04mgsdunes/>

Although this article also stated that the Mars Global Surveyor has been used over the past few months to monitor these bush-looking spots as they form and evolve on the Martian polar dunes, no such actual evidence was provided. I would like to see this evidence from Malin Space Science Systems which shows that these spots are indeed seasonal phenomena and are not present year round as real bushes would be.

Nick Balaskas

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:21:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>Hello Everyone,

>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims involves the
>sound of nine knocks in three series of three. Strieber
>associates the sounds he heard in 1986 with his own abductions
>and presents several cases in which the nine knocks form part of
>other people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough and
>The Communion Letters).

<snip>

>It would be interesting to hear from anyone else who has
>experienced the 'nine knocks' phenomenon. In view of claims
>involving raps and thuds throughout history, any banging noises
>that manifest in threes ð whether they total nine or not ð could
>be relevant to this study.

Hi Chris,

If I were to mention the detail I'm going to share on an
"Abductee List" hands would fly up. Here I'm afraid, I'm just
going to sound like a nutcase. So be it. After reporting that
I've been abducted by "aliens" from time to time throughout my
life, stuff like this detail is Mickey Mouse in comparison.
<LOL>Damn the torpedoes.

I want to preface this note by saying that I don't think much of
Whitley Streiber or his books. Mr. Strieber is just too
inconsistent for my liking and seems to report/reveal
'phenomena' when it suits the plot of the book he is currently
writing. "The Secret School" is an example of what I'm talking
about. That said,...

I haven't heard "knocks." What myself and my wife have both
heard over the years (on rare occasion but consistently) is a
series of "beeps." Electronic sounding beeps that play in three
groups of three beeps each. Nine total. Then it stops for
awhile, and the cycle of beeps will play again. It can go on for
as long as an hour or better sometimes.

We have gone nuts some times going from room to room in the
house looking for the source of this 'beeping.' No matter which
room you are standing in, the "beeps" sound like they are
emanating from that room. We don't own any digital watches so we
know that watches aren't the cause. (It sounds like the beeping
of an electronic watch.)

And, it doesn't matter 'where' we live either. The beeps have
followed us in our three moves in the 32 years we have been
married. The "beeps" are a private running joke between my wife
and myself. I had no idea that they may be "abduction related"
until I started talking to other abductees.

I have received letters from people reporting the exact same phenomena, and we have had extended discussions about this 'beeping' business on the AIC e-mail List as well as at a group I attended four or five years ago at Budd's house. I _have_ heard of this before but not with 'knocks.' Isn't that odd? The reports I have, (and that I have experienced myself) involve electronic sounding beeps. Not "knocks." Maybe the "aliens" have upgraded their hardware! <VBG>Hope this 'helps' somehow although I can't imagine how. *I know I owe you an e-mail! I haven't forgotten you. Been busy. ;)

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:14:26 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:23:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

>Date: 12 Mar 2001 07:04:43 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:08:05 EST
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl@juno.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>>>>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>>>>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>>>>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>>>>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>>>>1994, according to local media.

>><snip>

>>>This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does
>>>not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous

>>Hi, Gary, Scott:

>>Unless these are just airplanes and helicopters flying over to
>>check out the volcano's caldera. I'll bet it's a pretty sight.

>According to the images captured around Mount Popocatepetl by
>Jaime Maussan's crew of videographers, the white objects around
>the volcanic smoke appear to be perfect spheres.

>The images are quite clear on that.

>These spheres either maintain static positions or sometimes move
>about.

Hi Bill,

Gee Bill, you couldn't possibly mean those same 'spheres' that
so many folks have been recording on video and photos for years
and trying to tell others about would you? ;)

I don't know how many of these reports it's going to take before
some experts decide to take a look at all the taped and
photographic evidence that has accumulated. Beginning with Jaime
Maussan's material, and hopefully to include the hours of stuff
that guys like Tom King has captured over his native Arizona
skies and the all the footage that I and others have gotten of
white or sometimes silvery 'spheres' and discs flitting about in

the skies over New York. These 'things' whatever they are, are not party or weather balloons. Their movements are unique and the maneuvers are oft times quite startling. You yourself can testify to that. You've seen and recorded the same things.

Nobody cares or ever listens Bill. I used to report every time I got shots or video of them. Nobody ever bothered to even take a look. Much less conduct an in depth analysis on them. It's the complete apathy that caused me to stop reporting my sightings formally. If just one more person (who hasn't seen what is being captured on tape) dares to tell me that I'm looking at party or weather balloons I'm going to lose it. So, I've opted to just keep my mouth shut. I figure sooner or later some of these armchair analysts are finally going to go out and look up and when they begin to see what is tooling around up there, then we'll all kick back and have a good talk about what we're going to do to find out what the hell is going on.

You've seen the response this thread has gotten. What does that tell you my friend? ;)

Regards,

John Velez, Just another whacko with reams of "sphere" and "disc" video that has never been properly analyzed.

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive

From: **Rooyce J. Myers III** <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:32:25 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 05:32:30 -0500
Subject: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

EXCLUSIVE

ROSWELL REVELATION?
Website Claims To have Evidence In Roswell Crash
Will This Be The Smoking Gun Or A Smoldering Dud?

UFOWATCHDOG.COM presents an exclusive interview with UFO X Files
about its claim of having material from the Roswell UFO crash.
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/roswellex.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 02:54:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:48:12 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

Hi Mac, hi All,

This is a copy of a note I wrote to Mac Tonnies about the JPL geologist dismissal of the "tubes" as an optical illusion.

>Martian "Tubes" Go Down The...You Know What
>by Mac Tonnies

Hiya Mac,

(Personal note in response to a comment that Mac made.)

Yeah, but I still see a tube! I have tried and tried to see it as a flat scene, but hard as I try Mac I can't. The freakin things look tubular. Of course I bow to the experts, but I remain unconvinced by their argument that the shapes I'm looking at are an optical illusion.

I suppose that you have learned the trick of seeing the flat terrain. It's got me stumped Mac. The second my eyes or my brain allow me to see it as a flat space I'll join you. You have my word on it. Until then, it's 'tube city' as far as I'm concerned. I'm not alone. Many others see the shapes too. Numbers don't make us right, but 1 geologist's opinion doesn't make us wrong either. ;)

(These Mars photos must be like those 3D line drawings of a hollow cube. One second it's facing one way, then facing the opposite direction in the next.)

I'm sure the geology experts will be proven right. I just can't "see it" as flat terrain right now.

*JPL geologist or not, that's where I stand with this. I don't think we should put this to sleep because one guy from JPL chimed in. I'd like to hear some more opinions before I'm ready to sweep this one under the rug. Someone with equally impressive credentials may disagree! Quien sabe? (Who knows?)

Ghod, I am getting like Hoagland! I argued against the Face and all the myriad Mars anomalies that have been breeding like cockroaches for the last five years, and here I am arguing for a tunnel on Mars! Somebody shoot me now please! <LOL>

John "I got tunnel vision" Velez,

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:50:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Hello Everyone,

>>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims
>>involves the sound of nine knocks in three series
>>of three. Strieber associates the sounds he heard
>>in 1986 with his own abductions and presents several
>>cases in which the nine knocks form part of other
>>people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough
>>The Communion Letters).

><snip>

>Hi Chris,

>If I were to mention the detail I'm going to share
>on an "Abductee List" hands would fly up. Here I'm
>afraid, I'm just going to sound like a nutcase. So be
>it. After reporting that I've been abducted by
>"aliens" from time to time throughout my life, stuff
>like this detail is Mickey Mouse in comparison.
><LOL>Damn the torpedoes.

>Regards,

>John Velez

Hi John,

I found your personal account of the 'nine beeps' fascinating.

If this has been going on for centuries we would expect early experiencers to have reported not beeps but other sounds they were familiar with. The chirping or hooting of birds, for example. The key would seem to be that the nature of the sound heard must be identifiable by the experiencer. If the abduction phenomenon is real and truly includes this 'nine-noise' feature it would be logical to expect electronic beeps today instead of wilderness or knocking sounds. Indeed, the CEIII/IV experience has evolved externally from one involving nature spirits (fairies, etc.) to technologically advanced aliens. Your remark that "Maybe the 'aliens' have upgraded their hardware!" would actually be a good theory in this sense.

All this would imply that the sounds have a function, like a signal to the brain following a session of hypnosis. You would not necessarily be aware of any physical or psychological change after or during a signal of this kind, and it would not necessarily mean an abduction would be about to take place. Any

change or activity in the brain could be entirely internal with no external signs.

Anyway, this is all just speculation based on the theory that abductions are real. As you know, I do not want to come to any personal conclusions about the UFO question yet and am focusing my attention purely on the historical aspects of the reports.

What interests me right now is whether it can be demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds' phenomenon were published in the UFO literature prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find evidence of it?".)

Best regards,

Chris Aubeck

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Sanchez-Ocejo

From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami@prodigy.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:44:46 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:52:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Wendelle C. Stevens? - Sanchez-Ocejo

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:14:41 -0800
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: Wendelle C. Stevens?

>>From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <ufomiami@prodigy.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Wendelle C. Stevens?
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 13:45:05 -0600

>>Need Help!!!

>>I need to get in touch with Col. Wendell C. Stevens. Does anyone
>>know his e-mail, address or phone number?

>Hi Virgilio,

>>Has someone already sent you this information? I've been away
>for a week and am now just trying to catch up on e-mail.

Yes, thanks to all!

Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo

Miami UFO Center (Español) <http://ufomiami.nodos.com>
Miami UFO Reporter (English) <http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Corridor/1341/index.html>
CHUPACABRAS (Español) <http://ufomiami.homestead.com/index.html>
CHUPACABRAS (English) <http://bloodpredator.homestead.com/index.html>
Patagrande -Bigfoot- (Español) <http://patagrande.homestead.com/index.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 12:49:10 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:59:14 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:09:41 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

<snip>

>>I have an enhanced image illustrating this and can post it if
>>anyone would like to see it for themselves. Contact me directly.

>Hi Neil, plus "wondering" William, "galloping" Ed Gehrman, and
>all other Listerions,

>Note: No pun, nothing but fun meant in the above or below.
>Brits, I like my humor wet with no ice or lemon.

Josh, all taken with a <g>,

>Neil, I see you state above that computer programmers "DO IT
>with BITS of BYTES". You are a computer programmer. I've never
>written program. I am the kind of guy who prefers to DO IT
>using my girlfriend's special software to download my stored
>genetic memory through my HARD DRIVE into her lovely ZIP DRIVE.
>-Of course we can't make floppies any more and we are glad they
>are grown and gone. Now it is just us and a cable that keeps us
>together.

Not strictly a programmer, my main job is electronics, computer
and network hardware and O/S's but this includes computer
interfacing to scientific experiments for which I have written
the control and data aquisition software, together with some
specific data display/analysis packages. This was highly
specialised "in house" stuff.

>My work is in music recording engineering, music production, and
>artist management. I work with a different medium so I know
>nothing about what I will first ask you below.

>I appreciate you providing an enhanced image, especially of the
>clipboard. Thanks for "tweaking it". I wonder to what extent you
>tweaked it? What software, etc.?

In the case of the "Danger" sign I've used a technique we use
here in the lab to "drag" a better signal out of "noisy" data
where the signal is repetitive, you simply add the data sets,
the noise being of random nature tends to cancel while the
signal content reinforces. Extend this concept to the AA film
"frames" where you have a static or "trackable" target (the
Danger sign) in a sequence of frames, I've found that the noise
(film grain) and signal (image) seem to exhibit the same
qualities and the end result in this case is a reasonably legible
sign.

>If we could get a better
>"tweaking" perhaps it would help define whether the person was
>writing autopsy notes or something like: Call after film shoot -
>Ray Santilli - Will Volker pay for extra scenes? If I remember
>correctly there were several people on the list who had
>"tweaked" the Ramey message. I wonder if there is any software
>or technique that could bring more out?

This technique couldn't be applied to the Ramey Message as we only have the one data sample, the single negative.

>William, a recent post of yours caused me to wonder something
>and become "wondering" Josh. I don't know when you folks first
>became interested in the alleged AA autopsy. Until this thread
>started I hadn't given much thought to it for a while because
>for some time things had reached a standstill until some new and
>proven evidence would perhaps appear.

Josh, I have followed the AA saga since Jan 95 when Reg Presley mentioned it on British TV, but my recent interest was only rekindled when searching for symbol matches to those I had spotted in the Fort Worth Photographs. The debris footage from the AA provided a match(s). I then had to ask myself how the hell could a "hoaxed" film include matches for symbols that had never been identified (to my knowledge) before from 50 year old photographs that were of historical provinance and had been lost and undisturbed in the archives until the late 1980's?.

How would the hoaxers know what symbols to place in their hoax?.

I've had lot's of ridicule about the "symbols" but no one has yet claimed to have spotted them previously. The hoaxer would have had to have had prior knowledge they existed, or more than a bucket load of luck, other than that they might just be real artifacts seen in two historical documents indicating two linked events took place in New Mexico in the summer of 47, Socorro and Corona(Roswell).

>Shortly after the AA film
>was shown in London for the first time I was able through MUFON
>to look at a video of all the scenes, long before it was sold as
>a home video. I remember when Bob Shell first got involved and I
>remember it making the rounds of film directors and special
>effects people, including some of the best in effects, Stan
>Winston and Dennis Muren (sic). It also made the rounds of some
>forensic pathologists, including the noted Cyril Wecht. I know
>there have been others who have looked at it since then.
>Recently there was a post regarding the texture of the facial
>structure and it caused me to wonder something else.

>Neil, I'm wondering if with your new evidence you are trying to
>get the opinions of any experts in their fields? I've seen the
>attempts of you and Roger to get to the point of him seeing the
>CD. There are many other, more noted filmmakers than Roger (sorry
>Rog). Have you consulted any of them? Special effects, forensic
>pathologists, or whatever people are needed to evaluate your new
>evidence? I would rather read that on the list than jawbone
>speculations.

In my case the AA interest re-started as a facinating side issue to the main research I've been doing with Bond Johnson's Fort Worth Photographs.

The reason for my digitising the AA film was simply to provide myself with a better and more flexable research tool than the VHS tapes of the AA when the opportunity of access to a BetaCam copy of the footage came my way. I was now by this time, also interested in verifying for myself Theresa Carlson's critical findings on the AA, as these directly challenged the premise that the film (in part, at least) was a historical document.

Using the digitised AA version and after going over her findings in "Shadows of Doubt", I now believe she is wrong in a number of her conclusions.

Neil

--

```
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1 1
Univ of Manchester 0 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0 0
Manchester. 1 1
M13.9PL. UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/
```

Radio Callsign G8KOQ
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:21:31 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:03:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Lehmborg

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:14:26 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>Date: 12 Mar 2001 07:04:43 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:08:05 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
>>>>>To: updates@sympatico.cam
>>>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>>>>>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>>>>>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>>>>>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>>>>>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>>>>>1994, according to local media.

>>><snip>

>>>>This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does
>>>>not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous

>>>Hi, Gary, Scott:

>>>Unless these are just airplanes and helicopters flying over to
>>>check out the volcano's caldera. I'll bet it's a pretty sight.

>>According to the images captured around Mount Popocatepetl by
>>Jaime Maussan's crew of videographers, the white objects around
>>the volcanic smoke appear to be perfect spheres.

>>The images are quite clear on that.

>>These spheres either maintain static positions or sometimes move
>>about.

>Hi Bill,

>Gee Bill, you couldn't possibly mean those same 'spheres' that
>so many folks have been recording on video and photos for years
>and trying to tell others about would you? ;)

...Or that a group of over twenty sullenly unintoxicated
professional people (and more than a few scientists) watched
with dwindling interest as it flew by them five times.

<http://www.worldwiderenaissance.org/ufol.html>

>I don't know how many of these reports it's going to take before
>some experts decide to take a look at all the taped and
>photographic evidence that has accumulated. Beginning with Jaime
>Maussan's material, and hopefully to include the hours of stuff
>that guys like Tom King has captured over his native Arizona
>skies and the all the footage that I and others have gotten of
>white or sometimes silvery 'spheres' and discs flitting about in
>the skies over New York.

Now dammit -- I was just in New York on a business trip, and
damned if I didn't see stuff moving around up there that
seemed, ah... divergent from the explicable (not to put too fine
a point on it). The 'natives' <g> I was with seemed unmoved.
There's a lot of stuff in the skies over New York -- plenty
enough stuff to camouflage the "bionically weird".

>These 'things' whatever they are, are
>not party or weather balloons.

'Ya think?

>Their movements are unique and
>the maneuvers are oft times quite startling. You yourself can
>testify to that. You've seen and recorded the same things.

Oh, well sure... -- yeah... and how are those Mets doing! You
know John, (and of course, you do know -- don't you?) this
should be the red letter kicker, the smoking gun, the straw that
broke the camels back instead of the non-event that it has
become... There is evidence recorded. That evidence, not so
astonishingly, is ignored in the passionate pursuit of not
having to re-do ones work, an abundance of spiritual arrogance,
and the complacency of bare-assed elitist convenience.

>Nobody cares or ever listens, Bill.

And how could you expect them to, Johnny? Those charged to do
the 'watching' are spun into their own little pathetically
parochial cocoons of method, procedure, and worldview. The
real substance of the work is the destruction of that cocoon
and the reality of what is to emerge from it! A quick look
around at that occurrence in nature indicates that what comes
out seems more preferable to what went in -- but I don't want to
be accused of overworking the metaphor.

>I used to report every time I
>got shots or video of them. Nobody ever bothered to even take a
>look. Much less conduct an in depth analysis on them. It's the
>complete apathy that caused me to stop reporting my sightings
>formally. If just one more person (who hasn't seen what is being
>captured on tape) dares to tell me that I'm looking at party or
>weather balloons I'm going to lose it. So, I've opted to just
>keep my mouth shut. I figure sooner or later some of these
>armchair analysts are finally going to go out and look up and
>when they begin to see what is tooling around up there, then
>we'll all kick back and have a good talk about what we're going
>to do to find out what the hell is going on.

...and treat it like a first time discovery -- try to **own** it
in some gainful way. If there was but the most insignificant
attempt at cooperation over the prevalent competition of
individuals in the ufological community we would have gotten to
the bottom of this thing decades ago. Dan Sheehan had a plan
for that cooperation. I think it's a measure of that plan's
eventual success that it was so resoundingly ignored by the
so-called principals of our **unsettling** investigation.

Did I lose you on that, Dick? A little too over-long and
illogical for ya'? There are other logics, sir. They will be
found to be fuzzy and chaotic, even alien to an allegedly
rational mind. The hot flash is that they are only going to be
understood in the context of a synthesis in art, music and their
use in education. They will only be exposed in the use of all
the tools we have, and not just those approved by a tyrannical
coterie of selected sophisticates. It will most assuredly be
found in the realization of a current worldwide renaissance that
is happening explosively as we speak. Pardon me if I don't wait
for you to catch up, advantage the new sentience, or figure it
out for me.

>You've seen the response this thread has gotten. What does that
>tell you my friend? ;)

In the paraphrased words of my father, "I know not what course
others may take, but mine is changing now." What I'd tell him is
"...lead, follow, or get out of the way." What I'd say is "It's
the end of the world as we KNOW it, and the beginning of the
world as we WANT it!" ...if we wish it.

>Regards,

>John Velez, Just another whacko with reams of "sphere" and
>"disc" video that has never been properly analyzed.

There will be a place (of your own design) for you in the new
order, John. <g>. In the valley of the blind the one-eyed man is
King! <g> Now when that one man (or woman) takes the time to cop
what is seen in the sky overhead... what a kingdom we shall
have! We'll all have *wings* in that one, hoss!

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

~~Ö~~

EXPLORE "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Hostpros URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually.
He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put
one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention
he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail.
\$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see
from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by
the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:21:02 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:05:24 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Hi, Neil!

>At the risk of seeming more nit picky than I usually am, doesn't
>this seem a little out of place? I mean, in the past it has been
>your position that none of the situations in AA were "ideal";
>that this was all a very hurried and spontaneous event. Given
>that context, don't you find it odd that they not only had the

>contamination suits at the ready, but also had a room complete
>with a warning sign about how long they were safe to be in
>there?

>If this were the first AA then how would they know? And if the
>sign didn't apply to them, then what was it meant for? Also,
>according to the clock, do the doctors stay in there more than
>an hour? If they do, then it would seem that rules and
>regulations aren't as severe as some suggest. On the other hand,
>if they only stay and hour, then that would indicate they had
>prior knowledge of how much exposure to an alien corpse was
>considered "safe".

>Does any of this seem odd to you?

Roger,

It's all very odd, the sign say's 1 "hours" indicating it can be
set to any length of "hours" not just 1, yet the reels of the AA
span more than 1 hour and they're still in there?. But you could
just read this as some other facility being used for a purpose
it was not originally intended for.

>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted
>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk
>missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the
>software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so
>far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam
>SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad
>to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than
>anything on disc.

Sorry Roger I can't help you here, I no longer have the
original and though a Betacam dupe was made I do not have the
facilities to copy this. It took a great deal of time and effort
and the use of a local TV studio's equipment to obtain the
original digitisation and it's not the sort of process I could
go through again just for a further copy.

I can only suggest, if you are opposed to loading the software on your own machines, that maybe you can hijack a friend or relatives computer for a while.

>I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and
>grab frames for work in Photoshop.

The M2 demo software package provided can save and number individual frames to disk directly from the MPEG2 source file.

Neil

```
--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris.      /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs.   1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St.    0
Manchester.       1
M13.9PL. UK.     \0101010110010110110010110101101011011011110101011010/
```

Radio Callsign G8KOQ
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

```
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
```

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:42:50 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:25:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:14:26 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>Date: 12 Mar 2001 07:04:43 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 22:08:05 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>Date: Wed, 07 Mar 2001 23:30:28 -0600
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl@juno.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 05:49:49 -0500
>>>>Subject: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>>>>LOCALS CLAIM SEEING STRANGE LIGHTS OVER POPOCATEPETL Mexico,
>>>>>March 6 (EFE)-. Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60
>>>>>kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that
>>>>>"fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December
>>>>>1994, according to local media.

>>>>><snip>

>>>>>This is Persinger's Tectonic Strain Theory in action. It does
>>>>>not explain all UFO reports but does explain some luminous

>>>>>Hi, Gary, Scott:

>>>>>Unless these are just airplanes and helicopters flying over to
>>>>>check out the volcano's caldera. I'll bet it's a pretty sight.

>>>>>According to the images captured around Mount Popocatepetl by
>>>>>Jaime Maussan's crew of videographers, the white objects around
>>>>>the volcanic smoke appear to be perfect spheres.

>>>>>The images are quite clear on that.

>>>>>These spheres either maintain static positions or sometimes move
>>>>>about.

>Hi Bill,

>Gee Bill, you couldn't possibly mean those same 'spheres' that
>so many folks have been recording on video and photos for years
>and trying to tell others about would you? ;)

>I don't know how many of these reports it's going to take before
>some experts decide to take a look at all the taped and

>photographic evidence that has accumulated. Beginning with Jaime
>Maussan's material, and hopefully to include the hours of stuff
>that guys like Tom King has captured over his native Arizona
>skies and the all the footage that I and others have gotten of
>white or sometimes silvery 'spheres' and discs flitting about in
>the skies over New York. These 'things' whatever they are, are
>not party or weather balloons. Their movements are unique and
>the maneuvers are oft times quite startling. You yourself can
>testify to that. You've seen and recorded the same things.

>Nobody cares or ever listens Bill. I used to report every time I
>got shots or video of them. Nobody ever bothered to even take a
>look. Much less conduct an in depth analysis on them. It's the
>complete apathy that caused me to stop reporting my sightings
>formally. If just one more person (who hasn't seen what is being
>captured on tape) dares to tell me that I'm looking at party or
>weather balloons I'm going to lose it. So, I've opted to just
>keep my mouth shut. I figure sooner or later some of these
>armchair analysts are finally going to go out and look up and
>when they begin to see what is tooling around up there, then
>we'll all kick back and have a good talk about what we're going
>to do to find out what the hell is going on.

>You've seen the response this thread has gotten. What does that
>tell you my friend? ;)

>Regards,

>John Velez, Just another whacko with reams of "sphere" and
>"disc" video that has never been properly analyzed.

John,

Yes, those spheres we call "orbs" have been around for years. Seen in daylight they appear to be metallic spheres. Several of them in formation can hover at fixed positions and do not move when the wind blows. And, as you say, sometimes they move, sometimes slowly and sometimes rapidly. At night, they have been seen glowing with different colors. The peculiarity is that they glow, but do not produce glare or reflection from all that light emission.

As always, the skeptics are seeking a conventional explanation, but so far their conventional explanations have failed to explain what is seen on videos or video stills. Balloons during the day or flares at night do not explain these orbs. I have videotaped numbers of balloons ascending in clear and cloudy skies. Flares have also been taped and compared. Orbs have been seen at very close range (within 100 feet by some) and I would say that some of the stills Jaime showed on screen were as close as that.

Some of these have been seen on the property of Aerospace facilities in the Antelope Valley by many residents in the area. They have been seen hovering above the ground brilliantly lit, yet not lighting the ground (photon absorption?). Orbs have been seen in company with the Big Black Triangles.

So, what are they? I do not profess to know and, John, I do not think we will find an answer on this list. At one time the U.S. Air Force was concerned about air space intrusions, but now it is "ho hum, let them come".

Bill Hamilton

Skywatcher

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:52:49 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:29:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Hello Everyone,

>>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims involves the
>>sound of nine knocks in three series of three. Strieber
>>associates the sounds he heard in 1986 with his own abductions
>>and presents several cases in which the nine knocks form part of
>>other people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough and
>>The Communion Letters).

><snip>

>>It would be interesting to hear from anyone else who has
>>experienced the 'nine knocks' phenomenon. In view of claims
>>involving raps and thuds throughout history, any banging noises
>>that manifest in threes ð whether they total nine or not ð could
>>be relevant to this study.

>Hi Chris,

>If I were to mention the detail I'm going to share on an
>"Abductee List" hands would fly up. Here I'm afraid, I'm just
>going to sound like a nutcase. So be it. After reporting that
>I've been abducted by "aliens" from time to time throughout my
>life, stuff like this detail is Mickey Mouse in comparison.
><LOL>Damn the torpedoes.

>I want to preface this note by saying that I don't think much of
>Whitley Streiber or his books. Mr. Strieber is just too
>inconsistent for my liking and seems to report/reveal
>'phenomena' when it suits the plot of the book he is currently
>writing. "The Secret School" is an example of what I'm talking
>about. That said,...

>I haven't heard "knocks." What myself and my wife have both
>heard over the years (on rare occasion but consistently) is a
>series of "beeps." Electronic sounding beeps that play in three
>groups of three beeps each. Nine total. Then it stops for
>awhile, and the cycle of beeps will play again. It can go on for
>as long as an hour or better sometimes.

>We have gone nuts some times going from room to room in the
>house looking for the source of this 'beeping.' No matter which
>room you are standing in, the "beeps" sound like they are
>emanating from that room. We don't own any digital watches so we
>know that watches aren't the cause. (It sounds like the beeping
>of an electronic watch.)

>And, it doesn't matter 'where' we live either. The beeps have
>followed us in our three moves in the 32 years we have been

>married. The "beeps" are a private running joke between my wife
>and myself. I had no idea that they may be "abduction related"
>until I started talking to other abductees.

>I have received letters from people reporting the exact same
>phenomena, and we have had extended discussions about this
>'beeping' business on the AIC e-mail List as well as at a group
>I attended four or five years ago at Budd's house. I _have_
>heard of this before but not with 'knocks.' Isn't that odd? The
>reports I have, (and that I have experienced myself) involve
>electronic sounding beeps. Not "knocks." Maybe the "aliens" have
>upgraded their hardware! <VBG>Hope this 'helps' somehow
>although I can't imagine how. *I know I owe you an e-mail! I
>haven't forgotten you. Been busy. ;)

John,

You certainly are brave admitting such things on this List with
all those wolves hiding in the dark ready to pounce on you, but
I am going to take a long chance myself and add a note to your
revelation concerning "beeps".

Years ago when I investigated the Brian Scott case I recall he
mentioned hearing beeps just as you have. But, there is more.
Some of those beeps were recorded on audio tape. I have at least
one of the tapes with a record of those mysterious beeps. I
thought it might be associated with a signal or communication
that Brian was receiving at the time. When he made a requested
trip to Tiahuanaco and stood in the entrance portal of the
Temple of Kalasasas, beeps were also recorded on tape. It was a
strange case with traces of physical evidence which made it
fascinating and compelling. I am sure there must be others who
have reported this.

Bill Hamilton

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:03:16 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:30:56 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Tonnies

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 02:54:51 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>Hiya Mac,

>(Personal note in response to a comment that Mac made.)

>Yeah, but I still see a tube! I have tried and tried to see it
>as a flat scene, but hard as I try Mac I can't. The freakin
>things look tubular. Of course I bow to the experts, but I
>remain unconvinced by their argument that the shapes I'm
>looking at are an optical illusion.

I've asked Mark Carlotto if he can help provide an answer with
"shape-from-shading" technique. With any luck we can answer the
"concave/convex" argument soon.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 13](#)

Filer's Files #11 -- 2001

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:53:01 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 10:34:21 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #11 -- 2001

Filer's Files #11 -- 2001,
MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
March 13, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com
Webmaster Chuck Warren
<http://www.filersfiles.com>

IN SUMMARY, SIGHTINGS CONTINUE IN SPACE AND AROUND THE WORLD. UFOs are seen in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Oklahoma, Washington, Mexico, Honduras and Norway. Senator John Glenn says objects are seen in space. Our shuttle flights including STS 102 continue to video tape anomalies. Everyone knows their out there, the question is who are those guys? Its either ours or other intelligent life. Why does NASA keep attempting to hide the truth? Did you know the first photos from the Mars Viking Lander were destroyed because they showed a beautiful blue sky and green patches on rocks? Why was the Japanese fishing vessel Ehime Maru operating at full speed chasing the US submarine USS Greenville?

NEW ANOMALIES FOUND ON STS-102 SHUTTLE FLIGHT

SACRAMENTO - Jeff Challender writes, "Things are changing in the way I get my footage during NASA Shuttle missions. There is a man in Wanamingo, Minnesota, named Les Wille, who has been taping Shuttle missions for the last four years. He is very well known in the UK as LL Wille. He has, in the past, shared with the world such incredible footage as that of anomalous objects near the Russian space station Mir. These seen live during the un-docking of STS-84, filmed in zoom mode from 2800 feet, in May 1997." Les Wille and Jeff Challender are now working together as a team to tape and scrutinize Shuttle mission STS-102/Discovery. As of this writing, we have captured several anomalies, which will require further investigation. This cooperation adds the new dimension of having raw tapes, (Source; NASA live feed) from two separate locations at the same time. Mr. Wille has his own forest of seven satellite dishes, which he uses to intercept NASA feed directly from the Tracking Data & Relay Satellite System. He gets his signal BEFORE it goes to Houston for censoring. Les often sees live payload bay camera feed that is not shown through the public NASA channel.

Les taped an unexplained bright, strobing, object seen through the overhead cabin windows of Discovery during ascent to orbit. Both Les and Jeff taped an unusual object on Friday 9 March which described a very convoluted, path off the tail of the Shuttle before disappearing off screen to the left. During the spacewalk on Saturday evening 10 March, an object literally shaped like a saucer was seen in an S-band slide show sequence. Recently, it has been said that NASA uses so much S-Band slide show TV, in lieu of the full motion Ku-Band, because during rendezvous and separation, the Ku antenna is being used for "radar ranging". If so, it was not done in flights of years past. This writer has investigated the allegation, and found it wanting. Multiple sources, including discreet sources inside NASA itself, assure me that this is not, and has never been, so. Add to this the fact that S-Band frequently dominates spacewalks, module installations, fly-arounds, and low priority

Earth views, where "radar ranging" is unnecessary. So the question remains why so much more S-Band downlink during missions? One possible explanation is selective editing, and deniability. If nothing is being kept from the taxpaying public, who by the way fund NASA 100 percent, the Ku-Band television should be in use to the fullest extent possible. Thanks to Jeff Challender and Les Willie.

SENATOR JOHN GLENN ON "FRASER TV SHOW" SAYS WE SAW THINGS IN SPACE

Astronaut John Glenn appeared on the "Fraser" nationwide television show on March 6, 2001, where Fraser and a female character are arguing, while Glenn faces the camera and delivers the following speech: "Back in those glory days, I was very uncomfortable when they asked us to say things we didn't want to say and deny other things. Some people asked, you know, were you alone out there? We never gave the real answer, and yet we see things out there, strange things, but we know what we saw out there. And we couldn't really say anything. The bosses were really afraid of this, they were afraid of the War of the Worlds type stuff, and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep quiet. And now we only see these things in our nightmares or maybe in the movies, and some of them are pretty close to being the truth." After Glenn finished delivering the speech, he returned to the control room where Fraser and the woman were arguing. At this point he realizes that he was being taped and says that he needs to take the tape; he was unaware that he was being recorded and this information "can't get out to the public." Thanks to Ambrovista, David Wilcock, and Joe Stefula.

NASA's OFFICIAL FACT SHEET: NO EVIDENCE OF ALIEN LIFE:

NASA states, "No branch of the United States Government is currently involved with or responsible for investigations into the possibility of advanced alien civilizations on other planets or for investigating Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO's). The US Air Force (USAF) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) have had intermittent, independent investigations of the possibility of alien life on other planets; however, none of these has produced factual evidence that life exists on other planets, nor that UFO's are related to aliens. From 1947 to 1969, the Air Force investigated UFO's; then in 1977, NASA was asked to examine the possibility of resuming UFO investigations. After studying all of the facts available, it was determined that nothing would be gained by further investigation, since there was an absence of tangible evidence." See

["http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/facts/HTML/FS-015-HO.html"](http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/facts/HTML/FS-015-HO.html)

Editor's Note: I suggest NASA start watching the videos their taking in space. The key Air Force Study to deny UFOs and alien life was conducted at the University of Colorado under the direction of Dr. Edward Condon. By 1968, there was a near mutiny of the scientific staff, when two Ph.D.s were dismissed and the administrative assistant resigned because they strongly felt the evidence pointed to the existence of UFOs. Dr. David R. Saunders and R. Roger Harkins book "UFOs Yes" tells the story where the Condon Committee went wrong. Dr. Saunders one of the three key principle investigators blasted the project as unscientific, biased and precluded "findings." He cites the evidence, the specific cases, that have led him along with the majority of researching scientists -- to conclude that UFOs are likely to be vehicles from outer space. Although, the Condon Committee concluded UFOs were not worth further study, those scientists who disagreed were fired. The official government policy is based on false conclusions. Virtually every pronouncement by NASA is based on this falsely biased study. Many fine people at NASA have open minds and see the UFO evidence, yet are forced to keep quiet. Some have contacted me and are very frustrated by the narrow minded thinking at NASA. I have learned there are always two answers from NASA, the official government releases and what the scientists really think off the record. From Daniel Goldin on down there is the private truth and the official denials. Those who stray lose their job. I salute Senator John Glenn for explaining the truth.

MARS SKY IS REALLY BLUE AND ROCKS HAVE GREEN PATCHES

We spent millions of dollars sending the Viking Lander I to

Mars in 1976. The world waited in great anticipation to see the first color images of Mars. At about 2:00 PM PDT on July 21, 1976, the first color image from the surface of another planet arrived at JPL in wonderful color. Mars showed its beautiful blue sky, brown and reddish soil and rocks with patches of green. You, I and the world never saw the true images. According to the men who worked at the Viking Image Formatting and Processing section of JPL. Mr. Van der Woude says, "Both Ron Wichelman and I were responsible for the color quality control of the Viking Lander photographs, and Dr. Tomas Mutch, the Viking Imaging Team Leader told us he got a call from the NASA Administrator asking that we destroy the Mars blue sky negative created from the digital data." The images were then falsely reddened to make it appear there was no life, no green algae or lichen on the planet. See "Mars the Living Planet" by Barry Digregorio, Dr. Gilbert Levin and Dr. Pat Straat. Page 142.

The book also explains how the tests for existence of life on Mars were rigged to deny life, despite the relatively favorable conditions. Dr. Gilbert V. Levin who was in charge of the Viking Lander experiments revealed that when the Mars soil was examined by on board instruments in a miniature laboratory there was a startling positive response. THE VIKING HAD FOUND EVIDENCE OF LIFE. The tests, and follow on samples showed the evidence everyone had agreed on prior to the mission that would confirm the presence of life. Dr. Levin and his team were proud for they had discovered the first proof of life on another planet. Dr. Levin strongly believes they found life on Mars in 1976, but NASA insisted the instrumentation must be faulty. The official NASA answer was to deny the existence of alien life despite strong scientific evidence. All reasonable arguments against the Viking Mission Labeled Release life detection system had been over come except for the claimed absence of water. Yet many scientists knew the images also showed evidence of water such as the ice cap. Until recently the discovery of water on Mars, that includes waterspouts and geysers was also hidden from both scientists and the public. Some NASA personnel even claim UFOs were air brushed out of photos. Assuming Senator John Glenn's statements are true, a deliberate policy has been in effect to hide the possibility of intelligent life in the universe. Billions of taxpayers money have been spent and only recently are the true findings coming out. Do you remember that the first Viking Lander also imaged an infinity symbol or a figure 8 on one of the rocks? On the Pathfinder July 4, 1997, the Sojourner rover buggy sent back images of strange symbols on the ground? Many insiders are discussing many other strange anomalies on Mars. Why are we not told?

CONNECTICUT FLYING TRIANGLE SIGHTED

STAMFORD - The National UFO Reporting Center received a report from a witness who saw six bright lights on a triangular shaped object. Driving west on Long Ridge Road on February 23, 2001, the witness saw a series of six bright white lights hovering in the sky. The witness stated, "I stopped driving to get a closer look since I didn't want to cause an accident, but as I looked around the road, at least four other cars had stopped to look as well." Upon closer inspection there were blue triangular lights between each of the six white lights. The object appeared to be triangular in shape and seemed to be stationary. After studying it, I continued driving. Peter Davenport says he spoke at length via telephone with this witness, and we found her to be exceptionally lucid and credible. The case is under investigation by MUFON Connecticut. Thanks to NUFORC www.ufocenter.com.

MASSACHUSETTS THREE DISCS SIGHTED

BECKET - Peter Davenport is filing this report on behalf of four eye witnesses who observed three dish shaped crafts with lights. This report is reflecting what the caller stated: Three dish shaped disks with lights were noticed through a picture window on February 27, 2001. The color of the lights started as white then changed to red. They were hovering over a pond and chasing each other in the sky. The police were notified and came to the scene, just as the crafts left. The officer stated he did not see the crafts. However the caller stated, "She saw the officer turn off his lights and back up on the road near her driveway near the pond." So it is likely he saw them. The caller stated that she saw these crafts on other occasions.

Thanks to <A HREF="<http://www.UFOcenter.com/>">National Reporting Center www.ufocenter.com.

PENNSYLVANIA UFO

SOUTH PHILADELPHIA -- In the August of 1997, my aunt, my sister, my cousin, two friends and I, were sitting in my grandmother's backyard, at about 5:30 in the morning. We had been up all night talking because my aunt and my cousin had just moved back to Philly from Florida. My cousin was telling a story and out of the corner of my eye, something in the sky had caught my attention. I'm not one to believe in UFO's, ghosts and other paranormal activities, so I turned my head and continued to listen. a couple minutes later, I still seen the gleam in my eye, so I looked up again and in the far distance, there was a round object lingering in the sky. I don't know exactly how far up in the sky it was but it had white and red lights all around it. I didn't say anything because I didn't want my aunt or anyone to think I was crazy. I turned my head, thinking "maybe it would go away," but then I noticed my sister looking at it too. We looked at each other and both of our mouths dropped, and everyone was looking at us. By the time we could get the words out of our mouth, it was gone with the flash of light. I never seen anything move so quickly. Thanks to Jillian Romano ALLuEVaWaNted26

ILLINOIS TRIANGLES FLY OVER

CHICAGO --"Hank Spranza" writes "Did anyone see the three triangle shaped objects in the sky over Chicago on Sunday, March 4, 2001. They went over the center of the city flying from east to west at high altitude at about 12:05 AM. They were displaying light orange lights, looked to be large objects traveling at a high rate of speed at what appeared to be a very high altitude and created zero noise. My hobby is astronomy and I'm very familiar with the night sky and this is the first time I've seen anything like this in the twenty or so years that I've been observing the Chicago area sky. Thanks to Hank Spranza, HANK01@TELO CITY.com.

OKLAHOMA SEES LARGE BRIGHT OBJECT

OKLAHOMA CITY -- Jim Hickman reports that KFOR-TV news in (www.kfor.com) reported March 7, 2001, that a large bright object was seen last night by hundreds of people in central and northern Oklahoma. The newsroom's phones were flooded with calls. The object was described as being an orange sphere with a red/blue "streak" of a tail. It was seen from the Oklahoma City area to the Kansas border. The National weather service was contacted and they advised that the object was more than likely rocket debris... I will have a follow up report on this sighting as more facts become available. Thanks to the Hickman Report <http://www.thehickmanreport.com>

WASHINGTON GLOWING, EGG-SHAPED OBJECT SIGHTED

PUYALLUP -- I would like to start-out by saying that I am an expert on aircraft and flying, and can honestly say that this object was not an aircraft, helicopter, or meteor, or any other man-made object On March 2, 2001, my two friends and I were driving north on Highway 161 near Puyallup when we saw a bronze-colored object fly overhead at an elevation of about 5500 feet above sea level at 8:24 PM. The object was traveling at a very high rate of speed, around 700-750 mph, but showed no signs of it's propulsion system such as an afterburner flames, exhaust, etc. I could detect no noise being emitted from the object either. Aircraft that fly that fast are most often VERY loud at low elevations. We followed it until it disappeared from sight 65 miles away. It followed a straight path and did not change altitude or speed. The object "blinked-out" at about 70 miles away. One interesting piece of information is that it flew directly through the upwind leg of the landing pattern of Seatac Airport at a very dangerous altitude, violating FAA regulations. It most likely violated the airspace of McChord AFB also. The AM radio in my car had slightly more static during the time when the object was overhead. Thanks to Peter Davenport <A HREF="<http://www.ufocenter.com/>">NUFORC <A HREF="<http://www.ufocenter.com/>">NUFORC www.ufocenter.com.

MEXICO STRANGE LIGHTS OVER VOLCANO

POPOCATEPETL -- March 6 (EFE) . Residents of the Popocatepetl area, some 60 kilometers east of Mexico City, reported seeing lights that "fly" over the volcano, which has been erupting since December 1994, according to local media. The lights were seen last night over the Popocatepetl and tens of residents from adjacent communities called radio stations to make this known, according to the "Buenos Dias" program broadcast on the ACIR network out of Puebla, 125 kilometers east of Mexico City. According to reports received by Puebla stations, the alleged sightings could be seen particularly from an area near the volcano, well-known for its accumulations of energy which interfere with the proper operation of compasses. Eyewitness Guadalupe Carriillo told a local station that the lights "had movement, passed over the volcano, turned around and rotated." A resident of Totimihuacan pointed out that one of the lights remained fixed in the sky while another spun around it. Another person claimed to have captured it all on videotape and made it available to the public. Popocatepetl, with an elevation of 5,452 meters, is one of the places in Mexico where there is talk of suspicious lights or unidentified flying objects (UFOs), although the number of accounts has increased since it entered its eruptive phase in December 1994. Special Thanks to EFE Translation (C) 2001. by Institute of Hispanic Ufology and Gloria R. Coluchi

HONDURAS DOZENS OF CITIZENS SEE ANOTHER UFO

THE LA TIGRA NATIONAL PARK -- La Tribuna News, March 9, 2001, -- Without having quite recovered from having concluded that the National Park harbors a mysterious attraction for UFOs, or may be a "magnetic vortex " or "window area" for said activity, dozens of persons yesterday saw another starship over the Honduran capital. It was around 11:30 a.m. with the sun almost blazing in full noon glory when an oval, unknown artifact, grey in color and occasionally vibrating with intense whiteness, appeared over a region of the city's periphery on a contrail which seemed to come from the "Cristo de El Picacho" area. Two telephone technicians, Gerardo Aceituno and Juan Mairena, informed us of "the experience of their lives," noting that the starship was perhaps searching for a power source (since some 400 meters down the road, there is an electrical substation). The UFO was at an estimated altitude of 300 meters. Similarly surprised were college student Ivan Flores and amateur photographer Juan Carlos Molina, who managed to snap photographs of the two different UFOs, near Cristo del Picacho and La Tigra." Both were surprised to learn that certain extraterrestrial beings power their starships to earth using the magnetic force of the areas they wish to reach--in other words, the so-called "magnetic vortexes" or "window areas." One such area could be the entire mountainous massif which includes "La Tigra" up to the El Picacho hill, which appeared to be its point of origin. "Upon looking ahead, we saw something moving back and forth, up and down, some 300 meters up. We clearly saw it was a flying saucer," states Gerardo Aceituno. "We stopped the car and saw that the UFO was grey, oval and with a whitish intensity, and while it was far away, it could have easily measured some five meters in diameter," he described, while Juan Francsico Mairena corroborated the three minute event. A row of 20 cars formed behind the Siemen's vehicle and their occupants stared at the UFO's erratic movements in sheer amazement before it vanished southward with stunning swiftness. "It's velocity was amazing, perhaps faster than sound. Thanks to Gloria R. Coluchi and Institute of Hispanic Ufology

NORWAY AND ITALIAN UFO STUDY

Ralph O. Howard, Jr., MUFON Georgia's Deputy Director for Science writes, "There is some interesting work going on in Hessedalen, a small valley community in Norway where UFOs are, and have been for decades." They are part of the residents' lives and routines. There is hard scientific evidence of a real phenomenon here, with several investigations over the years getting intriguing results that include EM (light, radar) hits mostly, plus numerous high quality recorded observations. Most sightings are balls of light in similar fashion to MUFON and CUFOS Investigator Greg Long's observations from the Yakima Indian Reservation in Washington state in his book- 'Examining the Earthlight Theory-1990'.

THE EMBLA PROJECT IN HESSDALEN: A Preliminary Report' by Massimo Teodorani, Ph.D., Stelio Montebugnoli, MScEE, Jader

Monari MscEE. ABSTRACT follows: In August 2000, a team of Italian physical students, working in collaboration with Norwegian scientists from Ostfold College, carried out a instrumental expedition in Hessdalen, which was just the first of a series of future scientific missions planned by the joint Italian-Norwegian EMBLA project. The employed radio spectrum analyzers, which were automatically in function all the time for 25 days, permitted the discovery of highly anomalous periodic signals which were characterized by a spike-like and a doppler-like morphology. Moreover, during the many planned skywatching sessions, it was possible to sight repeatedly luminous atmospheric phenomena in various points of the Hessdalen valley. This paper represents a preliminary report on this mission, in which both radio and visual phenomena are described. A speculative model explaining some aspects of the recorded anomalous radio signals is also discussed. (End Abstract) Note: This is exactly the type of scientific approach desired and described by Ralph in his excellent presentation at our last general MUFONGA meeting . We have personnel with the expertise to do some of this type field work, but currently none of the funds to develop or obtain the instruments. Thanks to Ralph Howard from the abstract at the website www.itacomm.net/PH/ and Tom Sheets, State Director MUFONGA

THE CRASH OF JAPANESE EHIME MARU AND US SUBMARINE

HAWAII -- Robert D. Morningstar asks "What was the Ehime Maru, one of the world's most advanced (and 'stealthy') high tech fishing vessels, doing in a U.S. military operations area warning zone on February 9th, 2001, resulting in the collision with the attack submarine, U.S.S. Greenville. He says, "I'm writing in regard to the recent accident which occurred off Hawaii recently and which is the subject of a current NTSB investigation. I really hate it when the Navy makes a captain swing in the wind to save face in international politics. On behalf of Commander Waddle getting a "fair shake", I would like to point out that the Japanese government often disguises spying operations and R&D operations as "fishing explorations" or student projects." The development of stealth technology at sea is not unheard of in our day and age. The fishing vessel could very easily have been "stalking" the submarine. Was it really correct for the Japanese fishing vessel, an advanced oceanic laboratory, to be operating in a U.S. Navy military operations area warning zone? However, the major point I am going to make is in regard to the type of propeller on the fishing vessel. If this propeller was milled using an advanced propeller milling technology, which our country shared with the Japanese in the 1980's, it is possible that the frequency produced by such a propeller could be stealthily quiet. Furthermore, if its frequency was a harmonic of that of the submarine's screw, its frequency could have been cancelled out by the frequency of the submarine's propeller resonating through the sea at harmonic levels. It is possible that the Japanese were testing an undersea noise-canceling technology similar to those we have in aviation headsets. The sound of the screws of the sub and the fishing vessel could have been made to cancel each other out. it is known that the Ehime Maru was moving at nearly top speed when she struck the submarine. All these avenues should be investigated before condemning the captain of the USS Greenville. Thanks to Robert Morningstar

NEW JERSEY GREAT UFO CONGRESS 2001

BORDENTOWN -- March 31 and April 1, at the Days Inn on Route 206 at the NJ Turnpike Exit #7. Jan Aldrich will talk about his Project 1947 investigations, Don Ecker will discuss the Dark Side of the Moon, Viki Ecker's talk concerns "In Search of the Secret Keepers," Dolores Cannon discusses The Soul, Between Death and Life, Richard Cassaro will speak on the truth concerning Ancient Egypt, , Bob Durant's talk is about The Ramey Memo, and Nancy Talbot talk is on the Physical Evidence regarding plants, soils at crop formation sites. Call Pat Marcatillio for reservations at 609 631-8955

NEW NASA SHUTTLE VIDEO OF UFOs IN SPACE

Jeff Challender has prepared a new tape of various UFOs that were caught on recent Shuttle video footage. Jeff has over an hour long tape of UFOs shot in space. Jeff spends hundreds of hours watching the shuttle broadcasts from space and is now an

expert on NASA missions and even those onboard the shuttle are unlikely to see what Jeff does. Using Jeff's directions you will be able to learn the difference between space junk, ice crystals and real UFOs. I feel confident we could go into a court of law and convince any jury that there are UFOs moving at high speed around the Earth. Send \$25 to: Jeff Challender 2768 Mendel Way - Sacramento, California 95833-2011

BEFORE YOU BUY OR SELL A HOME SEE MY FREE REPORT

All real estate agents are not the same? Some real estate agents are part timers and inexperienced. Others are experts with an excellent experience and capabilities. When you are selling or buying your home, you need to make sure you have the best real estate agent working for you before you make any important financial decisions on one your biggest investments! Remember, the majority of people do not know the right questions to ask, and what pit falls can cause major problems. Picking the right real estate agent can be a wonderful experience, and picking the wrong one can be a big mistake that can waste your time and cost you thousands! Find out, " What you need to understand before hiring any real estate agent!" Learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent for your needs. To get a free copy of this report, just call (609) 654-0020 or e-mail us at Majorstar@aol.com. We can also help you with your own or corporate Worldwide Relocation to Australia, Benelux, Canada, Cayman Is, England, France, Guam, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the US.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL that costs only \$30 per year by contacting MUFONHO@aol.com. Mention that I recommended you for membership. Filer's Files is copyrighted 2001 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the files on their Web Sites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. These reports and comments are not necessarily the official MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar@aol.com. Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name, address, or story confidential. Caution, most of these are initial reports and require further investigation.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [hank01](#)

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Serious Research - Kelly

From: Christopher Kelly <tophar@pacific.net.au>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 02:34:05 +1100
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:07:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Kelly

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>a Council could work in practical terms.

>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>the focus. I reject outright the idea that the truth or falsity
>of UFO reality can be divined by deduction from scientific
>theory and generalizations about human perception.

>Given that we may fizzle out and get nowhere, I still think it
>is worth a try to have some serious, scientific dialogue in
>which we debate and discuss the factual evidence and whether or
>not it points (a) to an unexplained phenomenon and (b) to a
>nonearthly origin. Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and
>proponents be asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to
>focus on. Then all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the
>nominated cases.

>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>Balloonism, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission of
>where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

>James Easton's latest posting about pelicans sounded well
>researched and reasonable and had relevant information to offer,
>but how definitive is it? Bruce Maccabee already has disputed
>some of Easton's statements with some equally relevant
>considerations. Anyway, let's leave Arnold out of this since
>none of us considers it to be among the strongest evidential
>cases.

>I still believe a case study effort is worth a try, if for no
>other reason than to expose the pro and con reasoning to general
>scrutiny. Something combining a "debate" format and a "jury"
>judgment might prove to be interesting. I am willing to nominate
>cases and to debate their merits.

Dick Hall has made a very good point here. Even NASA saw that
the only way to get through the vast amount of information out
there was to employ a equally vast amount of help. ie: Seti.

Plus I feel that by taking on Dick's idea, Individuals can
concentrate on what that one individual is good at doing. That
way when the team is looking at a case each member of the team
would be able to give the case the kind of investigation it
deserves. This would also cut the time of investigations at

least in half.

The NSA, CIA, FBI ect all do there investigating in much the same way. No one person does the hole investigation, The team working on a case has individuals that specialize in various fields, But one person does manage the case.

I think by using the same format that the pro's use I think there could be some very positive results found. And UFO investigation mite start to get the kind of recognition it deserves. I have wondered for sometime as to why this is not the norm for UFO Investigations. One of the reason why we are criticized so much for what we investigate is simply because of the chaotic disorganized way UFO investigations are done.

As my cousin once said to me when I told him I was doing UFO research and had been doing it for some years, He laughed and said, " You will never find anything and even if you did you would never be believed, Because the scientific community will prove you as a hoax." I have to admit, I have good reason to believe that UFO's are real. But as my cousin pointed out. I have no real proof. Well nothing that would stand up in a scientific court. And your evidence needs to be able to stand up to the investigations of the hole scientific community, as we all know.

Anyway, I see Dick's comments as being very positive and a big step forward for all UFO/ET researchers. I really hope it gets off the ground. Dick has my support 110%.

I do recommend looking at the way the likes of the NSA, CIA, FBI ect do there investigating as I feel the way in which they go about investigating really is second to none.

But I am not to sure about the debate or jury side of this. Only because this sometimes leads to personal agendas, personal dislikes and likes ect getting in the way of good investigating. But it would be good as a way to choose cases to study.

Chris Kelly

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

The Watchdog - 03-13-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:09:31 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:13:32 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-13-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

NEWS

<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/news.html>

- ~ EXCLUSIVE: Roswell Smoking Gun? Website claims to have extraordinary material from Roswell UFO
- ~ UFO Photographed Over California
- ~ Lowery Update: The Claw Analyzed - Preliminary Report
- ~ UFO Over Honduras...Again

OF INTEREST

UFOWATCHDOG.COM is seeking your comments and opinions regarding Senator John Glenn's appearance on NBC's sitcom Fraiser. Were Glenn's comments an admission of UFOs or simply taken out of context? Let us know - e-mail comments to ufowatchdog@earthlink.net

Your ad here, GREAT rates
e-mail ufowatchdog@earthlink.net for details

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 08:04:45 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:50:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

>Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:52:49 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

<snip>

>Years ago when I investigated the Brian Scott case I recall he
>mentioned hearing beeps just as you have. But, there is more.
>Some of those beeps were recorded on audio tape. I have at least
>one of the tapes with a record of those mysterious beeps. I
>thought it might be associated with a signal or communication
>that Brian was receiving at the time. When he made a requested
>trip to Tiahuanaco and stood in the entrance portal of the
>Temple of Kalasasas, beeps were also recorded on tape. It was a
>strange case with traces of physical evidence which made it
>fascinating and compelling. I am sure there must be others who
>have reported this.

The Betty/Barney Hill case is an example of sorts; they heard a
beeping sound from the rear of their car, I think, before and
after the abduction. Even though it didn't recur, it's still an
interesting similarity.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:08:07 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:52:13 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Date: Thu, 8 Mar 2001 13:40:11 -0500
>Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2001 08:49:25 -0500
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 12:04:19 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>The ET hypothesis is, I have argued, the _conceptually simplest,
>most direct_ way to explain the presence of OI/NHI sightings
>around the world.

>That does not mean that Arnold's sighting proves the ETH but
>rather that Arnold's sighting is evidence of OI/NHI as opposed
>to ice meteors, motes in the eye, mirages, wave clouds, clouds
>of billowing snow, reflections from dust and haze layers, water
>drops on the windshield, ordinary military aircraft (only 6
>miles away), US secret aircraft, USSR secret aircraft, meteors,
>swans and pelicans (all explanations offered in the past)..

Bruce:

OK, I understand your idea.

>Could the ETH be wonrg? Sure. Until we can follow a craft from
>the earth to another planet or perhaps a mothership way out in
>the solar system, somewhere we can't be sure.

There was recently a post about the all-sky surveys of
astronomers and how they might be filtered to elliminated UFO
sightings. Recently there has been an interesting observation of
a Near Earth Orbit Object, during a search for dangerous
asteroids, which turned out to be a Sun observing spacecraft on
a periodic loop in its orbit. The object was at first estimated
at 10-30 meters in size.

This would seem to be the type of search which is not filtered.
In fact the discoveries are widely publicized. This might be the
sort of thing which would turn up a 30 to 100 foot object
passing near the Earth.

There are some great links which describe these programs at:

<http://astrosun.tn.cornell.edu/staff/bottke/asteroid.html>

Clear skies,

Bob Young

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Randle

From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:55:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Randle

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

<snip>

List, interested parties,

>What interests me right now is whether it can be demonstrated
>that reports of the 'nine sounds' phenomenon were published in
>the UFO literature prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will
>be forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find evidence of
>it?".)

Not necessarily in the UFO literature, this particular
phenomenon of knocks or beeps or chirps, in multiples of three,
often three sets of three, is well known in the demonic
literature. See, for example:

The Haunted by Robert Curran (St. Martin's Press, 1988)

The Demonologist by Gerald Brittle (Berkley Books, 1980)

True Tales Of The Unknown by Sharon Jarvis (Bantan, 1985)

This is not to suggest in any way that abductions are tied up in
the occult or demonology, but only to point out that this idea
of the three knocks, six knocks, or nines knocks (three sets of
three) does appear in wide spread areas of occult literature.

KRandle

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 08:55:07 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:57:37 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:21:02 +0000
>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

<snip>

>It's all very odd, the sign say's 1 "hours" indicating it can be
>set to any length of "hours" not just 1, yet the reels of the AA
>span more than 1 hour and they're still in there?. But you could
>just read this as some other facility being used for a purpose
>it was not originally intended for.

<snip>

If the AA is a recording of a real event, then it seems certain this wasn't the first time these surgeons had dealt with the so-called "aliens." They go right to the eye covers as if knowing precisely what to expect--as if they'd done it before. There's an "assembly-line" quality to the efficiency of their operation that suggests previous experience.

Critics correctly note that it's odd for the first encounter with alien beings to be filmed in such a sloppy manner. A counter-argument could be that this wasn't the first time at all.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 17:11:45 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:00:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 22:01:19 -0000

>Hi Dick,

>You wrote:

>>Forcean Times and Bob Rickard, whom I actually used to know in
>>person, face-to-face (nice, humorous fellow) are notoriously
>>anti-UFO.

>>Their "coverage" of the topic proceeds from an extremely slanted
>>and negative bias.

>So anti-UFO and slanted in their coverage that Forcean Times
>organised two UFO-orientated un conventions in the mid-90s,
>attended by such luminaries at Budd Hopkins, Phil Klass, Dennis
>Stacy and even the esteemed Jerome Clark, I believe. A mixture
>of opposing viewpoints which one is unlikely to find at any
>ufological revival meeting on the other side of the Atlantic,
>I'll wager.

Hi Dave,

Which cup is the ball under? You have shifted the universe of discourse from Forcean Times (the magazine) to UFO conventions sponsored by FT. I never said that the FT organization was worthless across the board; only quite clearly that their coverage of UFOs in the magazine is extremely biased. (As is your characterization of conventions over here being "ufological revival meetings" compared to your "objective" ones.

The book you cite that I contributed a chapter to clearly was a good job. As a result of that chapter I received a free subscription to FT and read its UFO coverage for over a year. It was terribly biased against pro-UFO reality material and in support of anything that placed UFOs in the context of some kind of social craze (psychosocial to the core).

>So slanted and anti-UFO that they managed to produce one of the
>finest part-contributed works on the subject of the 90s (UFO
>1947-97, edited by Evans and Stacy), which contained an article
>'Bridging 50 years of UFO history' by one Richard Hall, can't
>think who he may be!

>I think you should replace "negative" with "objective" - an
>adjective one does not associate with the credulous nonsense
>which fills so many so-called journals of ufological record.

I consider psychosocial theorizing to be credulous nonsense, so there you are!

>>I would be delighted to debate him on the subject in the pages
>>of FT.

>I look forward to it. While I'm sure Bob would never describe
>himself as an expert on matters strictly ufological, that's no

>bad thing. What this subject needs are people with knowledge of
>other traditions of belief, who can see outside the blinkered,
>hermetically sealed world which ufology has become.

I'll be glad to debate you. Not sure what you mean by other
traditions of belief; you mean Far Eastern? Mystical? Shammism?
What?

>The lack of even basic acquaintance with other systems of
>supernatural belief was displayed on this list only recently,
>when someone who will remain nameless dismissed the study of
>fairy traditions as a joke - while at the same time expecting us
>to accept stories of time-travelling aliens dropping in on a
>USAF base as a serious theory!

"Supernatural belief?" Do you think UFOs are supernatural? I
certainly don't. Could this be, er, one of your biases: that
those who "believe" in UFOs are practicing a religion or
engaging in folklore development?

By the way, I like your Sir Walter Raleigh quote. The Scoffers
clearly don't live up to it.

Regards, Dick

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:44:09 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:02:11 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

<snip>

>If this were the first AA then how would they know? And if the
>sign didn't apply to them, then what was it meant for? Also,
>according to the clock, do the doctors stay in there more than
>an hour? If they do, then it would seem that rules and
>regulations aren't as severe as some suggest. On the other hand,
>if they only stay and hour, then that would indicate they had
>prior knowledge of how much exposure to an alien corpse was
>considered "safe".

Regarding the "DANGER" sign: can this sort of sign (with the
apparent hanging, adjustable digits) be traced? Can they be
found in radiation test areas of the era, or in medical
facilities? The sign provides another point of potential
confirmation--whether it's confirmation of an actual autopsy or
of thorough hoaxers being immaterial to the investigation.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:20:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:04:53 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:03:16 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnie <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 02:54:51 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?

>>(Personal note in response to a comment that Mac made.)

>>Yeah, but I still see a tube! I have tried and tried to see it
>>as a flat scene, but hard as I try Mac I can't. The freakin
>>things look tubular. Of course I bow to the experts, but I
>>remain unconvinced by their argument that the shapes I'm
>>looking at are an optical illusion.

>I've asked Mark Carlotto if he can help provide an answer with
>"shape-from-shading" technique. With any luck we can answer the
>"concave/convex" argument soon.

Way to go Mac! "Excellent idea Smithers." <VBG>

I have looked for and found what I believe to be relief shadows
under 'some' of the arches. It would be nice to know one way
or the other (for sure) if we are looking at a 3D object or
the illusion of a 3D object.

Please keep us posted (as I know you will) I'm interested to
find out what Carlotto can determine from his study of the pix.
I would still like "second opinion" from another geologist just
to see if the experts all agree that we are looking at flat
(dune) terrain and not huge tubular structures. I have seen the
pix that everybody is referencing when they mention the
surrounding terrain. I agree, the features look like ordinary
wind-blown dunes. But the "worm/tube" part (section) appears to
be just that, a transparent tube of some kind.

Until we hear from you again,

Regards and thanx for getting another set of eyes on this thing.
Nice work Mr.Mac! ;)

John Velez,
Hearing 'Tubular Bells';)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

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

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:21:37 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:07:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims
>>>involves the sound of nine knocks in three series
>>>of three. Strieber associates the sounds he heard
>>>in 1986 with his own abductions and presents several
>>>cases in which the nine knocks form part of other
>>>people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough
>>>The Communion Letters).

>><snip>

>>If I were to mention the detail I'm going to share
>>on an "Abductee List" hands would fly up. Here I'm
>>afraid, I'm just going to sound like a nutcase. So be
>>it. After reporting that I've been abducted by
>>"aliens" from time to time throughout my life, stuff
>>like this detail is Mickey Mouse in comparison.
>><LOL>Damn the torpedoes.

You wrote:

>I found your personal account of the 'nine beeps' fascinating.

Not 'just mine' Chris. This was a matter of open discussion
among several of the members of the AIC e-mail List that
recalled the exact same detail.

>If this has been going on for centuries we would expect early
>experiencers to have reported not beeps but other sounds they
>were familiar with. The chirping or hooting of birds, for
>example. The key would seem to be that the nature of the sound
>heard must be identifiable by the experiencer. If the abduction
>phenomenon is real and truly includes this 'nine-noise' feature
>it would be logical to expect electronic beeps today instead of
>wilderness or knocking sounds. Indeed, the CEIII/IV experience
>has evolved externally from one involving nature spirits
>(fairies, etc.) to technologically advanced aliens. Your remark
>that "Maybe the 'aliens' have upgraded their hardware!" would
>actually be a good theory in this sense.

"When you ain't got nothin' you ain't got nothin' to lose!" I
was just making light of the difference between what Whitley has
reported (knocks) and the beeps I am reporting here. I have no
idea what the nature or origin of these odd sounds could be.
Honest, I don't pretend to know.

>All this would imply that the sounds have a function, like a
>signal to the brain following a session of hypnosis.

You may be closer to the mark than you think my friend. I hope you're wrong. It would reduce us to automatons awaiting a 'signal' to spring into action at the throw of a switch. Scary scenario to contemplate. But then all of this abduction business falls under the "scary scenario" heading! ;)

>You would
>not necessarily be aware of any physical or psychological change
>after or during a signal of this kind, and it would not
>necessarily mean an abduction would be about to take place. Any
>change or activity in the brain could be entirely internal with
>no external signs.

Again, what we have experienced would bear that out. We did not notice any "behavioral" or mood changes, and I don't recall the Beeps coinciding with any other 'anomalous' activity.

>What interests me right now is whether it can be demonstrated
>that reports of the 'nine sounds' phenomenon were published in
>the UFO literature prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will
>be forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find evidence of
>it?".)

Sorry, I have never been a big reader on the subject. I have tried (to no avail) to keep myself as "unpolluted" by the reports of others as I could. Because of the nature of my involvement that has been impossible. I am not aware if any reports of this particular detail exist in the literature prior to 1985. You will want to contact Budd or Dave Jacobs for those kinds of answers. If anyone knows, they will.

Regards,

John Velez
Human digital watch alarm ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:24:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:12:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:52:49 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims involves the
>>>sound of nine knocks in three series of three. Strieber
>>>associates the sounds he heard in 1986 with his own abductions
>>>and presents several cases in which the nine knocks form part of
>>>other people's visitor-related experiences (see Breakthrough and
>>>The Communion Letters).

>><snip>

>>>It would be interesting to hear from anyone else who has
>>>experienced the 'nine knocks' phenomenon. In view of claims
>>>involving raps and thuds throughout history, any banging noises
>>>that manifest in threes Û whether they total nine or not Û could
>>>be relevant to this study.

>
>>Hi Chris,

>
>>If I were to mention the detail I'm going to share on an
>>"Abductee List" hands would fly up. Here I'm afraid, I'm just
>>going to sound like a nutcase. So be it. After reporting that
>>I've been abducted by "aliens" from time to time throughout my
>>life, stuff like this detail is Mickey Mouse in comparison.
>><LOL>Damn the torpedoes.

>
>>I want to preface this note by saying that I don't think much of
>>Whitley Streiber or his books. Mr. Strieber is just too
>>inconsistent for my liking and seems to report/reveal
>>'phenomena' when it suits the plot of the book he is currently
>>writing. "The Secret School" is an example of what I'm talking
>>about. That said,...

>
>>I haven't heard "knocks." What myself and my wife have both
>>heard over the years (on rare occasion but consistently) is a
>>series of "beeps." Electronic sounding beeps that play in three
>>groups of three beeps each. Nine total. Then it stops for
>>awhile, and the cycle of beeps will play again. It can go on for
>>as long as an hour or better sometimes.

>
>>We have gone nuts some times going from room to room in the
>>house looking for the source of this 'beeping.' No matter which
>>room you are standing in, the "beeps" sound like they are
>>emanating from that room. We don't own any digital watches so we
>>know that watches aren't the cause. (It sounds like the beeping
>>of an electronic watch.)

>
>>And, it doesn't matter 'where' we live either. The beeps have
>>followed us in our three moves in the 32 years we have been
>>married. The "beeps" are a private running joke between my wife
>>and myself. I had no idea that they may be "abduction related"
>>until I started talking to other abductees.
>
>>I have received letters from people reporting the exact same
>>phenomena, and we have had extended discussions about this
>>'beeping' business on the AIC e-mail List as well as at a group
>>I attended four or five years ago at Budd's house. I have
>>heard of this before but not with 'knocks.' Isn't that odd? The
>>reports I have, (and that I have experienced myself) involve
>>electronic sounding beeps. Not "knocks." Maybe the "aliens" have
>>upgraded their hardware! <VBG>Hope this 'helps' somehow
>>although I can't imagine how. *I know I owe you an e-mail! I
>>haven't forgotten you. Been busy. ;)

Hi Mr. Bill, ;)

You wrote:

>You certainly are brave admitting such things on this List with
>all those wolves hiding in the dark ready to pounce on you, but

I'm not afraid of the big bad wolves! <LOL> My mom was right
Bill. Telling the simple truth is something you should never be
afraid of. I am able to speak/post with the confidence that
comes from knowing I am telling the truth. I always go out of my
way to just "tell it like it is" without embellishment or
"making the fish bigger" than it actually was. ;) After that, I
have no "fear."

>I am going to take a long chance myself and add a note to your
>revelation concerning "beeps".

See? It's not me, it's you! You're the "brave" one. I am an
admitted abduction experiencer. Many folks already think I'm
nuts or deranged. You on the other hand have a reputation as a
thoughtful and serious man. (At least I always think of you that
way) so it is -you- that has something to lose by making such an
admission. My rep (such as it is) has already been trashed
(socially) by my admissions/reports. Any new revelations I make
neither help nor hurt me. I think folks like you who have
'something to lose' are the "brave" ones. ;)

>Years ago when I investigated the Brian Scott case I recall he
>mentioned hearing beeps just as you have. But, there is more.
>Some of those beeps were recorded on audio tape.

Now that I'd like to hear! I can tell you immediately if it is
the same sound/pitch that myself and my wife have heard. Can you
send me a simple sound file with a sample of Brian's beeps?

>I have at least
>one of the tapes with a record of those mysterious beeps. I
>thought it might be associated with a signal or communication
>that Brian was receiving at the time.

I don't have enough evidence to convict, but my 'suspicion' is;
that it is 'some form' of communication or maybe even a sound
that is supposed to "trigger" some response. (ala Manchurian
Candidate)

>When he made a requested
>trip to Tiahuanaco and stood in the entrance portal of the
>Temple of Kalasasas, beeps were also recorded on tape. It was a
>strange case with traces of physical evidence which made it
>fascinating and compelling. I am sure there must be others who
>have reported this.

There are others Bill. As I mentioned in my original, we have
conducted lengthy dialogs on the AIC List (abductee List) about
precisely this topic - beeping sounds.

EBK had Lindy Tucker on his program who recorded "beeping"
sounds during UFO sightings!

So there is a documented connection between the Beeping and
some UFOs (whatever they may have been.) Interesting and
intriguing little detail this is. I hope we can learn more about

it as time passes. It's just one of many such 'details' that many abductees from all over the globe share in common.

We need a GD serious investigation! I've been trying to get one for years now. It's frustrating as hell but then I don't give up easily. ;)

Still here, still waiting,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

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

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:08:03 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:14:49 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:21:02 +0000
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

Previously, I wrote of the AA sign:

>>At the risk of seeming more nit picky than I usually am, doesn't
>>this seem a little out of place? I mean, in the past it has been
>>your position that none of the situations in AA were "ideal";
>>that this was all a very hurried and spontaneous event. Given
>>that context, don't you find it odd that they not only had the
>>contamination suits at the ready, but also had a room complete
>>with a warning sign about how long they were safe to be in
>>there?

>>If this were the first AA then how would they know? And if the
>>sign didn't apply to them, then what was it meant for? Also,
>>according to the clock, do the doctors stay in there more than
>>an hour? If they do, then it would seem that rules and
>>regulations aren't as severe as some suggest. On the other hand,
>>if they only stay an hour, then that would indicate they had
>>prior knowledge of how much exposure to an alien corpse was
>>considered "safe".

>>Does any of this seem odd to you?

Neil replied:

>It's all very odd, the sign say's 1 "hours" indicating it can be
>set to any length of "hours" not just 1, yet the reels of the AA
>span more than 1 hour and they're still in there?. But you could
>just read this as some other facility being used for a purpose
>it was not originally intended for.

Hi, Neil!

I suppose so, but why? Why look for detail in the footage then
dispute the meaning of the detail once you find it? Sure, you
could see this as some other facility or you could see this as
an indication that strict military rules were ignored which
would increase the likelihood that AA is bogus. You _could_ see
the sign as a multi use item, or you could see this as an
example of misspelling that the AA producers either missed or
didn't think would be noticed. Frankly, the symbols you see in
the photos are open to more interpretation than this sign is,
yet you see this sign only in a way that supports AA.
Considering the obvious context of the sign and your preferred
take on it, is it not surprising that others just don't seem to
see the debris symbols as clearly as you and Ed do?

Continuing, I wrote:

>>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted

>>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk
>>missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the
>>software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so
>>far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam
>>SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad
>>to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than
>>anything on disc.

>>I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and
>>grab frames for work in Photoshop.

Neil replied:

>Sorry Roger I can't help you here, I no longer have the
>original and though a Betacam dupe was made I do not have the
>facilities to copy this. It took a great deal of time and effort
>and the use of a local TV studio's equipment to obtain the
>original digitisation and it's not the sort of process I could
>go through again just for a further copy.

>I can only suggest, if you are opposed to loading the software
>on your own machines, that maybe you can hijack a friend or
>relatives computer for a while.

>The M2 demo software package provided can save and number
>individual frames to disk directly from the MPEG2 source file.

The MPEG2 will still be a generation away from the Beta. The
MPEG2 data rate is only 4.5 megs per second, I believe. Beta SP
is greater at 6 megs per second. If I digitize at 13, I'll still
get a better image than the MPEG2 material. How about if I send
you the \$35 you guys want as well as a blank BetaSP tape? That
should cover the cost of a dub. After all, Beta SPs are only 90
minutes at the longest. Then I'd be swimming in information.
Heck, I might even see things you guys don't!

Roger

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

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 15:34:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:22:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

>Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:42:50 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>John,

>Yes, those spheres we call "orbs" have been around for years.
>Seen in daylight they appear to be metallic spheres. Several of
>them in formation can hover at fixed positions and do not move
>when the wind blows. And, as you say, sometimes they move,
>sometimes slowly and sometimes rapidly.

Bill, allow me to share one with you if I may.

Back in 1997 I reported to Budd that there were approximately 15 of those 'things' including a large white boomerang shaped object (that tumbled end over end as it flew) that appeared in the skies over Jamaica Bay. (for an hour or better.)

Bill, I watched them come and go, hover in one spot and then dart away so fast the eye could hardly follow the speed, I watched three of them slowly drift together until they were in a perfect triangular formation, which then proceeded to rotate around an invisible central axis. All three objects locked in absolutely perfect unison. They performed maybe three or four of these rotations and then two of the objects broke formation, came to a stop, and then hovered in one spot. They weren't perfectly still when hovering. They appeared to 'jitter' in place, a slight but quick paced pendulum effect. One object/disc flew directly overhead, stopped, began to 'tumble' and flash colors as it did so. First a white flash, then a neon blue-green flash, then a dark neon 'bloody' red flash and the sequence would repeat. I had to stop watching it because my neck started to hurt from looking straight up.

I told Budd every detail of it at the time, and provided hand drawn sketches. My camera had no film in it that day and there was -no way- I was going to walk away from that sighting to go buy film. I was transfixed and nailed to that spot for the duration.

People who haven't witnessed stuff like that cannot possibly begin to understand how deeply and unalterably it changes you inside. How it shatters the whole world and your subsequent perceptions of it. It changes you. Forever. It all becomes, "your life before the sighting" and, "your life after the sighting." I think that's pretty universal. Like dying and being reborn. No diff that I can see. Only in my case being 'reborn' had nothing to do with "Jesus." It was a bunch of shiny white spheres and silvery discs playing games in the sky that killed 'old' John.

Wonders are happening right over our heads. I have accumulated a bunch of video of 'them'. I have posted single frame captures from the videos to the List along with as detailed a report as I could. I used to hope that one of the "experts" on the List, (hopefully an "objective one") would -call me on it- and

actually analyze the stuff.

Check this out:

Four years ago one of the UpDates List members who worked at a video lab (at a University in Japan) requested the material. I willingly provided him with everything I had. The only proviso I had placed on it was; that he would post the results of his analysis of the video to this List.

The guy wrote to me shortly afterward to tell me how excited he (and his colleagues) were about my video. He told me he wasn't ready to publish yet, but all indications were that I had captured images of a genuine "unknown" on tape. Wonderful, so I wait and I wait and I wait.

Long story short,...

The guy never wrote back, all my e-mail to him was bounced back to me with "addressee unknown" errors, he never contacted me, or posted any results, he dropped off the UpDates List, and I never got my tape back. S.O.B.!

That my friend is the kind of stuff that has made me the man I am today. Some crud eh? Like the Arizona MUFON guy that ripped off Tom's tape. ;)

For ordinary, honest people who are only seeking answers, and who are willing to cooperate with investigative efforts in any way that they can - this is one tough neighborhood! <LOL> You need the patience of a Saint. This has been a _titanic_ uphill all the way battle and a whale of a learning experience for me. I'm certain it is that way for you too. That's part of the reason I was so glad to see you back on the List. I love people who just keep getting up and doing what needs to be done. Regardless. It just shows a kind of old fashioned "Character" that is so rare in people now-a-days. ;)

>At night, they have been
>seen glowing with different colors. The peculiarity is that they
>glow, but do not produce glare or reflection from all that light
>emission.

Night lights are so hard to figure Bill. It's why I only skywatch during the day. I have to be able to train a camera lens or a pair of binocs on them before I get too excited. I need the visual confirmation that I am seeing something "unusual." Can't do that at night unless the thing is putting on a light show.

And yes, the close-up encounter I had in the late 70's involved a large, brilliant, (as bright as the sun) football shaped object that did not illuminate the surroundings. It was intensely bright but it didn't hurt your eyes to look at it. (As one would expect from something so luminous.)

>As always, the skeptics are seeking a conventional explanation,

That's always been okay by me Bill. How else would one go about an investigation? If you don't eliminate all the more prosaic explanations, you do not have an anomaly!

>but so far their conventional explanations have failed to
>explain what is seen on videos or video stills.

I agree 100% I feel the same way about abduction. I have been at this for about 7 years now. I still have not heard a theory or an explanation that 'fits' my own life experiences and recollections as well as the abduction scenario does. In my case, the "abduction glove" fits perfectly. (Apologies to O.J. ;)

>Balloons during
>the day or flares at night do not explain these orbs. I have
>videotaped numbers of balloons ascending in clear and cloudy
>skies. Flares have also been taped and compared.

My friend, I have taped the Moon, helicopters, airplanes at all altitudes, birds, insects, party balloons, and these "Orbs" as you call them ain't any of that other stuff. I have been an avid amateur astronomer for damn near 30 years. I have been observing

both day and night skies meticulously for all that time. I _am_ a highly skilled sky observer. (My buddy Greg Sandow will vouch for my sky watching skills.) I am very familiar with our skies and its contents. I wouldn't post reports of ordinary anything, much less balloons. It's just something that has to be dealt with Bill. These other folks weren't there to get the full whammy-jammy of the event. They see little white spots against a blue (or cloudy) background and they don't know what the hell they're looking at. I don't blame them. I blame the GD researchers who don't research anything, and the experts who don't even bat an eyelash at repeated reports of videotaped UFO sightings.

>Orbs have been
>seen at very close range (within 100 feet by some) and I would
>say that some of the stills Jaime showed on screen were as close
>as that.

There's a ton of good stuff around Bill. Until it all gets the "hairy eyeball" treatment by the guys who know how to do the science, it doesn't mean squat. All indications are that all of those guys are out to lunch at the moment. Asleep at the wheel. Comatose maybe? Don't sweat it. When the wake-up call comes and their cages get rattled real hard, they'll come to their senses or lose their minds.

Me? I'm an old New York City "Boyscout." Our version of "Be Prepared" was, "If you stay ready, you don't have to get ready!" <LOL>

>Some of these have been seen on the property of Aerospace
>facilities in the Antelope Valley by many residents in the area.
>They have been seen hovering above the ground brilliantly lit,
>yet not lighting the ground (photon absorbtion?). Orbs have been
>seen in company with the Big Black Triangles.

Hey man, are those reports posted anywhere? Are they in your files Bill or do you have a website up? I'd love to peruse some of those case histories. Especially the ones involving the aerospace facility. I can't help it, I just love it when UFOs 'stick it to the Man by invading their restricted airspace. Hopefully it will make some of those uniformed apes think twice before they go playing with nukes.) There may be a bigger kid on the block with a much bigger 'stick' than they have. ;)

>So, what are they? I do not profess to know and, John, I do
>not think we will find an answer on this list.

Amen to that my brother! Testify!!! <LOL>

>At one time the U.S.
>Air Force was concerned about air space intrusions, but now it
>is "ho hum, let them come".

What else can they do? If it really is a case of "our stuff against 'their' stuff" judging from what I have seen with my own eyes, we are in as deep sh*t as the Indians were against the White Man. Worse!

Much worse!

Regards,

John Velez

'Learning' to have the patience of a Saint. ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:28:20 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:30:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:40:24 -0000

>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:47:37 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Magonia Supplement no.34

>At least now I know why it was not possible to find Bob Easton,
>if that was a pseudonym. This was the name given in Skycrash and
>the name eventually referred to by Jenny Randles....But
>quite frankly, Bob Easton was not that important considering he
>had not done much research, as Kevin now admits to. The only
>information I had to go on was from Skycrash, Street, Butler and
>Randles and Randles wasn't giving much away.

Hi,

Georgina, once again you strive to create friction when the need
for none exists.

Had you asked me who Bob Easton was then I would have happily
told you. But, as you are aware, you chose just to ask me a few
questions via an e mail when writing your book.

So how you can seriously blame me for not answering a question
that you never even asked and that if you had asked I would have
had no reason whatsoever not to answer?

There is not and never has been the slightest mystery over who
Bob Easton is or what he did in this case and its totally absurd
for anyone to suggest otherwise. And certainly outrageous to
imply it is somehow my fault that you couldn't (or couldn't be
bothered) to find out who he was.

This is emphatically not a pseudonym. It is his real name. He
was the BUFORA investigations coordinator for the Essex/ East
Anglia area in 1981 and so at the time of the initial
investigation was in effect Dot Streets 'boss'. He had an early
coordination role in the case as a result of that happenstance.

I have no idea where he is now as he left Ufology many years
ago. But his role in the case brought together the two separate
strands of the case (such as it then was) in Feb 1981.

That is the Steve Roberts story - of which he was aware through
his investigator Dot Street - and the Watton radar story - of
which he was made aware by me. At that time the Roberts story
was reasonably considered unique by BUFORA and I was completely
unaware that anything else had been reported by anyone beyond
the Watton radar allegations never having heard of (let alone
met) Dot Street or Brenda Butler.

So - when Bob and I exchanged these stories during an inter
group information exchange (believe it or not it is possible for
'rival' groups to work together!) we both knew immediately that

what we had until then considered to be isolated and unverified tales were corroborative accounts that matched each other.

This was the primary reason why from very early on I 'knew' there was a case to pursue. So - in my opinion - this was not an inconsequential event.

So, sorry, but it isn't true that Bob Easton is some mystery figure or to imply that I have somehow failed to assist in your quest to find him.

>You need to ask yourself why your real name was not used by
>those who were supposedly working with you.

And perhaps you might explain why you haven't properly read 'Sky Crash' - which you say in your post was your source for this information - since Kevin McClure's role is clearly discussed alongside that of Bob Easton (thus pretty obviously showing them to be two separate people). (See page 36 - for example - of the paperback edition).

So I am afraid your post makes little sense. I certainly never used pseudonyms for any of the investigators involved in this case.

In fact Sky Crash makes plain when pseudonyms are used (eg with witnesses) by using an asterisk to denote them.

But - I am afraid - it is worse, because I kept copies of my reply to your e mail questions. Here is the relevant text - my response to what you asked me about the early days of the case when writing your book...

As anyone on this list can see - not only does my reply indicate no evidence for my alleged failure to help you, but in my reply to your questions BOTH Kevin McClure and Bob Easton were named by me and their role set out. So you could not have been unaware of them.

Here's the first part of my (quite lengthy) reply...

>Question 1
>#1. The reason for question 1 was that you quoted two
>different dates in your published writings, as the date (month)
>you first heard about the case. Because I am trying to get my
>facts as accurate as possible I asked you if you would confirm
>which date you started working on the case. Nothing sinister
>here.

(My answer)...Its simple. I was first told of the Watton radar story by Paul Begg in late January. He called me, explained how he had heard the tale and checked if I was interested in pursuing it. I said I was and he agreed to check with the witness. I arranged for two people to get involved in the study of the credibility of the story along with me. One was Peter Warrington, who specialised in UFO radar cases and had solved an incident involving a British Airways Trident (see my book 'Something in the Air' for details). For this he had built up extensive contacts with UK radar manufacturers and I believed his expertise would help verify the probability of the story being told. The other was Kevin McClure, who was a specialist in how rumour developed (cf his then booklet on the Welsh wave - 'Stars and Rumours of stars'). I went by this route as the witness was describing a chain of events that came second or third hand in some instances and I was interested to know to what extent rumour propagation would effect credibility. By the time all these strands came together to allow a talk with the radar operator it was a week or so later - early February. So the two dates do not actually contradict one another, it really depends on whether you put the start point at the receipt of the story or first interview. I started using February 1981 in published references as it was unnecessarily complicated to go into details. Then someone asked me about the contradiction like you did and I have since then used January as the correct start point. But we are talking about a few days between late Jan / early Feb 81 for the sequence of events to unwind.

>Question #2.)
>I asked you when you first informed Butler and Street about the Watton
>incident. To elaborate, you heard the story from Paul Begg in February 1981

>and I understand you misplaced the original notes, which you found in June
>1984. This was written in Skycrash. Pg 27. I was just wondering if you told
>Butler and Street the full story because from their statements they
>appeared not to have seen the notes or spoken to "David Potts" or heard
>about the full story until much later.

(My answer) ...As explained above, I heard of the story via Paul Begg in late January, recorded details in February and got nowhere verifying it. Watton denied all knowledge when I called. And because 'Potts' declined to go public I could not elaborate or put anything in writing as it might incriminate him. At the time I discovered his story I was an ordinary UFO investigator - not a BUFORA director of investigations. I had never heard of Brenda Butler and Dot Street. Sometime that Feb I spoke with Bob Easton, BUFORA's Anglia region investigations coordinator. I told him of the Watton story and asked if he could think of any way to check into it further. He said he would try to come up with suggestions - then told me that Norman Oliver (then a BUFORA officer - in fact he was journal editor at the time) had received news (I later learned it was via Lucius Farish) that alleged that a military encounter had recently occurred over several nights near Bentwaters. All Oliver knew was that a USAF serviceman had mentioned this on return from England. I have never seen that story documented anywhere and when I later asked Oliver he could not recall any details. Bob Easton also told me that he had a new investigator (Dot) who was looking into some lights seen by local people around late December. We mutually asked ourselves if these things were all connected. So far as I knew, Bob was going to contact Dot Street and convey this news to her. There was no reason why he wouldn't. He knew Dot. I didn't. He was her coordinator and I had just solicited his help on what to me was just an unproven story. I had involved virtually anybody who I thought could help in the two or three weeks I had known the story and there was absolutely no reason to keep it from Dot. So I was pretty sure Bob told her what was happening. In fact, once satisfied I could not go any further to verify the Watton story (and frankly not overly impressed with half baked rumours when I had other cases where witnesses were willing to talk to me openly and which were not 300 miles away) I decided to simply write a note on the matter for FSR (Flying Saucer Review). I hoped that anyone in Ufology with any ideas how to proceed or other stories that might tie in would get in touch. That short note (I think it was titled 'Military contact alleged at Air Base') was written on 21 February (the date is included in FSR) and was published over half a page in Vol 26 No 6, page iii. Issue dated March 1981. It does not name Brenda and Dot - because it was written before I learnt of their existence. But the fact is this statement (the first ever on the case I believe) proves very clearly I was not withholding any data on the Watton incident as I put it into the UFO community at the first possible opportunity. It would be rather pointless to 'not tell' anyone at the same time as it goes into what was then the biggest circulating UFO magazine in the UK, wouldn't it? I also mentioned the Watton story in an interview given to the London Evening Standard in May - as an example of a story I was then trying to track to source. Again this hardly fits a plan of trying to keep the story secret - and I am afraid is typical of the selective memory of some people about this case. If Brenda and Dot think I kept the story from them, they are wrong and the evidence conclusively shows that I went public with it literally within days of determining I was at an impasse trying to verify it - that being during mid / late February 1981.

That October 1981 I was appointed BUFORA Director of Investigations. One of the first things I did was gather together the various people who had spent eight months chasing this story at a meeting in London. Paul Begg, Bob Easton, Dot Street were certainly there. Not sure about Brenda as she was not a BUFORA member so might not have come. This was the first time I met Dot. We went through in detail where we all stood on our individual attempts to get somewhere with the case. Watton was discussed and I assumed Dot knew about it already (via Bob, her coordinator, or FSR). Certainly it was not secret and she gave no expression of surprise. But in any case she certainly knew of it now, just eight months on. This was the first time I had had any direct contact with Dot and there was not the slightest circumspection in any discussion of this case. Why on earth should there be? It makes no sense. I was trying to bring together as BUFORA D of I as many people as I could who were interested. That was tough because, frankly, nobody thought there was any hope of getting any hard evidence given the lack

of on record witnesses and the blanket denials by the base and MoD. Kevin McClure, Bob Easton etc dropped out pretty soon saying they could do no more. I did persuade Andy Collins (who was then a Ufologist and lived reasonably locally) to do some digging, but he never got very far either. As I believed the Watton witness and, now having met Dot, could see she was sure there was a case via the civilian witnesses she had talked with, I decided that the best step was to document properly what we had.

(There is much more, of course, but the above text pretty clearly shows that I did tell Georgina 19 months ago and over a year before her book was published just who Kevin McClure was, just who Bob Easton was and what role both men had in this case.... Or is there something I am missing here?)

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Serious Research - Jones

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:49:54 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:31:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Jones

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>a Council could work in practical terms.

>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>the focus. I reject outright the idea that the truth or falsity
>of UFO reality can be divined by deduction from scientific
>theory and generalizations about human perception.

>Given that we may fizzle out and get nowhere, I still think it
>is worth a try to have some serious, scientific dialogue in
>which we debate and discuss the factual evidence and whether or
>not it points (a) to an unexplained phenomenon and (b) to a
>nonearthly origin. Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and
>proponents be asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to
>focus on. Then all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the
>nominated cases.

>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>Ballooning, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission of
>where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

>James Easton's latest posting about pelicans sounded well
>researched and reasonable and had relevant information to offer,
>but how definitive is it? Bruce Maccabee already has disputed
>some of Easton's statements with some equally relevant
>considerations. Anyway, let's leave Arnold out of this since
>none of us considers it to be among the strongest evidential
>cases.

>I still believe a case study effort is worth a try, if for no
>other reason than to expose the pro and con reasoning to general
>scrutiny. Something combining a "debate" format and a "jury"
>judgment might prove to be interesting. I am willing to nominate
>cases and to debate their merits.

>Dick Hall

Again I think you are being idealistic. I do not mean to be
insulting when I say this, honestly I don't.

Can you get ten respected UFO persons to agree on what amounts
to ten good UFO cases? No I very much doubt it, let alone 100.

To say which, can you get one hundred people to agree on ten
good UFO persons? With all the bitchiness that goes on here on

updates this should indicate to you the disparity in the same forum, let alone _on mass_.

Another thing to consider, how are you going to get the researchers of these 100 cases to release their files for other people to study? Remember the furore over a certain researcher selling his files to the NIDS? Confidentiality is a must, and also a restriction.

I really would love to see a _global_ effort to move things forward. Please remember there are many researchers the world over, who have cases from all over the world, that would have to be included in this case study. The co-ordination of all that alone is a whole mountain of work.

If you really think that you can get something like this off the ground, I here and now, publicly offer you 100 hours of my time for administration, or research.

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 17:50:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:46:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

Hiya Chris,

There are two accounts of beeps on the PEER website from two different experiencers. See:

http://www.peermack.org/pers_exp6.html

and

http://www.peermack.org/pers_exp7.html

There's an MP3 of the latter (no, not a recording of the beeps, but the experience in the experimenter's own words) at:

<http://www.peermack.org/mp3/960229e.mp3>

I would like to credit and give thanks to my friend "W" for providing this most timely information. ;)

Regards,

John Velez,

Human digital watch alarm ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 18:25:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:50:41 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 00:04:10 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 12:07:19 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 7 Mar 2001 22:53:55 EST
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Non-Human craft, but not ETs. OK, whatever Bruce likes. After
>>>all, he said it, so he must believe it.

>>Yup.

>>Those who do not agree should have explanations at the ready
>>(explanations for UFO sightings, that is).

>Bruce:

>OK, I'll start with Donald Menzel's list of 110 explanations of
>UFO sightings, circa 1969, or so.

Fine. That's step one. Now it is necessary to narrow down on those explanations possible for a single sighting. Suppose we tackle the Officer Val Johnson sighting of August 1980 (police car damage, investigated by the Sheriff's dept of Warren county and CUFOs). Which one of the 110 explanations would you propose and are willing to defend?

How about the New Zealand sightings that involve multiple witnesses, color movie film, audio tape recordings made in real time on radar (with recorded conversations between the radar operator and the air crew). Which one of the 110 explanations would you pick for these sightings... or, if neccessary, which collection of explanations?

How about the 1986 Japan Airlines Sighting over Alaska?

How about the White Sands movie film of April, 1950, showing (by triangulation) fast moving, 30 ft sized objects at 150,000 ft?

(I could suggest more sightings, of course)

>Could you match me with one, that's just one, proven OI/NHI
>(Non-ET craft created by non-human intelligences)? Is it
>possible for List Members to go someplace to see it? Other than
>Gulf Breeze, that is?

>Cause otherwise, you're asking me to prove your hypothesis.

Your hypothesis, unstated, is that all sightings can be explained. I am just asking you to prove your hypothesis by demonstration: provide convincing explanations for sightings.

Now, I realize you don't have the time to provide convincing explanations for ALL sightings that have ever occurred. Why not just pick a few and we'll see if everyone agrees. (I'm sure everyone would agree if the explanation is convincing.)

After we find one of more sightings that cannot be convincingly explained then we can explore the OI/NHI possibilities.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: American White Pelicans - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 18:25:43 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:53:44 -0500
Subject: Re: American White Pelicans - Maccabee

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:26:57 +0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: American White Pelicans

>>From: Jim Klotz <jklotz77@foxinternet.net>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 09:56:49 -0800
>>
>>Subject: American White Pelicans

>Jim wrote:

>>A while back when the 'Pelican Theory' for the 1947 Arnold
>>sighting was being discussed on the list...

>>As I see that American White Pelicans are again being discussed,
>>I'm posting (with permission) the reply I received to my query.

<snip>

>I don't know what specific experience Grettenberger has
>regarding White Pelicans, however, I did know someone who was
>familiar with this species - Peter Kingsmill, Director General
>of The Redberry Pelican Project (Canada) Foundation.

>When several Pacific North-west ornithologists told me,
>individually, that they recognised what Arnold was possibly
>describing, I contacted Peter Kingsmill.

>Explaining the nature of this 'unusual' enquiry and what had
>been deduced, I asked if he could please offer an informed
>judgement.

>As published in the 'Fortean Times' article, he responded:

>"Everything in Arnold's description [...] points to the strong
>possibility he saw a flock of American White Pelicans, the
>formation, the allusion to the tail of a Chinese kite, etc. I
>have also been baffled by optical illusions of distance when
>these birds are against a backdrop of hills."

Everything?

I wonder if Kingsmill would comment on the possibility that
pelicans could outrun Arnold's plane.

>It wasn't mentioned in the article that he added, "Incidentally,
>your contact from the Pacific Northwest has made a pretty
>accurate assessment".

>When I later summarised the research conclusions, I again
>contacted Peter Kingsmill.

>He wrote, "VERY interesting stuff, which I feel very possible
>(unexaggerated)".

>Could John Grettenberger please be informed about the overall

>context, either by forwarding a copy of this response or the
>actual article which was published. A transcript is on my web
>site, at:

><http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/saucers.htm>

>His comments now, when armed with all the facts, would be of
>great interest.

>Could these please be requested?>

>Does he still maintain the premise is unlikely, or will he alter
>his opinion and if so, why?. Perhaps, once he appreciates the
>entire perspective, he can even offer some informative insight.

>Jim, your own comments would also of course be welcome.

>Has this clarified at least these issues for you?

Draw a map.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 18:25:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:55:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>a Council could work in practical terms.

>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>the focus. I reject outright the idea that the truth or falsity
>of UFO reality can be divined by deduction from scientific
t>heory and generalizations about human perception.

>Given that we may fizzle out and get nowhere, I still think it
>is worth a try to have some serious, scientific dialogue in
>which we debate and discuss the factual evidence and whether or
>not it points (a) to an unexplained phenomenon and (b) to a
>nonearthly origin. Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and
>proponents be asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to
>focus on. Then all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the
>nominated cases.

>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>Ballooning, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission of
>where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

>James Easton's latest posting about pelicans sounded well
>researched and reasonable and had relevant information to offer,
>but how definitive is it? Bruce Maccabee already has disputed
>some of Easton's statements with some equally relevant
>considerations. Anyway, let's leave Arnold out of this since
>none of us considers it to be among the strongest evidential
>cases.

>I still believe a case study effort is worth a try, if for no
>other reason than to expose the pro and con reasoning to general
>scrutiny. Something combining a "debate" format and a "jury"
>judgment might prove to be interesting. I am willing to nominate
>cases and to debate their merits.

The idea to put a case on the table for analysis is not new.
That has been done here over the last several years, with
several cases having been ground into fine powder, the Arnold
case being one. The Arnold case illustrates how contentious can
become an argument over whether or not a particular explanation
is correct or at least convincing. (Note that you cannot always
determine whether or not an explanation is correct, but you can
determine (to your own satisfaction) if an explanation is
convincing.) To me the pelican explanation is not convincing,
taking into account all the "changes" or "reinterpretations" of

Arnold's report that are necessary to accept it (blindingly bright reflections? Arnold unable to realize that they were traveling more slowly than his airplane? Draw a Map!). But aside from that, one hesitates to post one sighting, to say nothing of a hundred, because it requires a huge teaching/learning process to bring everyone up to speed on a particular case so that all the technical details are understood and all the fine points of argument are appreciated. Consider that Arnold's sighting involved one observer and lasted a couple of minutes and has generated hundreds of hours of discussion over the years! (Many hours just within the last two years).

Can you imagine what it would be like to discuss the New Zealand sightings of December 31, 1978, which involved 8 people in toto, along with radar, color movie film and tape recordings made on the plane during the sighting. It is a documentable fact that Phil Klass and I exchanged hundreds of single spaced pages (in fact, I think it was well over 1,000 pages) of correspondence about the various aspects of those sightings over a period of 5 years (1980-1985). Of course, there is a greater payoff here, because the color movie film provides some hard evidence that something objective really happened and you can see what it looked like, at least to the camera.

Less complicated but of great interest in another way is the May 29, 1949 Rogue River sighting that involved 5 witnesses, two with binoculars, who had a daylight sighting of a pancake-shaped object. It is clear from the description that it was either the "real thing" (anomalous craft) or a hoax. And I concluded it wasn't a hoax (witnesses reported it to the security office at Ames Research Laboratory where they worked on classified military aircraft technology).

Then, of course, we have McMinnville which has produced a tremendous amount of argumentation over the years. Clearly either a hoax or the real thing.

I guess the bottom lie is that if one or several cases are put up for "grabs" then don't expect a quick resolution to either "explained" or "unexplained."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

More 'MJ-12 Documents'?

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:03:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:03:10 -0500
Subject: More 'MJ-12 Documents'?

From: ebk <updates@sympatico.ca>

Source: The Majestic Documents - Evidence That We Are Not Alone

<http://majesticdocuments.com/press/3-01.html>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

More Evidence of U.S. Involvement with Extraterrestrial Crash Recoveries

REDWOOD CITY, California, March 13, 2001. The Majestic documents investigation team has just posted 27 documents comprising 65 pages of classified Majestic and authentication supporting material. In addition to new documents, the Witness Section, Majestic Personnel, Supporting Documents, and Document Sources all were expanded.

In the "Documents Obtained in 2000" section are summary abstracts of seven documents comprising 19 pages of new material ranging in classification from Double Top Secret to Unclassified that provide stunning new evidence for pre-1947 (Roswell) UFO events. Fascinating new information reveals the establishment of the Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit (IPU) as a result of two UFO crashes in 1942 shortly after the Los Angeles Air Raid (a famous UFO event in February 1942). Another document discusses the CIA, UFOs, and Congress and how the CIA in fact briefed some congressional House and Senate committees in the late 50's on UFOs. There is even a pitch by Dr. Edward Teller to President Regan about the Space Defense Initiative (SDI) in which he clearly shows a high degree of familiarity with the UFO subject. Explore these and other documents at:

www.majesticdocuments.com/documents/2000.html

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

P-47/CANUFO: 1947 UFO Wave Canadian Media

From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@JPS.NET>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:40:35 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:56:50 -0500
Subject: P-47/CANUFO: 1947 UFO Wave Canadian Media

These are selected reports from a database I compiled from 1169 newspaper clippings from 97 Canadian newspapers represented containing close to 75,000 column lines. I strongly suspect that this sample of the worldwide media coverage will reflect the same findings if one was to take a look at a larger sample since most of the stories were wire stories that were repeated over and over at different locations.

This first report summarizes each newspaper's contribution to the total in both articles published and column lines printed. Of note is that no newspaper published any higher than 5.3% (HALIFAX HERALD) in this article sample, but in terms of column lines printed the WINDSOR DAILY STAR walked away from the remainder newspapers by printing almost 20% of the total sample of 75,000 column lines. Most newspapers had a comparable percentage of articles printed to column lines printed for the exception of two, TORONTO GLOBE AND MAIL with twice the output of printed lines to articles published, 6.52% to 3.42% and the WINDSOR DAILY STAR with almost four times the output of column lines to articles published 19.97% to 4.88%.

Report R6 - PROJECT 1947 - CANADA

Newspapers Lines	Articles		Column
AMHERST DAILY NEWS .67%	9	.77%	502
ATHABASCA ECHO .03%	1	.09%	21
CAMBRIDGE GALT REPORTER .09%	3	.26%	65
CAMPBELL RIVER COURIER - VANCOUVER ISLAN .05%	1	.09%	35
CARBERRY NEWS EXPRESS .01%	1	.09%	9
CARNDUFF GAZETTE-POST-NEWS .08%	1	.09%	59
CHILLIWHACK PROGRESS .31%	2	.17%	231
COQUITLAM HERALD .05%	1	.09%	35
COURTENAY COMOX DISTRICT FREE PRESS .22%	7	.60%	165
COURTENAY-COMOX ARGUS .45%	5	.43%	337
DIDSBURY PIONEER .07%	2	.17%	53
DRUMHELLER MAIL .04%	1	.09%	32
DUNCAN-COWICHAN LEADER .41%	4	.34%	307
EDMONTON BULLETIN .74%	7	.60%	552
EDMONTON JOURNAL 1.11%	24	2.05%	832
ESTEVAN MERCURY .10%	1	.09%	72

FISHERMAN'S ADVOCATE .25%	4	.34%	186
FISHERMAN, THE .09%	2	.17%	71
FLIN FLON DAILY MINER .11%	3	.26%	80
FORT WILLIAM TIMES-JOURNAL 1.39%	12	1.03%	1039
FRASER VALLEY RECORD .10%	2	.17%	74
GRANDBOOK COURIER .01%	1	.09%	9
GRANDE PRAIRIE HERALD .07%	2	.17%	53
HALFMOON BAY COAST NEWS .02%	1	.09%	13
HALIFAX HERALD 3.67%	62	5.30%	2740
HAMILTON SPECTATOR .68%	13	1.11%	507
HANNA HERALD .04%	1	.09%	33
HUMBOLDT JOURNAL .03%	1	.09%	20
INDIAN HEAD NEWS .01%	1	.09%	10
INNISFAIL PROVINCE .20%	5	.43%	149
KAMLOOPS SENTINEL .03%	1	.09%	23
KELOWNA CAPITAL NEWS .02%	1	.09%	15
KELOWNA COURIER .14%	3	.26%	102
KENTVILLE ADVERTISER .03%	1	.09%	26
KINGSTON WHIG-STANDARD .21%	7	.60%	157
KIRKLAND LAKE NORTHERN DAILY NEWS .72%	13	1.11%	541
LA PRESSE 2.31%	37	3.17%	1730
LADYSMITH CHRONICLE .04%	1	.09%	29
LAKE COWICHAN BULLETIN .20%	8	.68%	152
LE DEVOIR .16%	1	.09%	120
LE DROIT 1.58%	23	1.97%	1179
LE SOLEIL 1.99%	18	1.54%	1487
LETHBRIDGE HERALD .35%	16	1.37%	261
LONDON EVENING FREE PRESS 1.81%	31	2.65%	1353
MONCTON L'EVANGELINE .11%	2	.17%	83
MONTREAL GAZETTE 3.38%	35	2.99%	2526
MONTREAL STAR .04%	5	.43%	30
MOOSE JAW TIMES-HERALD .15%	2	.17%	114
NANAIMO DAILY FREE PRESS 2.54%	46	3.93%	1902
NELSON DAILY NEWS 3.22%	29	2.48%	2410
NEW WESTMINSTER BRITISH COLUMBIAN 2.70%	24	2.05%	2019
NEWCASTLE NORTH SHORE LEADER .03%	1	.09%	26
NOKOMIS TIMES .03%	1	.09%	20
NORTH BATTLEFORD NEWS .10%	2	.17%	76
NORTH BATTLEFORD OPTIMIST .09%	2	.17%	67
NORTH BAY DAILY NUGGET 1.30%	25	2.14%	975
NORTH SHORE REVIEW	2	.17%	46

.06%			
OTTAWA EVENING CITIZEN	47	4.02%	2372
3.17%			
OTTAWA JOURNAL	10	.86%	331
.44%			
OWEN SOUND SUN-TIMES	3	.26%	214
.29%			
PAS NORTHERN MAIL	3	.26%	91
.12%			
PORT ALBERNI WEST COAST ADVOCATE	14	1.20%	641
.86%			
PORT ARTHUR NEWS-CHRONICLE	40	3.42%	1895
2.53%			
PORT COQUITLAM HERALD	1	.09%	32
.04%			
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE LEADER	3	.26%	66
.09%			
PRINCE ALBERT DAILY HERALD	5	.43%	213
.28%			
PRINCE RUPERT DAILY NEWS	1	.09%	34
.05%			
RED DEER ADVOCATE	1	.09%	8
.01%			
REGINA LEADER-POST	39	3.34%	2522
3.37%			
REVELSTOKE REVIEW	1	.09%	114
.15%			
SASKATOON STAR-PHOENIX	8	.68%	988
1.32%			
SAULT ONTARIO DAILY STAR	24	2.05%	750
1.00%			
SEDGEWICK COMMUNITY PRESS	1	.09%	27
.04%			
ST. JAMES SPRINGFIELD LEADER	2	.17%	152
.20%			
ST. JOHN'S EVENING TELEGRAM	3	.26%	108
.14%			
ST. STEPHENS ST. CROIX COURIER	3	.26%	287
.38%			
STEVENSON MARPOLE RICHMOND REVIEW	1	.09%	34
.05%			
STONEWALL ARGUS	1	.09%	7
.01%			
SUDBURY DAILY STAR	22	1.88%	298
.40%			
SYDNEY POST-RECORD	18	1.54%	1134
1.52%			
THREE HILLS CAPITAL	2	.17%	19
.03%			
TIMMINS ONTARIO DAILY PRESS	15	1.28%	565
.76%			
TORONTO DAILY TRIBUNE	42	3.59%	2268
3.03%			
TORONTO EVENING TELEGRAM	28	2.40%	1882
2.52%			
TORONTO GLOBE AND MAIL	40	3.42%	4871
6.52%			
TRAIL DAILY TIMES	4	.34%	73
.10%			
VANCOUVER DAILY PROVINCE	7	.60%	443
.59%			
VANCOUVER NEWS HERALD	22	1.88%	1063
1.42%			
VANCOUVER SUN	44	3.76%	2225
2.98%			
VERMILION STANDARD	2	.17%	42
.06%			
VICTORIA DAILY COLONIST	51	4.36%	2865
3.83%			
VICTORIA DAILY TIMES	22	1.88%	1187
1.59%			
VICTORIA NEWS HERALD	1	.09%	11
.01%			
WATROUS MANITOU	3	.26%	94
.13%			
WINDSOR DAILY STAR	57	4.88%	14926
19.97%			
WINNIPEG FREE PRESS	36	3.08%	3116
4.17%			
WINNIPEG TRIBUNE	25	2.14%	1028
1.38%			

Total # of Newspapers: 97 Articles: 1169 Col-Lines: 74756

To: "canufo@yahoogroups.com" <canufo@yahoogroups.com>
 From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
 Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 06:27:44 -0800
 Subject: [canufo] 1947 Wave (Canadian Press) on Shape, Size and Kenneth Arnold

Back in 1996 I took all the 1947 Canadian newsclippings available to me at that time (1169 clippings) and developed a database which attempted to identify data of relevance from each newsclipping. I developed a total of 151 separate data elements in an attempt to analyse possible data patterns related to the stories published and media influence. Some of the reports generated and the database were distributed to Canadian members of this list that were present at the MUFON Grand Rapids extravaganza. The following data is from that database.

Size of object identified and reported in the news stories

Available database entries	1169
no size identified	1027
less than 1 foot	22
1-3 feet	53
3-10 feet	10
10-30 feet	9
30-100 feet	7
100-300 feet	2
greater than 300 feet	1
greater than aircraft	9
apparent size - baseball	1
apparent size - basketball	6
apparent size - golf ball	5
size stated as unknown	17

Of those sightings where the size was identified, the greatest majority was for alleged objects smaller than 3 feet in diameter. Saucer descriptions in the news stories made references to table top cups and saucers which could have implanted a small size in the reader's mind when they read the initial stories. Most of the alleged objects as seen by the numbers above would not have been able to carry any occupants unless they were the size of a household lizard.

Shape of object identified and reported in the news stories

Available database entries	1169
no shape identified	579
blimp shape	1
boomerang shape	1
cylinder shape	5
diamond shape	2
disc shape	537
donut shape	10
other	61
oval shape	23
sphere shape	19
starlike shape	18
teardrop shape	9
shape stated as unknown	96

Of those sightings where the size was identified, the greatest majority was for alleged objects shaped as a disc. The boomerang shape was a follow-on article on Kenneth Arnold. This was the only article in the entire wave as reported in the Canadian Press that mentioned Arnold's objects as crescent-shaped (boomerang shape as adopted for this database). Obviously the influence of the media in wrongly categorizing Arnold's shape in its initial reporting can be seen by the above numbers.

Canadian articles sighting Kenneth Arnold's original sighting

Available database entries	1169
Arnold sighting - yes	10
6/25/47 AP DISC SHAPED	
6/25/47 AP DISC SHAPED	
6/26/47 AP DISC SHAPED	
6/26/47 AP DISC SHAPED	
6/27/47 AP DISC SHAPED	

6/29/47 AP UNKNOWN SHAPE
6/29/47 AP UNKNOWN SHAPE
6/29/47 ? UNKNOWN SHAPE
7/4/47 AP NO MENTION
6/26/47 UP CRESCENT SHAPED (LISTED AS BOOMERANG

UP ABOVE)

Arnold sighting - no 1159

Dates are for the wirestory date. In most cases they actually appeared the following day in the newspapers running the wire story. The UP story was a follow-up story in the Toronto Daily Tribune of 6/27/47 titled "Still Insists He Saw Mystery Speed Planes". It describes Arnold's sighting as shiny and flashing, crescent-shaped planes or pilotless missiles flying in formation. For media analysts and social scientists on the list I categorized this 24 line article as neutral, episodic and anecdotal.

Enjoy the stats.

Ed Stewart

--

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [canufo](http://canufo.com)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:39:43 +1300
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:04:16 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:04:16 +1300

>Previously, William asked:

<snip>

>>>2. Using the same techniques can the words following the
>>>"DANGER....." sign above and to the left of the phone be
>>>deciphered?

>Neil replied:

>>The sign says
>> DANGER
>>Maximum Working
>> Time 1 Hours

>Hi, Neil!

<snip>

>If this were the first AA then how would they know? And if the
>sign didn't apply to them, then what was it meant for?

Roger

Do we really know if this is the first autopsy?

If the sign isn't meant for the AA I'm sure there were many other hazardous substances induced into, or considered at that time to be hazardous to the human body. What it does show tho, is that whatever was going to be worked on in that particular area would be "restricted!" at least.

To hazard a guess, perhaps the "adjustable" "DANGER" sign and the Contamination Suits go hand in hand for that area/lab(?) and in this case are purely "precautionary"

<snip>

>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted
>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk
>missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the
>software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so
>far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam

>SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad
>to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than
>anything on disc. I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and
>grab frames for work in Photoshop.

With all due respect Roger you have stated you work with
videotape and very familiar with the workings of such. The AA
CDs are produced on MPEG2 files, which, as I understand it are
the professionals standard.

I find it difficult to accept that you don't have some
viewing/editing programs on one of your computers able to see
the CDs if you were truly wishing to contribute to this
discussion with everyone seeing the same images.

As Ed explained the BetacamSP copy was only loaned to Neil, so
to do what you're asking seems to be a pretty difficult task
especially seeing as you can't or won't open the CDs already
sent.

If the subject is getting so tiresome to you who's to say you
won't be too tired, or to have completely "lost interest" to
view a BetacamSP or NTSC copy.

Fairs fair mate.

Regards as Always

William

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'-

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: 14 Mar 2001 01:35:12 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:06:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'-

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:40:28 -0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

Hello Georgina/list,

I have ploughed through the "questions" posed by Larry, and think that I have extracted the pertinent ones that relate directly to your book.

I regret having to play the role of grand inquisitor, but if what Larry suggests is not true, then we should be presented with the opposing evidence.

I should point out, I have read neither your book, nor Larry's, partly because of the hype surrounding both books, and partly due to the fact that I have a backlog of about a dozen books that I have bought but not had the time to read yet! I would, however, be obliged if you would respond to the questions that Larry has raised below. I can guess at the answers to some of them, and some are so trivial as to be of no real importance, but taken as a whole, Larry seems to have a point.

I refer to Larry's numbering of the questions:

Q#2. Did you take account of previous witness statements in researching your book? If so, were you selective as to which versions you chose to use?

Q#3. Were you aware of the two distinct branches of the 81st Security police?

More importantly, what do you mean specifically by "surface to air" weapons, and did you verify their availability to the 81st?

Q#6. Did you visit the locations involved at night in the course of your research for the book?

Q#8. Regarding Larry's contemplation of suicide-he plainly refutes your remarks, what do you base your assertions on?

Q#12. I don't know if Larry is getting into semantics here, or he is suggesting that there was no communication between the "Aeronaut" entities and Williams, what is your basis for the interpretation that Larry said there was any such communication?

Q#13. What led you to say that Larry saw a "huge machine land"?

Q#14. What gave you the impression that Larry was "surprised" that Verrano took part in the show?

Q#15. Larry apparently refutes your statement that he was "talking to everyone" about the event. What gave you the impression that he did?

Q#17. Is Larry correct in his contention that the presence of

Williams at the event is supported by earlier interviews with participants? If so, what causes you to choose to ignore those earlier interviews?

Q18#. Larry refutes your assertion that he was not cleared to work in the Weapons Storage Area. What causes you to think he wasn't?

Q21#. On the question of Larry accepting an offer by Brenda Butler of false information, did you misquote Brenda? Can you support the quote by Larry that he denies making with a recording?

Regards, Joe

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:17:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
>Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
>Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

Bruce wrote:

>Easton has returned on the backs of the pelicans.

Bruce,

You know how it goes; I couldn't find an available beamship, or one of the Gulf Breeze models, and those ungainly 'Trent' saucers are so 'declassé' - people keep laughing and pointing out the design was modelled on a 1950's rear-view car mirror.

>At one point he says I no longer mention brightness of reflection as an argument against pelicans.

I said you no longer challenged that 'shiny' pelicans didn't exist. I easily proved to you they did.

>So far as I know, no ornithologist or glider pilot or whatever >has compared the reflection from a pelican to the brightness of >a welder's arc.

I'm also not aware of anyone other than Arnold who described undulating flight as 'like skipping a saucer across water'.

What's Arnold describing - it's a 'blinding flash', or a 'dazzling' light.

Are you seriously suggesting that no-one has ever seen this being reflected by an enormous, glossy, white-plumaged bird, with a 30 foot area of wingspan?

Evidently not, as you acknowledge I've cited examples. I'll reference some new ones in a moment.

So what are you saying? That Arnold's mention of a 'blinding flash' isn't comparable to a 'dazzling flash', because he used a comparative, 'arc like' simile?

Or are you just seizing at stalks of threshed grain.

More significantly, Arnold was satisfied this had to be consistent with birds or he wouldn't have confirmed "I, at first, thought they were geese". Remember, he supposedly made that determination after the 'bright flash' had caught his attention. Although this depends on which version of Arnold's account is most reliable. As you know, the lengthy narrative in that inaugural KWRC radio interview doesn't mention anything about those early 'flashes' - Arnold simply claims he suddenly, "noticed to the left of me a chain which looked to me like the tail of a Chinese kite, kind of weaving and going at a terrific speed across the face of Mt. Rainier".

Even if it was a 'flash' which first caught his attention, Arnold confirmed that when the actual objects were first noted,

he thought they were Snow Geese.

If you still wonder why Arnold would ever remotely have considered Snow Geese, to the extent he rationalised they wouldn't be flying at such altitude (which we was incidentally wrong about) or heading south at that time of year, alas, only Arnold could have explained this to you.

All I know is that before he decided these were jets, Arnold thought they were Snow Geese. And that's all we need to know.

>However, he has pointed out that ornithologists and bird
>watchers have referred to bright reflections from pelicans. How
>can this be? Any diffuse reflecting surface can have a "glint"
>which is a brighter than normal reflection when the light source
>is almost aligned with the surface. In this case it means that
>the pelican is nearly between the observer and the sun so the
>sunlight causes a grazing reflection from the pelican feathers.
>In the case of Arnold this does not apply: the sun was to the
>west of Arnold and the UFOs were to the east (Easton has not
>disputer this.... yet...) so any reflection off the pelicans
>would be the normal diffuse reflection. They would have appeared
>no brighter than the snow reflection ...and ,in fact may well
>had been less bright than the reflection from snow on Mt.
>Rainier.

As with suggestions that White Pelicans are not indigenous to the Western Cascades, or can't travel south in June, it's also surprising that anyone would think such as basic factor as the local conditions would never have been investigated.

This was discussed with people who do actually understand the nature of light being reflected from feathers and have many years experience observing birds, as opposed to guessing from a vehemently predisposed position.

I have published much of this material before, although not all of it. The following is part of extensive discussions with local ornithologists and begins after I had first raised the topic of Arnold's sighting. The question was - does local expertise recognise anything in Arnold's descriptions which indicates the formation of nine objects might have been an indigenous bird species:

[BEGIN]

James Easton writes, re UFO's:

>On 24 June, 1947, Kenneth Arnold, a successful salesman and
>experienced search and rescue pilot, took off in his small plane
>from Chehalis, Washington en route to Yakima. Close to Mineral,
>Washington and about 25 miles from Mount Rainier, he noticed a
>formation of 9 unusual objects flying from north to south.

<snip>

>"They didn't fly like any aircraft I had ever seen before...The
>elevation of the first craft was greater than that of the last.
>They flew in a definite formation but erratically. ...Or maybe
>it would be best to describe their flight characteristics as
>very similar to a formation of geese,

<snip>

>Arnold dismissed geese as an explanation due to the reflective
>nature of the objects and his estimate of their speed and
>distance.

<snip>

>"At the time I did not get the impression that the flashes were
>emitted by them, but rather that it was the sun's reflection
>from the extremely highly polished surface of their wings".

Arthur C. Clarke recounts in one of his 1960's nonfiction books (Profiles of the Future'?) a similar sighting of 'skipping saucers' off the coast of Sri Lanka that (as he knew they would) turned out to be gulls with sunlight reflecting off the water onto their underwings where it was alternatively visible and invisible in a regular pulsating pattern.

This isn't an uncommon sight, either, though it usually requires a particular set of conditions. First, calm water; second, low sunrise or sunset angle to the light; third, a slightly distorting horizon heat-haze sometimes enhances the illusion but it's not mandatory; fourth, the birds, usually gulls, moving along the horizon need to be flying just off the water and to be sufficiently far off that the observer can't make out any features on them including shape. Seen it a ton of times. and I expect one could see it at virtually every seaside in the world where distant gulls fly over brightly-lit water.

So, on to Mr. Arnold's description that started this whole damn thing about UFO's (part of my misspent youth was spending a few thousand hours as an amateur astronomer and I never got to see even one UFO that really baffled me, he grumbled). Given the location, 25 mi off Mt Rainier's glacial sides, ice would be a great substitute reflector and would easily blast enough sunlight back up onto birds' underwings to make them reflect very brightly. Just look at the excruciating whiteness of the underwings of an adult white-headed gull such as a Herring or Glaucous-winged flying over snow on a sunny winter day.

Given the time of year, and that, if Arnold were looking at birds whether or not he knew it, what would they likely be? Canada Geese come to mind immediately, most other large waterfowl being in the North, and he mentions geese as a possibility. But what would Canada geese be doing high up over Mt Rainier in late June? Heading for a molting lake, probably. Could they reflect that much light? Certainly, particularly if over ice. How about gulls? Well, which gulls are likely then? It's a little ways inland, so Glaucous-winged Gull isn't likely, but California Gull would be.

The formation's possible: gulls may fly in ragged 'V's, but they don't necessarily maintain uniformity in the vertical as they might in the horizontal, and so gulls might fly in the formation Arnold describes.

There's another possible candidate species in the area at that time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high altitude would even more produce every detail of the phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-breeder southbound White Pelicans.

They'd have been large enough to visible for a good distance, they fly in formation, and if the light were reflecting just right off a large nearby glaciated peak, their comparatively vast white underwing area would reflect a ton of light in exactly the pattern described by Arnold.

I'd submit that the hypothesis of a small southbound flock of failed- or non-breeder American White Pelicans observed by someone unfamiliar with underwing reflectivity would provide the same phenomena and be at least as good an alternative possibility than seeing artefacts from another planet.

Darn it.

>Appreciating this is perhaps something of an unusual query to
>the list

And a pleasure to think about. Lots of fun. Thanks, James!

Michael Price.

In a message dated 97-11-20 07: Michael Price writes:

>>There's another possible candidate species in the area at that
>>time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile
>>and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high
>>altitude would even more produce every detail of the
>>phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-
>>breeder southbound White Pelicans.

Oh no! Another myth debunked. But, you've just gotta believe.

Yikes Michael! Are we of like minds or what?! When I first read the original post from James Easton, White Pelicans was the first thing that came to mind as I was reflecting back on an

ultra-high flying southbound formation I saw a few years ago over the Barancas in western Durango, Mexico, east of Mazatlan. It was a fluke that I detected them at all by unaided eye. Even in the bins, I was perplexed about what they were for awhile, at first not even sure they were birds. Strange lighting and angle it was.

I spend more time than just about anyone out exposed and looking at the sky. Much to my dismay, I've yet to see anything that couldn't be explained. I'm taking it personal by now, and am convinced that I've been singled out and left out. :-/

Richard Rowlett.

>>There's another possible candidate species in the area at that
>>time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile
>>and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high
>>altitude would even more produce every detail of the
>>phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-
>>breeder southbound White Pelicans.

Michael, my first thought when I started reading your analysis was white pelican. Several years ago, when training a good birder in the finer details of splitting migrating hawks into species, age, etc at long distances at the beginning of the fall migration season (i.e. training him to run our count), we saw distant white "blurps" fading in and out of visibility many miles north. This was at the Goshutes, i.e. on the Utah/Nevada border. It was near sunset. It was obvious that the sun was reflecting on their underwings. They'd disappear momentarily and then reappear in sequence. They were flying east-to-west and we first spotted them somewhat to the northeast. I pegged them as white pelicans almost immediately, as the whole cadence of the thing matched the way white pelicans will soar in line (in this case - they'll also "V" up), and rather than flap all at once, often will each begin to flap as each reaches the position where the previous bird began to flap. Same with turning, etc. Of course, they'll also do this in more of a synchronized formation, too, but I'm sure you've all seen white pelicans flap and glide in the kind of pattern I'm describing.

I couldn't think of any bird that would show such a cadence and literally twinkle white while switching from soaring to flapping.

As they continued heading west, of course the northerly component of their distance from us diminished (i.e. they got closer :) and the squat battleship like profile of the pelicans were noticeable.

It was very cool, actually. Among other things, the trainee started believing me when I told him a distant accipiter was a sharpie, not a Coop (or vice-versa).

>I'd submit that the hypothesis of a small southbound flock of
>failed- or non-breeder American White Pelicans observed by
>someone unfamiliar with underwing reflectivity would provide the
>same phenomena and be at least as good an alternative
>possibility than seeing artefacts from another planet.

Having spent a lot of time watching pelicans, I'm convinced they are artefacts from another planet :)

Don Baccus.

James Easton writes:

>This is obviously of great interest and I'm extremely grateful.

>If the "gap" Arnold mentions is a known feature of Pelican
>formations, perhaps someone could kindly confirm for the record.

Fortuitous, in my opinion; all line-abreast, -diagonal and -astern flocking birds develop gaps and fill them in randomly.

>"What startled me the most was the fact that I could not find
>any tails on them".

From a small plane, looking for such relatively small body

features as tails is like a grown man standing above a penny on the ground and trying to make out the date.

>Arnold stated that, "the time was about 3:00 PM and the sun was >just slightly to the southwest of being directly overhead" and >also estimated that the objects "were pretty much on the horizon >to me which would indicate that they were near the same >elevation as me".

They're on the horizon and he's looking for _tails_? Holy Nelly, that's ambition for ya. Well, that would be 2 PM without Daylight Saving Time, so the sun position would be as he said. Assuming he was looking at birds, the flipflop appearance of these birds would be visible whether higher, same altitude, or lower as the sun might be reflecting strongly and directly off white upper and/or underwing surfaces, but the underwings might be catching light from the same source as caused the flashes mentioned further on.

[...]

>You do realise, I'll never convince the 'true believers'.
>PELICANS!!! It's an outrage!!

Reality usually is. They'll get over it. Or not. That's their problem.

Michael Price
[END]

Indeed it is...

So, as you see, the issue was comprehensively covered.

But surely you knew that already.

Here's one more example of how light reflecting onto feathers can produce a reflection of such 'brilliance' it contrasts with the snow.

"One would think a pale gray and white adult male harrier would blend into the whiteness, but this is far from truth. There is some contrast in the bird's coal black wing tips and two bright yellow eyes in a face that rotates, turns, scans the ground and glances my way. But it is the sunlight, reflecting from the snow below, that turns the white feathers of the underparts and underwings from soft and light into a surreal brilliance of such white purity it seems to shine luminously, contrasting with the snow".

See:

<http://www.utahbound.com/12042000/stories/50701.htm>

>Finally, without parsing Easton's statement.... again.... (see a >zillion emails in the archive from years ago)...let me reiterate >my Pelican Mantra:

>Draw A Map.

If discussing the existence of Pixies, you could only go so far with someone who has written a book called, "Pixies Are Real: Here's the Pictures" and steadfastly proclaims how scientific research validates that those 'photographs', plus others which exist, are assuredly 'proof ignored by the world of science'.

Similarly, no conceivable amount of theoretical, speculative mapping would have any affect on a foundation of Bruce Maccabee's 'UFO' convictions.

As you're well aware, there are so many ambiguities and unknowns involved. What next; do we draw maps to argue how possible or impossible it was that Arnold's 'second sighting' can reasonably be explained as ducks?

He claimed, "I saw a cluster of about twenty to twenty- five brass coloured objects that looked like ducks".

"They seemed about two or three feet in diameter".

"As the group of objects came within 400 yards of me they veered sharply away from me and to their right, gaining altitude as they did so and fluttering and flashing a dull amber color".

Is it, seriously, argued these were also possibly 'alien spacecraft'?

They statedly came within 400 yards and Arnold attributed them to be 'UFOS', exclaiming how "excited" he was that they, "had the same flight characteristics of the large objects I had observed on June 24".

In total, during his flying days, Kenneth Arnold claimed to have had some eight encounters with 'UFOS'.

>For those newcomers, this refers to drawing a reasonable map
>showing how Arnold could have been flying in a plane at 100-110
>mph and have a flock of pelicans pass his plane going from north
>to south without him realizing that he was gaining on the
>birds... i.e., traveling faster than they were.

Which version of Arnold's story do you want to begin with - you do realise there are at least four of them?

[A] "That area is located at about, it's elevation is about 10,000 foot, and I had made one sweep in close to Mt. Rainier and down one of the canyons and was dragging it for any types of objects that might prove to be the Marine ship, uh, and as I come out of the canyon there, was about 15 minutes, I was approximately 25 to 28 miles from Mt. Rainier, I climbed back up to 9200 feet and I noticed to the left of me a chain which looked to me like the tail of a Chinese kite, kind of weaving and going at a terrific speed across the face of Mt. Rainier. I, at first, thought they were geese because it flew like geese, but it was going so fast that I immediately changed my mind and decided it was a bunch of new jet planes in formation".

Source: KWRC radio interview

[B] "I made a 360 degree turn to the right and above the little city of Mineral, starting again toward Mt. Rainier.

"I trimmed out my airplane in the direction of Yakima, Washington, which was almost directly east of my position and simply sat in my plane observing the sky and the terrain".

"The sky and air was clear as crystal. I hadn't flown more than two or three minutes on my course when a bright flash reflected on my airplane".

Source: Letter to Air Force

[C] "It was during this search and while making a turn of 180 degrees over Mineral, Washington, at approximately 9200 feet altitude, that a tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces of my aircraft".

Source: 'The Coming of the Saucers'

The first story is of merely observing objects crossing the face of Mt Rainier - to Arnold's left. Was Arnold heading south at this time?

Then, he claims to have made a 360 degree turn over Mineral and was heading in the direction of Yakima - and had been for 2-3 minutes - when the incident began. So, now he's heading east?

Next, it's a 180 degree turn and he's in the process of doing so when the first 'flash' is noted. This time, he's heading... where?

There's one more version I located and you previously didn't know about. In July last year, I posted on UFORL:

Looks like I may have come across another account of Arnold's - it's confirmed as his own voice and apparently taped from a TV

program - in which he claims:

"I could see way off to the right, coming in the vicinity of Mt. Baker, a whole chain-like string of very... of aircraft...".

That's a different story!

Now, the objects were first noticed "way off to the right" and not, as stated elsewhere, to his left.

This could make sense and explain some things which I suspected were possible.

As previously noted, we have quite different versions of where Arnold actually was and his heading when the objects had first been noticed. [END]

The interview I'm referring to is online at:

<http://www.iufomrc.com/arnold.htm>

Perhaps someone can source and date it.

Therefore, with Arnold now claiming he first saw the objects on his right-hand side. Was he heading north, rather than south, or east?

We do know he turned his aircraft around - "I kept looking for their tails, and they didn't have any tail. I thought, well, maybe something's wrong with my eyes and I turned the plane around and opened the window, and looked out the window, and sure enough, I couldn't find any tails on 'em".

It's an important fact only mentioned in that KWRC interview - I wonder why Arnold never included it again?

So, we don't know where Arnold was when the incident began, what direction he was heading and what his speed was. We don't know where the objects were first sighted, what Arnold did next and when he turned his plane around. We have no idea how long that turn took and whether Arnold subsequently reduced or increased speed.

What we do know is that no sooner had he seen the objects, then Arnold believed they passed behind a 'jagged peak' on Mt. Rainier and that's now almost certain been identified as 'Little Tahoma'. However, it's on the eastern side and as the objects flew down the western side, they couldn't have travelled behind it.

They must have passed in front of it, so almost straight away, Arnold, having relied on this peak as a '25 miles away' distance marker actually has no idea how distant the objects are, what size they are and where exactly they are heading.

Although Arnold thinks he does.

To the extent he decides to 'clock' how long it takes the objects to reach Mt Adams, or so he perceives.

This mess is entirely separate to what the objects might have been.

Taking all of the above into account, why are you still bleating that nobody's drawn you an 'accurate' map?

Tell you what... here's a simple question.

Is it possible that there's enough variation here to choose from, so that it illustrates one of many obvious scenarios why Arnold never recognised the true situation.

Yes or no?

Yes?

Good. Now draw a map which clarifies this and then consider it came from myself with best wishes.

Result!

You have a map and I haven't wasted my time.

What's the problem now... despite a map, you still don't believe it...

We're truly astonished...

>I have watched large birds (geese and others) fly in formation
>and have noted that they are spaced by a few feet to perhaps 20
>ft. They do this, presumably, so that one bird can "ride the the
>wave" produced by a bird just ahead of it. (The lead bird has
>the roughest flight).

Have you ever seen how White Pelicans uniquely operate this characteristic?

>So 9 in a line might cover a distance less than 200 ft. Arnold
>claimed that the string of objects was about comparable in
>length to a ridgeline about 5 miles long. From his position the
>distance to that ridgeline was about 25 miles.

However, as you're aware, there is yet another setback here.

In his 'official' report to the Air Force, Arnold claimed:

"I observed the chain of these objects passing another high snow-covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams and as the first one was passing the south crest of this ridge the last object was entering the northern crest of the ridge. As I was flying in the direction of this particular ridge, I measured it and found it to be approximately five miles so I could safely assume that the chain of these saucer like objects were at least five miles long".

Unequivocal - Arnold relates how at the time he was heading in that direction and so could accurately make this determination.

When we come to the account in his book, it's another story; Arnold didn't make any such judgement until after the sighting. He writes:

"Between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams there is a very high plateau with quite definite north and south edges. Part of this chain-like formation actually dipped below the near edge. As the first unit of these craft cleared the southernmost edge of this background, the last of the formation was just entering the northern edge. I later flew over this plateau in my plane and came to a close approximation that this whole formation of craft, whatever they were, formed a chain in the neighborhood of five miles long".

Big, big, difference...

>Draw A Map.

Good idea. Instead of ignoring it, let's see you show, on a map, which 'jagged peak' Arnold was talking about at the altitude he confirmed - naturally, it can't be 'Little Tahoma', otherwise there's zero grounds for any 'enigmatic' incident in the first place.

Correct?

As matters stand, Arnold's perception of distant, fast, objects are essentially proven to be a result of his, above, gross error.

What could Arnold therefore have observed which so perplexed him?

As demonstrated, there is an obvious answer.

I said there were some new references which further evidence that White Pelicans do exhibit 'brilliant' reflections and 'flashes' from sunlight:

"When viewing these huge birds at water level its difficult to imagine them getting airborne, much less soaring to heights on the thermals that renders them invisible to the naked eye. At times, as the birds spiral upward on bright sunny days, the entire flock will turn such that the sunlight reflects off the white back and wing feathers and contrasting black band producing a brilliant display against the blue sky".

<http://amrivers.localweb.com/missourim/whitepelicans100.pdf>

"I live on Lake Conroe and have seen white Pelicans for several years in the fall. Nov.27 my neighbor and I noticed a white flash in the sky and it turned out to be a flock of about 40 white pelicans at over 1000 ft. circling like buzzards...

Quite an amazing sight the sun would reflect off of the feathers at different points in the circling".

<http://www.ecocanada.com/seepel/messages/345.html>

"Glancing out my window this morning, I saw twenty or thirty little bright white spots against the blue sky. I thought it was my eyes, or a balloon release, until they wheeled and turned like a flock of birds. Looking a little harder, I could see they were indeed birds, very BIG white birds".

"Now, I've enjoyed seeing a lot of Brown Pelicans around here, but this was my first sighting of the once endangered American White Pelican. Sometimes almost twice the size of their brown cousins, these breathtaking birds have beautiful black wingtips contrasting with their white bodies and their super long yellow bills. They are often seen in flocks of 20 or more. These guys probably numbered around 30, and they put on quite an aerial show. First they flew in close formation, swooping this way and then circling around the other way, blinding flashes of sunlight as they turned".

<http://www.cccucc.org/light/thursdayjuly011999.html>

"Camera buffs will find the rapids an unforgettable sight, with brilliant white pelicans soaring over the river as it winds its way past island channels".

<http://www.virtualfortsmith.com/welcometoexcitement.asp>

"An occasional flock of white pelicans drifts in wide circles, flashing back silver light from their wings, or disappearing as they turn".

<http://www.caller.com/2000/october/10/today/birdwatc/6228.html>

As should be abundantly clear by now, White Pelicans - and uniquely this species - exhibit the characteristics Arnold described:

- an echelon formation - the undulating flight - 'fluttering and then sailing'

The following contains a clever metaphor for that undulating flight:

"We saw a number of osprey, oyster catchers and large flights of pelicans; 50 or more flying by following the leader. The leader changed altitude from the surface-skimming glide to a few feet higher to flap wings without touching the water. The rest would follow, creating a sine wave of birds".

http://homestead.juno.com/kalendrl/files/97_lsup/j21Fernandina.htm

Arnold's 'fluttering and then sailing' is equivalent to 'flapping' and then 'gliding', or a combination of 'flapping' and 'sailing', etc. Here's some descriptions of White Pelicans:

"Two species are native in the United States. The white pelican, with a body about 5 feet long and a wingspread of from 8 to 10 feet, is one of the largest American birds.

[...]

When traveling, a flock forms a straight line or a V and they alternately flap and sail, all in unison".

<http://www.newton.dep.anl.gov/natbltn/600-699/nb612.htm>

"Pelicans often fly together in long lines of several or more birds. They will flap their wings and then glide. The wing flaps are not at the same moment, but in sequence, starting with the leader. Each bird will flap when he reaches the same spot where the lead bird began to flap".

<http://www.marine.usf.edu/pjocean/prog/sp99/wimat/les2.htm> or:
www.marine.usf.edu/pjocean/prog/pdf/s99u3le2.PDF

"It is remarkable enough that the birds are able to follow one another in a perfect single-file or V-formation. But their ability to flap their wings in perfect synchronization makes them seem telepathically linked. Furthermore, the ability of such a bulky bird to glide effortlessly, for minutes at a time, hundreds of feet above the surf, looks like a violation of the laws of aerodynamics".

http://www.fulcrum-books.com/html/florida_stacked_3.html

"A flock of migrating American White Pelicans is a majestic sight -- a long line of ponderous birds, flapping and coasting. Each bird seems to take it's cue from the one in front of it, beginning to flap and starting a glide when it's predecessor does".

<http://www.superiorphotography.com/wpelican.html>

What was it Arnold said; "Another characteristic of these craft that made a tremendous impression on me was how they fluttered and sailed".

He also compared the formation as resembling "the tail of a Chinese kite". Others have made similar comparisons with White Pelicans:

"I could still clearly discern the massive forms of maybe a dozen American white pelicans. The pelicans were gargantuan in scale, dwarfing all of the other birds around them, but still they took flight and landed with surprising grace. Whenever a few of these birds took wing, they spread out their immense, black-tipped wings and soared high into the sky with amazing ease, often joining other pelicans in formation.

At one time, I actually saw maybe 60 or 70 pelicans stretched across the sky in a giant, twisting ribbon that glowed with the morning light".

<http://www.calphoto.com/sunny.htm>

"Then I realize about thirty birds trail in a line, and second and third squadrons move up, to the left and right. Bombers, they are too large for fighters, yet more graceful, flying in perfect formation".

"The sun burns the whites of their perfectly rigid backs upon the negative of my mind, blinding my eye to all else".

"They appear as crepe paper strips, tied to an invisible wind. Rising and falling as much as a hundred feet in the air, all following the slightest twitch to the left or right as they glide effortlessly through the morning sky".

<http://home.earthlink.net/~avirden/pelicans.htm>

The fact they are also associated with aircraft is commented upon in the following:

"A flight of pelicans glides overhead like a squadron of WWII bombers setting off across the English Channel on a nighttime raid...".

<http://www.messingaboutinboats.com/archives/mbissuejune15-98.htm>
1

"Then I realize about thirty birds trail in a line, and second and third squadrons move up, to the left and right. Bombers, they are too large for fighters, yet more graceful, flying in perfect formation".

<http://home.earthlink.net/~avirden/pelicans.htm>

"...he glanced up at the sky and watched a squadron of pelicans returning from one of their aerial expeditions".

"The squadron looked like old bombers with outstretched wings as they swept down to the very edge of the sea, inches above the water. Heads held high, wings fixed and bodies streamlined for maximum glide".

<http://www.nywcafe.com/wings/Archives/LIPSTOCK.HTM>

Of course, the strict terminology for any formation is a 'squadron of pelicans' - see:

<http://www.birding.about.com/hobbies/birding/library/weekly/aa032700b.htm>

It's not the unattainable intention to persuade any 'saucer devotees' that Arnold didn't actually see 'flying saucers'.

Arnold himself, eventually, admitted that.

This recapitulation is primarily to clarify, explain and address some issues which require to be highlighted and updated.

Conclusions - you can draw your own, and a 'map' if so inclined.

Without question, the most profound material I have come across in some three years related research concerns 'GUS, The Avid Flyer'. Although something of an aside, it's not actually disparate to a new, astounding, appreciation of White Pelicans and their rapport with aircraft.

Warning - this is a story with a tragic ending - have a hanky ready and read the extraordinary tale of 'GUS' at:

<http://www.groverweb.com/nwva/NWFlyer/Archives/Art100900.html>

Lest we should take the case of Kenneth Arnold's remarkable encounter too seriously...

After all, it's not as if all the recent factual revelations have threatened to destroy the foundations of a religion.

James Easton.

E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk

www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:24:04 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:08:07 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Maccabee

>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 11:32:19 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 21:50:18 EST
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>>Date: Fri, 9 Mar 2001 11:17:04 -0500

> To borrow a phrase from Reagan vs. Carter:

>There you go again!

>Listing a bunch of proposed explanations (you didn't list all
>that were proposed) without having the conviction to pick one
>and say "that's it."

Hey, I like several of these so much that I can't make up my
mind which I like the most.

>One of my complaints against the skeptics/scoffers/debunkers is
>the impression they give that the more explanation can be
>proposed the more likely it is that a sighting is explained. My
>counterargument is that only one explanation is correct and if
>you can't decide which, then either you mark the case as
>"insufficient information" and go do something else or you pick
>one and defend it "to the death."

Well, that could be a good approach if one was sure that one
hypothesis was IT, I guess.

I haven't made up my mind, although I think the mirage, birds or
meteor might be the answer.

Mirage, for example makes no sense unless Arnold was completely
wrong in thinking that the objects were first north of Mt.
Rainier, then between him and the flank of Mt Rainier, then
south of Mt Rainier, etc. Had you read my paper on the subject
you would see that Arnold would also have had to be wrong in
thinking they were "about" at his altitude and hence many
thousand feet below the top of Mt. Rainier. A mountain top
mirage appears above the mountain top, not below it. Try
again.

Did he say that he saw any of the objects in front of, with Mt.
Rainier as a backdrop, or is this just a supposition from his
estimated altitude? I thought that he said that he saw one or
more of the objects go behind a Mountain. The mirage of a peak
behind that mountain could account for this.

>As for OI/NHI/... this is simply my shorthand for "creatures"
>that are not human and come from somewhere. Certainly the ET
>hypothesis would be consistent with my claim that OI/NHI are

>here.

OK, I get your meaning here.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 05:34:23 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:20:30 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 12:49:10 +0000
>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:09:41 +0100
>>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

><snip>

>>>I have an enhanced image illustrating this and can post it if
>>>anyone would like to see it for themselves. Contact me directly.

Hi Neil,

Thanks for your reply.

>>I appreciate you providing an enhanced image, especially of the
>>clipboard. Thanks for "tweaking it". I wonder to what extent you
>>tweaked it? What software, etc.?

>In the case of the "Danger" sign I've used a technique we use
>here in the lab to "drag" a better signal out of "noisy" data
>where the signal is repetitive, you simply add the data sets,
>the noise being of random nature tends to cancel while the
>signal content reinforces. Extend this concept to the AA film
>"frames" where you have a static or "trackable" target (the
>Danger sign) in a sequence of frames, I've found that the noise
>(film grain) and signal (image) seem to exhibit the same
>qualities and the end result in this case is a reasonably legible
>sign.

>>If we could get a better
>>"tweaking" perhaps it would help define whether the person was
>>writing autopsy notes or something like: Call after film shoot -
>>Ray Santilli - Will Volker pay for extra scenes? If I remember
>>correctly there were several people on the list who had
>>"tweaked" the Ramey message. I wonder if there is any software
>>or technique that could bring more out?

>This technique couldn't be applied to the Ramey Message as we
>only have the one data sample, the single negative.

I was asking if the clipboard image could possibly be tweaked to
the point of getting any idea what was written and if there is
any technique for that image that could reveal more than your
technique?

On this list I remember all of Bond's images of the markings on
the debris, fresh and further enhanced. I remember your posts
comparing them to the alleged AA autopsy. There is something I

have never understood. Why, after looking at all of Bond's images, I could see no more than what looked like splotches, perhaps caused by manufacturing. Should I call an ophthalmologist for an appointment? I've never seen the markings in the alleged AA autopsy pointed out.

I hope they look better than Bond's did to me.

Would it be possible for you to post three images?

- 1) The best image of the clipboard
- 2) & 3) Side by side images of the best match in markings between the debris and the alleged AA autopsy

<snip>

>Josh, I have followed the AA saga since Jan 95 when Reg Presley >mentioned it on British TV, but my recent interest was only >rekindled when searching for symbol matches to those I had >spotted in the Fort Worth Photographs. The debris footage from >the AA provided a match(s). I then had to ask myself how the >hell could a "hoaxed" film include matches for symbols that had >never been identified (to my knowledge) before from 50 year old >photographs that were of historical provenance and had been lost >and undisturbed in the archives until the late 1980's?.

>How would the hoaxers know what symbols to place in their >hoax?.

've had lot's of ridicule about the "symbols" but no one has >yet claimed to have spotted them previously. The hoaxer would >have had to have had prior knowledge they existed, or more >than a bucket load of luck, other than that they might just be >real artifacts seen in two historical documents indicating two >linked events took place in New Mexico in the summer of 47, >Socorro and Corona(Roswell).

<snip>

>Neil

Wishing you joy on your quest,

Josh

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:42:57 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:22:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:14:26 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>Hi Bill,

>Gee Bill, you couldn't possibly mean those same 'spheres' that
>so many folks have been recording on video and photos for years
>and trying to tell others about would you? ;)

<snip>

John,

It is interesting that you earlier mentioned hearing beeps as I have heard several recordings of continuous beeping and have studied several cases where witnesses mentioned hearing groups of three raps. Your hearing groups of beeps seemingly combines the two phenomena. Yes, it is a rare, highly unusual yet significant event. Beeps of several other types are often reported by experiencers and the commonality of this between experiencers is the significant aspect.

Have you tried to take pictures at the time or shortly after you hear the beeps to see if film can "see" something your eyes cannot? Our studies seem to indicate an event can continue after hearing or seeing something unusual. Instruments or cameras can see parts of the event we are not personally sensitive to.

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Cydonian Imperative - 03-14-01

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:04:59 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:24:39 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative - 03-14-01

03-14-01
The Cydonian Imperative

Preliminary Shape-From-Shading Rendering of Eroded "Tunnel"

by Mac Tonnies and Chris Joseph

Please see "What's New?" at:

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

Using a variation of photoclinometry ("shape-from-shading"), a technique used to reveal the morphology of planetary surface features, Chris Joseph has produced the first true reconstruction of a Martian "tunnel" (seen below).

IMAGE

Below is the target area shown in geological context.

IMAGE

While Joseph cautions that these results are preliminary and may be flawed, comparison to the raw data (especially Joseph's stereoscopic view, posted above) shows that they are largely sound. Whatever these features are, they are clearly convex and unusual.

I've proposed that the next "tube" to be subjected to shape-from-shading analysis should be the especially mystifying "glass tube" discovered by Richard Hoagland. Hoagland has postulated that the "glass tube" may represent an artificial feature in a substantially better state of repair, thus the possible presence of "glass" (likely a silicate compound harvested from Martian soil: see "Ubiquitous Bright Lines" above).

If Hoagland is correct, then a thorough photoclinometric rendering of this feature may reveal further confirmatory detail.

-end-

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:15:26 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:26:09 -0500
Subject: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

HEROIC ASTRONAUT'S AMBIGUOUS ALIEN DISCLOSURE

The Electric Warrior : Exposé March 14, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/Expose005.htm>

HEROIC ASTRONAUT'S AMBIGUOUS ALIEN DISCLOSURE

"Some people asked, you know, were you alone out there? We never gave the real answer," said former Astronaut, Senator John Glenn in a recently televised situation comedy, "And yet, we've seen things out there, strange things."

A prime time audience saw Glenn in a scenario that had him baring his soul into the microphone of a radio broadcast studio and comedically unaware that he was being taped: "We know what we saw out there and we couldn't really say anything. The bosses were scared of this. They were afraid of 'War of the Worlds' type stuff and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep quiet."

Glenn was referring to another well known radio broadcast, the 1938 dramatization of H.G. Wells' "War of the Worlds", which caused wide spread panic when thousands of listeners believed Earth was under alien attack. Public reaction to Orson Welles' realistic Mercury Theater broadcast is often cited as the reason that a bona-fide alien presence cannot be authoritatively disclosed.

Depending on who's statistic you quote, 50% or more of the American public believe in the possibility of UFOs or extraterrestrial intelligence (ETI). Some, at least, took Glenn's words at face value.

"My wife said Senator John Glenn just confessed to the American people", wrote John Velez a frequent contributor to the UFO Updates mailing list." Velez filed an email report soon after the program aired.

"As loony as it may sound to some out there, I think her simple but honest reaction to it was correct. Within the context of a comedy routine, we just heard John Glenn confess to the American people on a prime time program."

HERO'S JOURNEY

The Mercury-6 astronaut's first jaunt into space atop a volatile liquid-propellant rocket was far removed from popular notions of spaceships and UFOs.

The Mercury-Atlas was essentially a missile adapted to carry a NASA space capsule. The capsule was packed with so many scientific instruments that the occupant was confined to about as much space as a bathtub. The pioneering team of seven Project Mercury astronauts made ergonomic design suggestions such as a

window and the ability to open the hatch from inside.

After successfully completing a historic three-orbit mission around Earth on February 20, 1962, Glenn was forced to manually pilot his Friendship 7 spacecraft for reentry when the autopilot failed.

He watched flaming chunks from his spacecraft fly past the window, wondering whether his heat shield might be breaking up. NASA Mission Control had taken the unusual emergency precaution of retaining the retro pack, to keep a possibly loose heat shield in place. Without the shield, both Glenn and capsule would have been incinerated.

In 1998 at age 77 John Glenn returned to space aboard the space shuttle STS-95 Discovery, to help NASA study parallels between space flight and aging. Glenn has logged over 218 hours in space.

PUSHING THE ENVELOPE

Why attribute Senator Glenn's performance on television to anything more than a playful acknowledgement that rumors of outer space UFO sightings have followed the astronauts since the beginning of NASA's manned space initiative?

"During the decade that I was in the astronaut corps, NASA did not brief us on UFOs -- nothing about what to do or not to do if we had a sighting in space," wrote Gordon Cooper, in his autobiography, "Leap of Faith". Cooper asserts that he saw no UFOs from space, and that purported sightings by other astronauts never happened.

Nonetheless Cooper, one of Glenn's teammates from the original Mercury Seven astronauts, has been an outspoken advocate of the reality of the UFO phenomenon.

Cooper's book offers his own insider's viewpoint on famous UFO cases, and contributes a few anecdotes of his own, including the filming of a classic saucer at Edwards Air Force Base in 1957. Cooper says he turned the evidence over to the air force's official Project Blue Book investigation, under orders from the Pentagon, and the incident was covered-up as if it never happened.

Why doesn't the government tell the truth about UFOs? "I give the public more credit than our government has at times. Most people want to know what's going on in the world around them and would rather hear the truth, whatever it is, than a pack of lies."

DOUBLE-ENTENDRE

John Glenn's guest appearance on "Frasier" not only hints at the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence, it also purportedly exposes an official cover-up.

We are given to imagine that the astronaut was told not to disclose the truth about an alien presence in the interest of national security. We can easily speculate that the retired Marine Corps Colonel broke radio silence in his later years the only way he could, in a comedic episode that has plausible deniability.

In 1950 President Truman issued an executive order that defined national security as a rationale for classifying secret documents. It concerned not only military secrets but scientific and industrial data as well. Contemporary efforts to protect information and know-how through export restrictions place an emphasis on both military technological superiority and continued prosperity.

How could a cover-up of extraterrestrial intelligence have been maintained for so long? It's arguable that ufologists have known about it for some time. It has always been speculated that the Air Force took a greater interest in the topic of UFOs than they cared to publicly admit, and this much, at least, has been demonstrated through documents acquired under the Freedom of Information Act.

The national security emphasis on continued prosperity is

interesting however, because it's clear that knowledge can come with a price. A long history of human wisdom enlivened by our own experience should tell us as much.

In the story of Prometheus, who stole fire from the gods, the first woman was thereafter bestowed upon mankind, entrusted with a box. Pandora opened the box out of curiosity and thereby released all the evils of human existence.

Reading just a little further into John Glenn's statements, is it possible to see his ambiguous alien disclosure as a source of many unforeseen troubles? Why were "the bosses" afraid of disclosure?

People who heard the "War of the Worlds" broadcast on Halloween night in 1938 didn't necessarily panic because of the disclosure of an alien presence, which they accepted readily enough under the circumstances. They probably panicked because they felt threatened.

Many people want to know the truth about UFOs. Some Ufologists suggest the cover-up continues because the disclosure of this information may also come with a price. Their argument:

A "War of the Worlds" scenario, in which a hostile and technologically superior alien presence causes wide-spread pandemonium.

The whole truth about extraterrestrial intelligence may be a Pandora's box that nobody wants to open.

ABOUT THE IMAGES

The following links point to thumbnails of the artwork for this feature. Please visit The Electric Warrior Website for zoomed images.

Astronaut John Glen - Hero's Journey.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/ewHerosJourneyThumb.jpg>

This image shows John Glenn in a pressurized space suit and crammed into a tiny capsule traveling at 17,500 m.p.h. at an altitude of 160 miles above the earth.

Light Years.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/ewLightYearThumb.jpg>

This image shows President John F. Kennedy accompanied by the astronaut as they examine the Friendship 7 space capsule, following John Glenn's historic first manned orbital mission for the United States.

Both images are based on a photos from the National Archives.

ON THE FRONT PAGE

» Why Don't They Land on the White House Lawn?

<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

MUFON's Elaine Douglass tells why the government won't tell the truth about UFOs.

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR

March 14, 2001

Silicon Valley, CA

<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/expose/Expose005.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without

permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: erious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:31:50 -0500
Subject: Re: erious Research - Randles

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>a Council could work in practical terms.

>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>the focus.

Hi,

Absolutely, Richard that was my intention with this idea.

Cases, hard data - the prime evidence for the ETH that working
investigators out there believe should be submitted to science
in order to make the prima facie argument that the ETH should at
least be taken seriously. That should be our goal.

So the focus should not merely be on cases but on cases that:

- have strong evidence to support their actual reality
- have strong evidence to support the ETH interpretation of that reality

(These are not the same thing)

No case - or probably even any collection of cases - will
'prove' either of these eventualities to general satisfaction.
That is not the aim. Indeed if the proof existed we would have
done this already.

But what we can do is agree between us - and that is the point
of this experiment - the best of the best that should be used to
make our prima facie argument that this is a credible field of
research that science should not be shunning.

And if we select the data to use in an objective, scientifically
credible fashion (as the plan for my council strives to be) -
rather than by simply debating this or that incident on Updates
in an haphazard manner - then if we submit them as a UFO
community in an agreed scientific format to the scientific
community - we have a fighting chance of being taken seriously
as at least making the effort to engender a meaningful
discussion.

Which is all we can ask.

Basically I am suggesting that we create a team of people

willing to devote some of their net time over the next (say) six months. Devote it to vetting and commenting upon case data submitted to them in an effort to find those cases to most strongly recommend via ufology as the ones most positively arguing towards the reality of the ETH.

The concept is simple. The execution a little less so, for the reason that you set out. Lack of time and commitment to other ventures. But this is not a fatal flaw if we value the opportunity that such a venture provides.

Perhaps sixteen is an unrealistic number but I suggested it as a way to ensure that as broad a spread and balance of viewpoints is represented. I would imagine 8 or 12 (that is 2 or 3 each of the pro, anti, ETH, the uncommitted and the outsider scientist perspective) would be achievable if that is all we can aim towards. But the exact number involved in the council is less important than actually creating it as the temporary entity that it is intended to be.

Surely we could find eight people supported by their peers as qualified to be on this council who would see the value of devoting some of their time during the next six months to debating the evidence put before them? Eight people willing to commit wholeheartedly to this experiment - as they must do.

After all, the main work lies with everybody else who would be charged with the task of finding the cases that they believe would convince science.

It is up to these people (which means every working ufologist out there who thinks the ETH may be true) to summarise their investigation, the data and its findings and submit it to the council. All the council would have to do is debate this data - on a case by case basis - offering their opinions about the scientific potential of the evidence.

When a case has been discussed by council then one person from the council (presumably the one with the most free time over the next six months!) could be charged with summarising the overall views on that case (and each other case as it is submitted by a ufologist during the period that the team operates) in a message to the UFO community.

Ufology - via UpDates, for instance - would thus be aware - on a day to day basis - of just what was going on in the council discussions as the project developed, and could discuss the councils views, feed in its own input and further the eventual debate leading towards the final report. The same could - and should - be true of skeptics lists. The whole point of this experiment is that this be a community effort and we recognise the differing opinions that exist.

The council would not be the kings of this project - only one part of it. Literally every one of us would have a role to play to whatever extent we felt willing or able to commit to the venture.

Then - at the end of the six months - the council could agree a statement to be issued to the UFO community summarising the sum total of the case data it has evaluated and the overall conclusions they reach about it - recommending which cases to ask the original investigators to work up into a proper format and to become part of a submission by ufology to science.

In this way, the burden is shared. Yes, the people elected onto the council have an individual responsibility to offer some time to debate the cases. Yes someone on that council has to take the responsibility to summarise the findings and post them regularly so you can all see what is going on and feed back your opinions into the debate. But all other ufologists have an equal responsibility to come up with the goods - their first hand case work. And make this a genuine group effort involving anyone who wishes to participate - since the comments of the council, the final selection of cases to be submitted to science and the form of that submission will be openly discussed by anyone who wants to do so.

The principle which I am suggesting allows this project to eschew giving power to individuals and to truly become a UFO community experiment that is harnessing the latent power of the

internet. Rather than - as now - using the net only to engage in debate with no end purpose.

We can easily say - its not possible or it is too hard. But ufologist needs to put defeatism and differences aside and try to make this happen.

I hope there are enough people committed to making progress in this area - rather than maintaining the status quo - to give it a chance of success. But we will not know unless we try. And really that is all I am proposing. That we give this a try.

That surely has to be preferable to doing nothing. We have been very good at that for a long time and a fresh approach seems called for.

>Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and proponents be
>asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to focus on. Then
>all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the nominated
>cases.

The problem with this is that we will soon get bogged down in wrangling over countless threads on multiple cases all going on at once. We need more structure behind the project to prevent it from degenerating into chaos. I think we need to limit the numbers - although setting no arbitrary total.

If we create the council first we could then ask people to submit their own cases (and they 'must' - in my view - be first hand research that they have conducted and not cases they think will stand up based on what they have read in a book)

This step, to me, is a vital prerequisite since it means the ufologist has to be confident enough in the calibre of their submitted work to let it be vetted by the council - which I think will limit us to the strongest candidates and impress science more than simply again reading digests of cases from old UFO books. We have been there, done that. Now it is time to make the T shirt.

I dont imagine this way we will get more than a dozen cases in the mix - although we may all be pleasantly surprised - but if so that is a manageable number for the council - and for the UFO community in general to debate each one in turn in a six month window.

A dozen or so is also a fair number to submit in depth to science at the end. 100 cases could not be the basis of this kind of submission without creating a report the size of a phone directory and I dont think most scientists will wade through that . Besides which we should give the impression of recommending the best candidates not scraping around just to fill an arbitrary number of 'berths' and make it look as if the argument can be made by strength of numbers alone.

We will be better served by fewer, stronger cases presented to science in the end in considerable depth. That is the consequence to which I think my idea would naturally lead.

>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>Balloonism, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission
>of where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

With respect, Richard, we will not do so if we fall back on polemics and stand by our entrenched positions. This project is not about fighting. It is about ius tolerating one anothers opinions and trying to work together. It needs a lot of people to show guts and determination and to put aside past prejudices and let the evidence be the only guide to the ultimate conclusion. I would hope there are plenty of people out there ready to accept that challenge.

What this needs is sufficient strong willed people to forget their own opinions about UFOs (whatever they are - and that means skeptics and believers alike) - and to see the sense of this venture and its potential value for the long term health of ufology .

After all, if only 8 people create the panel and only another dozen submit one strong case each that they have investigated - then the concept can work.

That means finding just 20 people in the entire UFO world - believers, skeptics, pelicanists, ETHers, investigators, scientists etc, etc - who see the worth of spending six months doing meaningful objective and scientifically orientated net based work like this as opposed to spending the same six months in more endless chit chat on personal theories or hobby horses.

I would hope that the UFO world has more than 20 such people. Because if it hasnt, it would be very worrying.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 01:40:49 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:28:35 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Gates

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:49:44 -0800
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber

>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 02:00:36 EST
>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>The so called Antartica Ozone hole, and the one at the North
>>Pole was discovered in 1958 by the US Navy. The flux of the
>>Ozone hole opening big, closing etc has been monitored ever
>>since then.
>>...

>Robert,

>Do you have any reference to this 1958 discovery by the Navy,
>which you could disclose to us? Or is this date not a typo?
>Scientists didn't become aware of the problem until the 1970s.

Some years ago as part of my cold war historical research I ran across Navy documents discussing how they were taking measurements of both the magnetic field and what we now call the Ozone hole down in the Antartica. They also measured how it expanded and closed.

Apparently the same thing has/was done at the North pole as well. In passing I mentioned this to some former submariners and one didn't know anything about it while others said they were aware of it.

At the time I didn't put alot of research time in it because I was more focused on the strategic arms side of the cold war.

I will see if I can find, or at least point you to what I found years ago. I also recall seeing a news article which discussed how we have known about the hole since 1958 or thereabouts.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:43:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:41:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 17:11:45 -0000

>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 22:01:19 -0000

<snip>

>The book you cite that I contributed a chapter to clearly was a
>good job. As a result of that chapter I received a free
>subscription to FT and read its UFO coverage for over a year. It
>was terribly biased against pro-UFO reality material and in
>support of anything that placed UFOs in the context of some kind
>of social craze (psychosocial to the core).

<snip>

Dick, Dave,

Hey, guys, let's quit tip-toeing around!

The name of the book is "UFOs 1947-1997, From Arnold to the
Abductees: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers," edited by Hilary
Evans and Dennis Stacy, illus., index, 272 pages.

Contributors include Dick Hall, Jerry Clark, Kenneth Arnold,
John Rimmer, Chris Rutkowski, Jenny Randles, Cynthia Hind,
Jacques Vallee, Col. Hector Quintanilla, Bill Chalker, Ray
Fowler, the aforementioned Evans and Stacy and others.

The book was so well-balanced that neither side bought it!

Fortunately, as a consequence, however, I still have a lot of
copies of the original hardcover book lying around. Did I say it
was also beautifully produced?

Anyway, I'm selling them (or trying to) for only \$19.95, postage
included, or \$18.95 autographed. Check or money order to:

Dennis Stacy
PO Box 12434
San Antonio
Texas 78212

Dennis Stacy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Liddle

From: Sean Liddle <gortrix@kos.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:47:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:35:23 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Liddle

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 09:44:09 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Regarding the "DANGER" sign: can this sort of sign (with the
>apparent hanging, adjustable digits) be traced? Can they be
>found in radiation test areas of the era, or in medical
>facilities? The sign provides another point of potential
>confirmation--whether it's confirmation of an actual autopsy or
>of thorough hoaxers being immaterial to the investigation.

If someone could send me a hi-res or close to it clip image of
the sign, I could send it to a company I deal with that provides
safety signage and has done so for a long time. Maybe they
could shed some light on it.

Sean Liddle

KAPRA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 10:49:13 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:36:38 -0500
Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Evans

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:20:24 -0500
>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities? - Velez
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:03:16 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Re: More Mars 'Tunnel/Worm' Oddities?
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

Previously, John wrote:

>>>Yeah, but I still see a tube! I have tried and tried to see it
>>>as a flat scene, but hard as I try Mac I can't. The freakin
>>>things look tubular. Of course I bow to the experts, but I
>>>remain unconvinced by their argument that the shapes I'm
>>>looking at are an optical illusion.

Hi, John, Mac, all...

Okay, I posted this once before but no one would bite. I'll try again.
If you look at the following URL, the shadows indicate a valley for the
"tubes".

Go to:

http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/display/MGSC_1023/m02012/m0201270.img.jpg

Now look at this URL:

<http://www.enterprisemission.com/images/arthur.jpg>

Here the shadows are different. In fact, the shadows are different on both sides of the photo. On the left the light appears to be coming from the southwest as indicated by the ridges in the terrain just left of the "worm". However, on the right, the light appears to be coming from the north as indicated by the lit southern rims of the craters to the right of the "worm". Therefore, the question is, "Which light is the key light?" If the light is coming from the north, then the central feature in question is not a valley, but a tube-like structure. If, on the other hand, the light is coming from the southwest, then you are correct about it being a valley with depressions.

Do we know for a fact where the sun was for this shot?

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:08:05 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:31:01 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:39:43 +1300
>Subject: updates@sympatico.ca - Sawers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

Previously, William asked:

>Do we really know if this is the first autopsy?

My point entirely, William.

AA proponents either give the military too much credit or not enough. On the one hand, the sloppiness of the video is explained by AA proponents that it was all hurried and spontaneous; no one knew what to expect. Then, when the issue of the sign is brought into play, the new answer is "Do we really know if this is the first autopsy?"

Make up your mind.

If this isn't the first, then there would have been more preparation and better quality documentation. But that issue aside, it is incomprehensible to me that, in either case, such poor attention would be given to something so monumental.

Continuing I wrote:

>>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted >>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk >>missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the >>software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so >>far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam >>SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad >>to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than >>anything on disc. I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and >>grab frames for work in Photoshop.

William replied:

>With all due respect Roger you have stated you work with >videotape and very familiar with the workings of such. The AA >CDs are produced on MPEG2 files, which, as I understand it are >the professionals standard.

>I find it difficult to accept that you don't have some >viewing/editing programs on one of your computers able to see >the CDs if you were truly wishing to contribute to this >discussion with everyone seeing the same images.

William, you obviously have little working knowledge about video editing programs, the number and variety of codexes that are available, the incompatibility of each nor the potential problems associated with introducing new software onto an edit system. As it stands, people that edit professionally are hard

pressed to load the latest version of the very software they currently use, for fear of causing problems with their systems. Anyone on the List that works in graphics or video for a living knows exactly what I mean about the potential for missing deadlines when introducing new software to your system. You just don't do it in mid-project and I am always in mid-project. I don't have a time when my hard drives are empty because of a lack of work. If I did, I'd starve.

Loading other software that is unnecessary to making a living is really quite a risk, whether you understand it or not. Regarding such, I don't really care how difficult it is for you to accept. I have stated the truth. There is no "due respect" you could extend that would offset calling me a liar when you have no basis for doing so.

Finally, you wrote:

>As Ed explained the BetacamSP copy was only loaned to Neil, so
>to do what you're asking seems to be a pretty difficult task
>especially seeing as you can't or won't open the CDs already
>sent.

>Fairs fair mate.

You have no idea what you are talking about, "mate".

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:18:47 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:33:37 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Evans

>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 05:34:23 +0100
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 12:49:10 +0000
>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

Previously, Josh wrote:

>I was asking if the [AA] clipboard image could possibly be tweaked to
>the point of getting any idea what was written.and if there is
>any technique for that image that could reveal more than your
>technique?

Hi, Josh!

Neil has done some wonderful work, but the problem is the difference in resolution in the AA footage and the Ramey photos.

While the Ramey photos were shot on 4x5 inch sheet film, with a resolution of thousands of lines per inch across several inches, the AA video is going to be limited to a total of about 650 lines, period, since it originated on PAL video and we have no access to the original (presumably) 16mm footage.

Considering that the writing is composed of only a handful of lines, at best, it is doubtful that they can be enhanced much and certainly not on the order of the Ramey photos.

Roger

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:50:33 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:45:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:15:26 -0800
>Subject: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Kurt posted:

>A prime time audience saw Glenn in a scenario that had him
>baring his soul into the microphone of a radio broadcast studio
>and comedically unaware that he was being taped: "We know what
>we saw out there and we couldn't really say anything. The bosses
>were scared of this. They were afraid of 'War of the Worlds'
>type stuff and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep
>quiet."

<snip>

>It has always been speculated that the
>Air Force took a greater interest in the topic of UFOs than they
>cared to publicly admit, and this much, at least, has been
>demonstrated through documents acquired under the Freedom of
>Information Act.

<snip>

>Reading just a little further into John Glenn's statements, is
>it possible to see his ambiguous alien disclosure as a source of
>many unforeseen troubles? Why were "the bosses" afraid of
>disclosure?

Hi, Kurt, all...

Here's my take on the whole secrecy thing:

One interest that the Air Force had in verifying the existence of UFOs had more to do with national security than scientific curiosity. However, I do not mean to imply that the military saw UFOs as a threat. On the contrary, I think that if they were presented with a real ET craft, the last thing they'd want to do is to shoot it down, their reputation notwithstanding. And that, of course, was the problem. For them to determine if a suspect UFO was really ET in nature and not, say, a Soviet nuclear bomber disguised as ET craft, then they'd have to ascertain the likelihood that ET craft even existed. The logic would be that, if flying saucers are proven not to exist, then any craft looking like one is bogus and can be shot out of the sky without hesitation.

As far as the question "Why were "the bosses" afraid of disclosure?", I think that until the issue above was settled in the mind of the military, then letting their position be known would be showing their cards, so to speak. If it was known that the military believed in flying saucers and would not shoot one down, then what better disguise for a Soviet bomber, eh? Therefore, even if the military did believe in UFOs, better to keep up a front of denial to fool the Rooskies.

That leaves the question of continued secrecy. Certainly, no one in power wants it known that they lied to the American public,

no matter the reason. Just look at all the Senate subcommittee hearings that pop up like weeds for all kinds of indiscretions. Evidence of "lying to the American public" would be simply be used as fodder to try and gain political ground at the cost of someone's career. No wonder no one is saying anything. Perhaps the current lie is simply designed to cover past lies. Perhaps when all those old timers involved in the lies of the past are dead, we'll finally know the truth, assuming it doesn't get buried with them.

Roger Evans

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:03 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:54:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>>the focus.

>Hi,

>Absolutely, Richard that was my intention with this idea.

>Cases, hard data - the prime evidence for the ETH that working
>investigators out there believe should be submitted to science
>in order to make the prima facie argument that the ETH should at
>least be taken seriously. That should be our goal.

>So the focus should not merely be on cases but on cases that:

>- have strong evidence to support their actual reality

>- have strong evidence to support the ETH interpretation of that
>reality

>(These are not the same thing)

Jenny & List,

I am using your message to try to zero in on where we agree and disagree, but I can go along with at least 95% of what you say. Since I'm very busy at the moment, this is a bit of a hasty posting. Please make due allowances.

There is no way that study of 12 or 25 cases is going to convince anybody of anything. First, I think we need to make a stronger distinction (you do make the distinction) between trying to demonstrate (a) that UFO reports are describing something important and unexplained, and (b) that the reports strongly support an ETH interpretation. I would much rather try to demonstrate that, on the basis of the best evidence, the ETH hypothesis is a reasonable one.

>No case - or probably even any collection of cases - will
>'prove' either of these eventualities to general satisfaction.
>That is not the aim. Indeed if the proof existed we would have
>done this already.

I agree.

>But what we can do is agree between us - and that is the point
>of this experiment - the best of the best that should be used to
>make our prima facie argument that this is a credible field of

>research that science should not be shunning.

I agree.

>And if we select the data to use in an objective, scientifically
>credible fashion (as the plan for my council strives to be) -
>rather than by simply debating this or that incident on Updates
>in an haphazard manner - then if we submit them as a UFO
>community in an agreed scientific format to the scientific
>community - we have a fighting chance of being taken seriously
>as at least making the effort to engender a meaningful
>discussion.

I agree.

>Basically I am suggesting that we create a team of people
>willing to devote some of their net time over the next (say) six
>months. Devote it to vetting and commenting upon case data
>submitted to them in an effort to find those cases to most
>strongly recommend via ufology as the ones most positively
>arguing towards the reality of the ETH.

No, toward the reality of an unexplained UFO phenomenon worthy
of careful scientific study. Secondarily, that the ETH is a
reasonable hypothesis.

>The concept is simple. The execution a little less so, for the
>reason that you set out. Lack of time and commitment to other
>ventures. But this is not a fatal flaw if we value the
>opportunity that such a venture provides.

>Perhaps sixteen is an unrealistic number but I suggested it as a
>way to ensure that as broad a spread and balance of viewpoints
>is represented. I would imagine 8 or 12 (that is 2 or 3 each of
>the pro, anti, ETH, the uncommitted and the outsider scientist
>perspective) would be achievable if that is all we can aim
>towards. But the exact number involved in the council is less
>important than actually creating it as the temporary entity that
>it is intended to be.

Here is where we begin to run into problems. I am sure everyone
will want to know who will be on the council and what the
procedures will be, and even hashing that out is very difficult.
I have been through this sort of thing several times before, and
achieving a "spread and balance" that is acceptable to everyone
could take months or years. Which is why I advocate a simpler
and more streamlined approach.

>Surely we could find eight people supported by their peers as
>qualified to be on this council who would see the value of
>devoting some of their time during the next six months to
>debating the evidence put before them? Eight people willing to
>commit wholeheartedly to this experiment - as they must do.

Those eight people then would have to pass muster by all sorts
of people out there who, as we all know, have all sorts of axes
to grind and positions to defend.

>After all, the main work lies with everybody else who would be
>charged with the task of finding the cases that they believe
>would convince science.

Here is where I strongly believe that the task of selecting
cases should be done by a committee of advocates and proponents
(by my terminology) and I volunteer to be a member of that
committee.

>It is up to these people (which means every working ufologist
>out there who thinks the ETH may be true) to summarise their
>investigation, the data and its findings and submit it to the
>council. All the council would have to do is debate this data -
>on a case by case basis - offering their opinions about the
>scientific potential of the evidence.

I have a serious problem with allowing "every working ufologist
out there" to submit cases for consideration. I strongly believe
that case selection should be done by senior, recognized people.
Every local investigator tends to think his or her case is the
most important one that ever came down the pike. And if this
seems elitist, then whatever nominating committee is
established, its members can and should consider strong cases

from lesser known investigators and can recommend them for consideration.

>When a case has been discussed by council then one person from
>the council (presumably the one with the most free time over the
>next six months!) could be charged with summarising the overall
>views on that case (and each other case as it is submitted by a
>ufologist during the period that the team operates) in a message
>to the UFO community.

Again, serious practical problems. Not just anyone can best summarize cases.

>Ufology - via UpDates, for instance - would thus be aware - on a
>day to day basis - of just what was going on in the council
>discussions as the project developed, and could discuss the
>councils views, feed in its own input and further the eventual
>debate leading towards the final report. The same could - and
>should - be true of skeptics lists. The whole point of this
>experiment is that this be a community effort and we recognise
>the differing opinions that exist.

I don't tend to think that a day-to-day or even week-to-week reporting to the List is either necessary or desirable.

>The council would not be the kings of this project - only one
>part of it. Literally every one of us would have a role to play
>to whatever extent we felt willing or able to commit to the
>venture.

>Then - at the end of the six months - the council could agree a
>statement to be issued to the UFO community summarising the sum
>total of the case data it has evaluated and the overall
>conclusions they reach about it - recommending which cases to
>ask the original investigators to work up into a proper format
>and to become part of a submission by ufology to science.

Again, the council's summarizations and recommendations will only be as good as the quality of the case input, and I for one don't care to leave that to amateurs.

>In this way, the burden is shared. Yes, the people elected onto
>the council have an individual responsibility to offer some time
>to debate the cases. Yes someone on that council has to take the
>responsibility to summarise the findings and post them regularly
>so you can all see what is going on and feed back your opinions
>into the debate. But all other ufologists have an equal
>responsibility to come up with the goods - their first hand case
>work. And make this a genuine group effort involving anyone who
>wishes to participate - since the comments of the council, the
>final selection of cases to be submitted to science and the form
>of that submission will be openly discussed by anyone who wants
>to do so.

Same reservations as above.

>The principle which I am suggesting allows this project to
>eschew giving power to individuals and to truly become a UFO
>community experiment that is harnessing the latent power of the
>internet. Rather than - as now - using the net only to engage in
>debate with no end purpose.

With this I strongly agree. Too many people appear to get their kicks merely out of trying to score debating points rather than trying to contribute to a resolution of the issues.

>We can easily say - its not possible or it is too hard. But
>ufologist needs to put defeatism and differences aside and try
>to make this happen.

>I hope there are enough people committed to making progress in
>this area - rather than maintaining the status quo - to give it
>a chance of success. But we will not know unless we try. And
>really that is all I am proposing. That we give this a try.
>That surely has to be preferable to doing nothing. We have been
>very good at that for a long time and a fresh approach seems
>called for.

Amen!

>>Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and proponents be

>>asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to focus on. Then
>>all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the nominated
>>cases.

>The problem with this is that we will soon get bogged down in
>wrangling over countless threads on multiple cases all going on
>at once. We need more structure behind the project to prevent it
>from degenerating into chaos. I think we need to limit the
>numbers - although setting no arbitrary total.

>If we create the council first we could then ask people to
>submit their own cases (and they 'must' - in my view - be first
>hand research that they have conducted and not cases they think
>will stand up based on what they have read in a book)

>This step, to me, is a vital prerequisite since it means the
>ufologist has to be confident enough in the calibre of their
>submitted work to let it be vetted by the council - which I
>think will limit us to the strongest candidates and impress
>science more than simply again reading digests of cases from old
>UFO books. We have been there, done that. Now it is time to make
>the T shirt.

Fine, if this "idealistic" council can be formed and accepted by
everyone, which seems to me more far-fetched than alien
visitors! Let's do it.

>I dont imagine this way we will get more than a dozen cases in
>the mix - although we may all be pleasantly surprised - but if
>so that is a managable number for the council - and for the UFO
>community in general to debate each one in turn in a six month
>window.

>A dozen or so is also a fair number to submit in depth to
>science at the end. 100 cases could not be the basis of this
>kind of submission without creating a report the size of a phone
>directory and I dont think most scientists will wade through
>that . Besides which we should give the impression of
>recommending the best candidates not scraping around just to
>fill an arbitrary number of 'berths' and make it look as if the
>argument can be made by strength of numbers alone.

Again, a dozen cases will not convince anyone of anything, and
my suggestion of a larger number should have included the
proviso that they are well-known and well-reported cases
internationally, so that exchanges of case material would not be
a serious problem. Again, if less well-known strong cases exist
out there, the nominators could and should take them into
account.

>We will be better served by fewer, stronger cases presented to
>science in the end in considerable depth. That is the
>consequence to which I think my idea would naturally lead.

Relatively speaking, I agree. But 12 strong cases is not going
to hack it.

- Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte

From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:37:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

>Bruce wrote:
>>Easton has returned on the backs of the pelicans.

>Bruce,

>You know how it goes; I couldn't find an available beamship, or
>one of the Gulf Breeze models, and those ungainly 'Trent'
>saucers are so 'declassé' - people keep laughing and pointing
>out the design was modelled on a 1950's rear-view car mirror.
>Lest we should take the case of Kenneth Arnold's remarkable
>encounter too seriously...

Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

Gentlemen,

This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
they would be UFOs.

Mr. Easton, your theory that what Mr. Arnold saw were White
Pelicans is fascinating, however, it cannot be proven, (Unless
you can somehow go back in time and come back with photographic
evidence of what Mr. Arnold was viewing), that what Mr. Arnold
saw were White Pelicans, same as it cannot be proven that what
Mr. Arnold saw were extra-terrestrial craft of some nature.

All the evidence you bring to the table means nothing because it
is based on supposition. It's based on the supposition that

1. White Pelicans WERE in the area
2. White Pelicans WERE flying around 10,000 feet up
3. Weather and lighting conditions were JUST RIGHT.
4. Mr. Arnold was telling YOUR version.

Theory and supposition do not make evidence.

<snip>

>After all, it's not as if all the recent factual revelations
>have threatened to destroy the foundations of a religion.

No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
inconclusively.

Dave (Furry)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 16:46:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:43:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Velez

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:42:57 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:14:26 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>Hi Bill,

>>Gee Bill, you couldn't possibly mean those same 'spheres' that
>>so many folks have been recording on video and photos for years
>>and trying to tell others about would you? ;)

><snip>

>It is interesting that you earlier mentioned hearing beeps as I
>have heard several recordings of continuous beeping and have
>studied several cases where witnesses mentioned hearing groups
>of three raps.

The 'recorded beeps' that you refer to, what were the
circumstances regarding how/when they were recorded? Was it
during a sighting/encounter?

>Your hearing groups of beeps seemingly combines
>the two phenomena.

How so Gary?

>Yes, it is a rare, highly unusual yet
>significant event. Beeps of several other types are often
>reported by experiencers and the commonality of this between
>experiencers is the significant aspect.

You mention 'beeps of other types' Gary could you elaborate a
little for us. What do mean by 'other types' of beeps?

>Have you tried to take pictures at the time or shortly after you
>hear the beeps to see if film can "see" something your eyes
>cannot?

No. Honest, I never would have thought to take pictures. Maybe
there's something wrong with me but, I just wouldn't think to
try to 'photograph a sound.' If I had been -real high- at the
time maybe, but not under ordinary circumstances. What would I
have aimed the camera at?

>Our studies seem to indicate an event can continue after
>hearing or seeing something unusual. Instruments or cameras can
>see parts of the event we are not personally sensitive to.

Wow. How interesting!

I gather you have photos to back up this claim that a camera
lens or the film it contains can "see parts of an event" that
our eyes are not sensitive to?

Gary you recommend to me that I shoot pictures of an empty room because the emulsion on the film is going to (possibly) record images that my eyes won't be able to see. I would like to see the pictures you are referring to. I'm curious to know 'what kinds' of things are turning up in your pix. What do I look for? Lights? Reflections? "Aliens?"

I worked on the graphics/art end of the printing industry for 16 years Gary. (Lithographer) We used photographic techniques all day long to create or assemble the images that would eventually turn up in ads in various publications, illo's for books, mags, CD packages etc. The list of things I cannot do with a piece of film is as short as the list of great British lovers. If we're talking knowledge of film emulsions and what they are capable of (sensitivity) the list is even shorter.

I know film.

I know cameras and lenses too, what they can do, and what they can't do. From humongous copy camera's, down to 35mm SLRs. I've done tricks with film that would blow your mind. I also took technical courses with experts from Kodak (paid for by my employers) while in the process of keeping my knowledge of film and all the different emulsions being used in the graphics industry current, and up to date. I had to. It was what I did for a living to support my family.

Gary I can honestly say that I've never heard of, or seen examples of, what you just recommended to me. Not that it isn't possible mind you, only that I really need to see a couple of examples of what you are referring to. (This film phenomena) I may even ask to see a negative or two.

(*Bob Shell, got yer ears on bro? If Gary can produce a couple of images I'll want your eyes on them too.) Gary can you share any examples of these pix please? I am genuinely curious and interested in having a look at them. I'm sure many others Listers will be as well. Actually, I can give you an 'educated' opinion of them. You'll be showing them to someone who -knows- film. (And if Bob isn't off on a jaunt or a desert shoot with the girls, maybe even two opinions.) ;)

Thanx,

until I hear from you,

John Velez

Got my loupe and my 'glasses assisted' eyeballs ready! ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

AUFORN Brisbane Australia Public Meeting March

From: Diane Harrison <tkbnetw@powerup.com.au>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 07:55:07 +1100
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:49:23 -0500
Subject: AUFORN Brisbane Australia Public Meeting March

AUFORN Brisbane
Public meeting will be held this Friday
on 16th March 2001

Guest Speaker: Tony Wicks

Topic: An Update on First Contact

Humanity is being observed by millions of UFOs. The Government
will soon admit they have been talking Face to Face with ETs for
over Fifty years

Come and find out what is in store for us in the next few years
leading to the year 2012 as we meet our Space Brother and
Sisters

Venue: Salisbury Community Center

183 Lillian Avenue Salisbury
07 38088567
Start time 7.30pm to Late
Tea, Coffee included and light supper

--
Regards

Diane Harrison

National Director
The Australian UFO Research Network
and UFO Hotline.

Tel number 1800 77 22 88 a Free Call
Australian UFO Research Network -
<http://www.powerup.com.au/~tkbnetw>

A non profit organisation
P.O Box 805
Springwood Qld 4127

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:09:22 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 18:56:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 11:43:41 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 17:11:45 -0000

>>>From: Dave Clarke <cd292@crazydiamonds.fsnet.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Can't Tell The Rendlesham Forest From The Trees?
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 22:01:19 -0000

><snip>

>>The book you cite that I contributed a chapter to clearly was a
>>good job. As a result of that chapter I received a free
>>subscription to FT and read its UFO coverage for over a year. It
>>was terribly biased against pro-UFO reality material and in
>>support of anything that placed UFOs in the context of some kind
>>of social craze (psychosocial to the core).

><snip>

>Dick, Dave,

>Hey, guys, let's quit tip-toeing around!

>The name of the book is "UFOs 1947-1997, From Arnold to the
>Abductees: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers," edited by Hilary
>Evans and Dennis Stacy, illus., index, 272 pages.

>Contributors include Dick Hall, Jerry Clark, Kenneth Arnold,
>John Rimmer, Chris Rutkowski, Jenny Randles, Cynthia Hind,
>Jacques Vallee, Col. Hector Quintanilla, Bill Chalker, Ray
>Fowler, the aforementioned Evans and Stacy and others.

>The book was so well-balanced that neither side bought it!

>Fortunately, as a consequence, however, I still have a lot of
>copies of the original hardcover book lying around. Did I say it
>was also beautifully produced?

>Anyway, I'm selling them (or trying to) for only \$19.95, postage
>included, or \$18.95 autographed. Check or money order to:

Dennis,

I agree. The book definitely is worthwhile and I recommend it to
serious students of the UFO question.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:53:46 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:52:27 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - Deardorff

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 01:40:49 EST
>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:49:44 -0800
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber

>>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 02:00:36 EST
>>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>The so called Antartica Ozone hole, and the one at the North
>>>Pole was discovered in 1958 by the US Navy. The flux of the
>>>Ozone hole opening big, closing etc has been monitored ever
>>>since then.
>>>...

>>Robert,

>>Do you have any reference to this 1958 discovery by the Navy,
>>which you could disclose to us? Or is this date not a typo?
>>Scientists didn't become aware of the problem until the 1970s.

>Some years ago as part of my cold war historical research I ran
>across Navy documents discussing how they were taking
>measurements of both the magnetic field and what we now call the
>Ozone hole down in the Antartica. They also measured how it
>expanded and closed.

>Apparently the same thing has/was done at the North pole as
>well. In passing I mentioned this to some former submariners and
>one didn't know anything about it while others said they were
>aware of it.

>At the time I didn't put alot of research time in it because I
>was more focused on the strategic arms side of the cold war.

>I will see if I can find, or at least point you to what I found
>years ago. I also recall seeing a news article which discussed
>how we have known about the hole since 1958 or thereabouts.

It's true that the annual O3 hole over Antarctica was, with hindsight, seen to be in existence quite a few years before scientists involved dared to recognize it as being real in the late 70's. But I don't recall that this oversight could date back as early as 1958, when the hole wouldn't have been much developed anyway.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:57:51 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:54:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:50:33 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

>>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:15:26 -0800
>>Subject: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Previously, Kurt posted:

>>A prime time audience saw Glenn in a scenario that had him
>>baring his soul into the microphone of a radio broadcast studio
>>and comedically unaware that he was being taped: "We know what
>>we saw out there and we couldn't really say anything. The bosses
>>were scared of this. They were afraid of 'War of the Worlds'
>>type stuff and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep
>>quiet."

Hi Roger, Kurt, Everybody:

Has it occurred to anyone that this was a TV sitcom?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:12:51 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:57:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:03 -0000

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

Dick, Jenny, List:

Have there been serious attempts to bring together a wide range of views for a colloquium, since the 1969 American Association for the Advancement of Science Washington affair, co-chaired by Carl Sagan?

I don't mean something like the sessions that the Society of Scientific Exploration sponsored, where only one side was presented, but a full-blown colloquium with skeptics and pro UFO researchers.

This is the sort of thing done by many scientific disciplines. Why not UFOs. The book that came out of the 1969 seminar is still widely quoted.

One good thing which does happen now are the exchanges on lists like this. This is common in scientific fields far and wide.

Any ideas along this line?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:41:44 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:02:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hart

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:24:13 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: 13 Mar 2001 06:52:49 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Years ago when I investigated the Brian Scott case I recall he
>>mentioned hearing beeps just as you have. But, there is more.
>>Some of those beeps were recorded on audio tape.

>Now that I'd like to hear! I can tell you immediately if it is
>the same sound/pitch that myself and my wife have heard. Can you
>send me a simple sound file with a sample of Brian's beeps?

>>I have at least
>>one of the tapes with a record of those mysterious beeps. I
>>thought it might be associated with a signal or communication
>>that Brian was receiving at the time.

>I don't have enough evidence to convict, but my 'suspicion' is;
>that it is 'some form' of communication or maybe even a sound
>that is supposed to "trigger" some response. (ala Manchurian
>Candidate)

>>When he made a requested
>>trip to Tiahuanaco and stood in the entrance portal of the
>>Temple of Kalasasas, beeps were also recorded on tape. It was a
>>strange case with traces of physical evidence which made it
>>fascinating and compelling. I am sure there must be others who
>>have reported this.

>EBK had Lindy Tucker on his program who recorded "beeping"
>sounds during UFO sightings!

>So there is a documented connection between the Beeping and
>some UFOs (whatever they may have been.) Interesting and
>intriguing little detail this is. I hope we can learn more about
>it as time passes. It's just one of many such 'details' that
>many abductees from all over the globe share in common.

>We need a GD serious investigation! I've been trying to get
>one for years now. It's frustrating as hell but then I don't
>give up easily. ;)

>Still here, still waiting,

>John Velez

John and Bill,

I would also be interested in listening to both examples of
taped beeps. Lindy let me have a copy of her tape several years
ago and the five beep sequences are very, very similar. In one
case the beeping came out of a video camera that was turned off,

while a dark triangle was flying over the witness's house.

Several other cases have cropped up in my research that involve beeps and the tape is very good for comparison purposes. The question is whether the beeps are what you hear both external to yourself and internally as some experiencers have at times reported. Maybe we can communicate further about this.

In Lindy's case, she heard the beeps, went outside to see what was happening, found her cat sitting on a fence post listening to them, then saw a small, silver disk come out of a nearby woods. She then went inside her house and could stop a kitchen clock by looking at it for 30 minutes afterward. A compass spun in her hand for that same time period so is this communication? It sounds more like an energy discharge and psychic charging effect. Ever heard of anything like this?

The biggest problem in doing research is getting your periodic witnesses to use a camera or tape recorder to document an event for further study. I have had witnesses say they saw small triangles float across their property on several occasions, for instance, then tell me they really weren't interested in having even a disposable camera handy. This is one reason I recommend using a charged videocamera to record image and sound together to make documentation easier but I can say usually I won't be at their house when things happen so I need their co-operation. Unlike some investigative groups, I will provide analytical results when they become available.

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:55:52 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:04:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000
>Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:17:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton

>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

><snip>

>Even if it was a 'flash' which first caught his attention,
>Arnold confirmed that when the actual objects were first noted,
>he thought they were Snow Geese.

>If you still wonder why Arnold would ever remotely have
>considered Snow Geese, to the extent he rationalised they
>wouldn't be flying at such altitude (which we was incidentally
>wrong about) or heading south at that time of year, alas, only
>Arnold could have explained this to you.

>All I know is that before he decided these were jets, Arnold
>thought they were Snow Geese. And that's all we need to know.

The explanation is simple: First there were flashes, exact
location unknown. Then the bright objects were spotted north of
Rainier, but no flashes initially. Then a flash and more flashes
were seen to come directly from the bright objects.

It was in the first few seconds of that middle stage when Arnold
spotted the bright objects that he thought for a moment they
might be white snow geese. He didn't think geese could fly that
high but if he was in doubt the intense arc-light flash settled
the question since geese couldn't do that.

The sequence of events was all but reconstructed by you in the
following UFO UpDates postings, quoted as follows:

1. A "tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces of my aircraft".
2. He spent, "the next twenty to thirty seconds urgently searching the sky all around".
3. There was a further flash.
4. He then (some more seconds having elapsed), saw "a formation of very bright objects coming from the vicinity of Mount Baker", which was to the north of Mt. Rainier.

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/jul/m18-001.shtml>
<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/jul/m22-009.shtml>

It was at stage 4 that Arnold thought they might be geese -- until he saw that intense flashes were coming straight from the objects. Until then he had no idea these "bright objects" had anything to do with the previous flashes.

The only question might be the exact durations of each interval since Arnold's initial sudden startlement from the first flash made him worry that he may be about to collide with another aircraft close by. Such stress tends to cause overestimation of time intervals.

When Arnold was asked by reporters when did he first see the "objects" he told them about the "bright objects" he had first thought to be geese and he omitted the prior flashes.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: HE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:46:10 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:06:13 -0500
Subject: Re: HE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Balaskas

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:32:25 -0500
>Subject: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive
>To: @snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net
>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

<snip>

>UFOWATHCDOG.COM presents an exclusive interview with UFO X Files
>about its claim of having material from the Roswell UFO crash.
><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/roswellex.html>

Hi Royce!

After I read your exclusive interview, the name Dr. Russell VernonClark who was with the University of California, San Diego came to my mind. Is Dr. VernonClark the name of the scientist involved with these Roswell UFO crash artifacts? If so, check out the URL below for Dr. VernonClark's initial incredible findings.

http://members.tripod.com/~Dr_VernonClark/talk.html

Nick Balaskas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:13:34 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:11:32 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01

>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:09:31 -0500
>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-13-01
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>UFOWATCHDOG.COM
>"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
><http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

<snip>

>***OF INTEREST***

>UFOWATCHDOG.COM is seeking your comments and opinions regarding
>Senator John Glenn's appearance on NBC's sitcom Fraiser. Were
>Glenn's comments an admission of UFOs or simply taken out of
>context? Let us know - e-mail comments to
>ufowatchdog@earthlink.net

I would suggest that if somebody got a copy of the script from that episode, they would find that the writer (who is writing fiction) is the one who gave John Glenn those words.

Bottom line is it has nothing to do with disclosure or otherwise, its just a Hollywood writer trying to put a new angle in having a real celeb guesting on a show.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

CCCRN News: 'Fields of Dreams 2001' Crop Circle

From: Paul Anderson <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:17:28 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:13:21 -0500
Subject: CCCRN News: 'Fields of Dreams 2001' Crop Circle

CCCRN NEWS
The E-News Service of the Canadian Crop Circle Research Network

<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

March 14, 2001

Reminder for those of you in or near the Vancouver, BC area:

'FIELDS OF DREAMS 2001'
BARCLAY MANOR HOUSE, VANCOUVER, BC
MARCH 19, 2001

In this next 'Fields of Dreams' presentation, part of a continuing series, CCCRN director Paul Anderson will provide an overview of the 2000 crop circle season, from Canada and around the globe, with special reports on the Canadian crop circles of 2000 in another busy and most interesting year. The Canadian crop circles and now the "ice rings" have been the focus of much media attention the past couple weeks, including The National Post, CBC Radio and others (see the media section on the web site for complete listings, including online news stories and some additional upcoming radio interviews this week). After this, the next lecture at Barclay Manor House, a beautiful historic old mansion in the heart of downtown Vancouver, will be in June.

Monday, March 19, 2001
7:30 - 9:30 pm
Barclay Manor House / West End Community Centre
1447 Barclay Street, Vancouver, BC

Free admission (call 604.257.8333 to pre-register; please book ahead as seating is limited)

For further information:
604-731-8522
<http://www.geocities.com/cropcirclecanada>

© Canadian Crop Circle Research Network, 2001

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:33:50 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:16:28 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Gates

>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:39:43 +1300

>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>Previously, William asked:

<snip>

Roger wrote:

>>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted
>>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk
>>missing a deadline because of a potential glitch induced by the
>>software. Sorry, no offense, but my interest in AA only goes so
>>far. However, I understand the original of this was a Betacam
>>SP. If you send me an NTSC version on Betacam SP, I will be glad
>>to look at your work. Besides, that would be better than
>>anything on disc. I can digitize it at 13 megs per second and
>>grab frames for work in Photoshop.

Bill Replied:

>With all due respect Roger you have stated you work with
>videotape and very familiar with the workings of such. The AA
>CDs are produced on MPEG2 files, which, as I understand it are
>the professionals standard.

>I find it difficult to accept that you don't have some
>viewing/editing programs on one of your computers able to see
>the CDs if you were truly wishing to contribute to this
>discussion with everyone seeing the same images.

I don't find it difficult to accept at all. Work with and around computers. First rule of thumb is to not put any new programs, or updates of old ones on your production computers. Why? Most if not all software is released with bugs. Not a good thing to put on a production line computer. For example when Microsoft released Windows 2000, it was released with approx 65,000 bugs. Some were fixed with SP-1 and some were not. Sometimes you have updates of old software that have problems working with either the "old" operating system, and or have problems working with whatever the "latest" operating system is.

While the MPEG2 standard may be marvelous for people to watch things over computers with, its a far cry from the quality Roger would get off the Betacam copy. Likewise Roger may be able to point something out to everybody that is visible in the Betacam capture copy as opposed to the lesser MPEG copy.

>As Ed explained the BetacamSP copy was only loaned to Neil, so
>to do what you're asking seems to be a pretty difficult task
>especially seeing as you can't or won't open the CDs already
>sent.

So why doesn't Ed or whom ever put Roger in touch with the person with the Betacam copy? The person may be tickled pink to let Roger take a look at it.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 14](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:49:15 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:18:08 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Tonnies

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:18:47 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>Neil has done some wonderful work, but the problem is the
>difference in resolution in the AA footage and the Ramey photos.

While I'm interested in the close look Neil has given to the AA, I've never been impressed with the proposed connection between the Ft. Worth/"debris footage" photos.

Interestingly, an image just hit the Net showing what some are claiming are "letters: on Mars. One of them, whatever it is, is a dead-ringer for one of the shapes supposedly detectable in the Ft. Worth wreckage. Email me and I'll be happy to send it to you as an attachment.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Myers

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:24:05 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:45:16 -0500
Subject: Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Myers

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:46:10 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:32:25 -0500
>>Subject: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive
>>To: @snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net
>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

><snip>

>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM presents an exclusive interview with UFO X Files
>>about its claim of having material from the Roswell UFO crash.
>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/roswellex.html>

>Hi Royce!

>After I read your exclusive interview, the name Dr. Russell
>VernonClark who was with the University of California, San Diego
>came to my mind. Is Dr. VernonClark the name of the scientist
>involved with these Roswell UFO crash artifacts? If so, check
>out the URL below for Dr. VernonClark's initial incredible
>findings.

>http://members.tripod.com/~Dr_VernonClark/talk.html

Nick,

Thanks for the info and the link. I do remember this scientist
and others have mentioned this to me. UFO X Files is not
releasing any names or other information concerning the alleged
Roswell debris one way or the other and I have been pressing for
more info. My initial assumption is that it may not be that same
piece of material as the information I have received is that
there are 3 to 5 pieces of material. However, I have not been
able to confirm that information as of yet.

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 00:47:01 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:47:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:55:52 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:17:18 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton

>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
>>>Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

>><snip>

>>Even if it was a 'flash' which first caught his attention,
>>Arnold confirmed that when the actual objects were first noted,
>>he thought they were Snow Geese.

>>If you still wonder why Arnold would ever remotely have
>>considered Snow Geese, to the extent he rationalised they
>>wouldn't be flying at such altitude (which we was incidentally
>>wrong about) or heading south at that time of year, alas, only
>>Arnold could have explained this to you.

>>All I know is that before he decided these were jets, Arnold
>>thought they were Snow Geese.

>>And that's all we need to know.

Uh uh.

No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import. The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all you need to know. The objects were stated by Arnold as too fast and too far away to be birds. He did the math. If birds, then their very size would make them too small to resolve on the retina at that distance. You are making presumptions unsupported by any facts.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Felder

From: **Bobbie Felder** <jilain@ebicom.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:45 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:50:04 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Felder

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:13:34 EST
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:09:31 -0500
>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-13-01
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

><snip>

>I would suggest that if somebody got a copy of the script from
>that episode, they would find that the writer (who is writing
>fiction) is the one who gave John Glenn those words.

>Bottom line is it has nothing to do with disclosure or
>otherwise, its just a Hollywood writer trying to put a new angle
>in having a real celeb guesting on a show.

I could not possibly agree with you more. I have been amazed at how "much ado about nothing" this whole Frasier episode has become around the UFO circles on the internet. I saw the episode in question. I thought it was very funny.

I think a lot of UFO Community people just so desperately want some sort of official disclosure statement, they are reading more into this than there actually is.

And that's my arm-chair psychoanalysis for tonight :)

Bobbie

=====
Bobbie "Jilain" Felder
--->backwoods of Mississippi
--->USA
--->planet Earth
--->somewhere in the Cosmos
www.jilain.com
Point of View Webcast
www.dragoncrest.net
Online publishing
=====

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 18:08:22 +1300
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:54:32 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:33:50 EST
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
>>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:39:43 +1300

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 18:10:51 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>>Previously, William asked:

><snip>

>Roger wrote:

>>>Again, I cannot play the CDs sent to me without loading unwanted
>>>software on systems that I use for my livelihood. I can't risk
>>>missing a deadline

<snip>

>Bill (erm (wondering(?) William)Replied:

>>With all due respect Roger you have stated you work with
>>videotape and very familiar with the workings of such. The AA
>>CDs are produced on MPEG2 files, which, as I understand it are
>>the professionals standard.

and William continued burble burble non import stuff

>>I find it difficult to accept that you don't have some
>>viewing/editing programs on one of your computers able to see
>>the CDs if you were truly wishing to contribute to this
>>discussion with everyone seeing the same images.

Bob said...

>I don't find it difficult to accept at all.

>While the MPEG2 standard may be marvelous for people to watch
>things over computers with, its a far cry from the quality Roger
>would get off the Betacam copy. Likewise Roger may be able to
>point something out to everybody that is visible in the Betacam
>capture copy as opposed to the lesser MPEG copy.

Then Billium said (huh?)

>>As Ed explained the BetacamSP copy was only loaned to Neil, so
>>to do what you're asking seems to be a pretty difficult task
>>especially seeing as you can't or won't open the CDs already
>>sent.

ahh Bob?

>So why doesn't Ed or whom ever put Roger in touch with the
>person with the Betacam copy? The person may be tickled pink to
>let Roger take a look at it.

I don't know Robert

Cheers

Bill erm William umm ;-)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:18:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:58:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

>Date Wed, 14 Mar 2001 164656 -0500
>To updates@sympatico.ca
>From John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject Re Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>The 'recorded beeps' that you refer to, what were the
>circumstances regarding how/when they were recorded?
>Was it during a sighting/encounter?

One beep event was recorded in Canada back in the '60s or '70s by game wardens who heard beeps, stopped their car, called headquarters and let the dispatcher hear and record the sound, then they fired a gun to see if the unseen beeping object would react. The beeps sped up and a disc took off with flames behind it. Two other cases were when beeps were heard and nothing was seen in a Canadian area near where crop circles had been found.

Beeps sound very much like sonar pings in each case. I think there were five, possibly four beep events on the tape.

>>Your hearing groups of beeps seemingly combines
>>the two phenomena.

>How so Gary?

Phenomena at several different locations often represents a mix of phenomena at each location with some overlap of phenomena types. My evolving case study technique involves conceptually connecting each location and series of event types by understanding that phenomena type overlap means the source is probably the same at each location.

I conceptually connect locations because it seems the overlap of event types increases the longer you look or collect event observational data so I make the conceptual connection rather quickly.

My study is only of areas or locations with ongoing activity with an emphasis on single pieces of property.

>You mention 'beeps of other types' Gary could you
>elaborate a little for us. What do mean by 'other types' of
>beeps?

Experiencers often hear beeps both inside and outside their head. These may or may not sound the same or similar to the recorded beeps. Perhaps you can tell me.

>>Have you tried to take pictures at the time or shortly
>>after you hear the beeps...

>No. Honest, I never would have thought to take pictures.
>Maybe there's something wrong with me but, I just
>wouldn't think to try to 'photograph a sound.' If I had been
>-real high- at the time maybe, but not under ordinary
>circumstances. What would I have aimed the camera at?

The apparent position of the sound. I have many odd pictures but only a few I consider significant because the images are so

strange and I know the conditions were controlled to some extent. The sound is an energy discharge, right? You are attempting to photograph an energy discharge.

One has a light in it that was unseen because I know I was in total darkness in an area where I was seeing dim arcs of blue or green so there was something going on. The irregular light is a fairly bright orange.

>>Our studies seem to indicate an event can continue
>>after hearing or seeing something unusual. Instruments
>>or cameras...

...may be able to...

>>see parts of the event we are not personally sensitive
>>to.

>Wow. How interesting!

>I gather you have photos to back up this claim that a
>camera lens or the film it contains can "see parts of an
>event" that our eyes are not sensitive to?

I have some video of strange zipping objects, some of which are the same as Barry Taff captured on daylight video at a CA location. Light darts and fast moving fuzz balls for lack of a better description.

One still picture came from a friend in AZ and looks like a glowing window in the air. Another picture looks like a stick on fire. Nothing was seen at the time.

I can only guess why the phenomena looks this way. We need to take much more data to even start to guess what is going on. When we can't get diffraction spectrums from some of the lights we do see perhaps you can start to see the difficulty in studying a range of phenomena that to some extent defies your normal attempts to observe and measure.

I typically study anomalous luminous phenomena and areas where it occurs. You can at least see something happening which makes pictures easier but some of the other event types found in these areas are sounds such as grinding noises or jet noises in the air and the like.

One report of an odd occurrence is in an area where blue balls of light were reported, which is why I got interested. The scared witnesses reported walking into an invisible solid-feeling object once and seeing robed figures walking through the woods on another occasion. There are five faults within several miles of the location, the spot is directly between several and has a history of lights following cars and bizarre things like that.

>Gary you recommend to me that I shoot pictures of an
>empty room because the emulsion on the film is going to
>(possibly) record images that my eyes won't be able to
>see. I would like to see the pictures you are referring to.
>I'm curious to know 'what kinds' of things are turning up
>in your pix. What do I look for? Lights? Reflections?
>"Aliens?"

You have to get good at looking carefully when you take your picture to see what might normally show up in the picture as an error factor. This includes reflections and such from room objects. Then you note anything that is extremely obvious as being out of place or unexplained in the resulting picture. It is easier to work with video because you have instant feedback for your viewing and can adjust the camera if you see something. No faces in clouds or mirrors stuff here. Anything odd must be exceptionally obvious to be worthy of additional study.

>I know film.

>I know cameras and lenses too, what they can do, and
>what they can't do. From humongous copy camera's,
>down to 35mm SLRs. Gary I can honestly say that I've
>never heard of, or seen examples of, what you just
>recommended to me. Not that it isn't possible mind you,
>only that I really need to see a couple of examples of

>what you are referring to. (This film phenomena) I may
>even ask to see a negative or two.

>Gary can you share any examples of these pix please? I
>am genuinely curious and interested in having a look at
>them. I'm sure many other Listers will be as well.

>Thanx,

>until I hear from you,

>John Velez

>Got my loupe and my 'glasses assisted' eyeballs ready! >:)

Give me a day or so. Remember, most of them (let me send two or three) are not be all, end all proof. I expect that to come from working with something for an extended time - many minutes or hours minutely interacting with some phenomena and documenting it with the proper technology. This is essential. My research methods must evolve with continuing observations. Making better observations through practice with equipment and application of better documentation methods works best.

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabeevvvv

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 02:31:39 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:08:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabeevvvv

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000

>.>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>>
>>Date: Sun, 11 Mar 2001 23:57:09 -0500
>>Fwd Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 14:12:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Bruce Maccabee - Maccabee

>Bruce wrote:

>>Easton has returned on the backs of the pelicans.

>Bruce,

>You know how it goes; I couldn't find an available beamship, or
>one of the Gulf Breeze models, and those ungainly 'Trent'
>saucers are so 'declassé' - people keep laughing and pointing
>out the design was modelled on a 1950's rear-view car mirror.

>>At one point he says I no longer mention brightness of
>>reflection as an argument against pelicans.

>I said you no longer challenged that 'shiny' pelicans didn't
>exist. I easily proved to you they did.

"Easily"... under the WRONG conditions: "Shiny"... when the
pelicans and the SUN are in the SAME direction for a grazing
angle incidence of light upon the birds.

>>So far as I know, no ornithologist or glider pilot or whatever
>>has compared the reflection from a pelican to the brightness of
>>a welder's arc.

>I'm also not aware of anyone other than Arnold who described
>undulating flight as 'like skipping a saucer across water'.

Has nothing to do with brightness of reflection.

>What's Arnold describing - it's a 'blinding flash', or a
>'dazzling' light.

>Are you seriously suggesting that no-one has ever seen this
>being reflected by an enormous, glossy, white-plumaged bird,
>with a 30 foot area of wingspan?

Yes,,,, when the birds were in a direction opposite the sun there
is no "blinding flash"

>Evidently not, as you acknowledge I've cited examples. I'll
>reference some new ones in a moment.

>So what are you saying? That Arnold's mention of a 'blinding
>flash' isn't comparable to a 'dazzling flash', because he used
>a comparative, 'arc like' simile?

Arnold clearly indicated that the flashes were very bright... the flash on his aircraft having alerted him to the presence of the objects (at a great distance)

>Or are you just seizing at stalks of threshed grain.

I think you are throwing out the grain and trying to make an argument based on the chaff.

SNIP

>Even if it was a 'flash' which first caught his attention,
>Arnold confirmed that when the actual objects were first noted,
>he thought they were Snow Geese.

Yes. It appears there was a flash which caught his attention. It was so bright that he started searching th sky for a neaby aircraft. He said he thought maybe some "hotshot" air force pilot had "buzzed" his aircraft. Then after some seconds a second flash directed his attention to the north of Mt. Rainier. There he saw the chain of distant objects which, because of their arrangement in the sky and their motions made him think of geese. It would appear that there was no flashing at the time he was thinking of geese. Arnold had the impression they were very distant... hence traveling very fast.

>If you still wonder why Arnold would ever remotely have considered Snow Geese, to the extent he rationalised they >wouldn't be flying at such altitude (which we was incidentally >wrong about) or heading south at that time of year, alas, only >Arnold could have explained this to you.

Yes. But this doesn't address the "data point" provided by Arnold: VERY bright reflection from objects so far away that he could barely make out their shapes. Note, if geese they had to be several miles away at least to prevent immediate identification.

>All I know is that before he decided these were jets, Arnold t>hought they were Snow Geese. And that's all we need to know.

>>However, he has pointed out that ornithologists and bird >>watchers have referred to bright reflections from pelicans. How >>can this be? Any diffuse reflecting surface can have a "glint" >>which is a brighter than normal reflection when the light source >>is almost aligned with the surface. In this case it means that >>the pelican is nearly between the observer and the sun so the >>sunlight causes a grazing reflection from the pelican feathers. >>In the case of Arnold this does not apply: the sun was to the >>west of Arnold and the UFOs were to the east (Easton has not >>disputer this.... yet...) so any reflection off the pelicans >>would be the normal diffuse reflection. They would have appeared >>no brighter than the snow reflection ...and ,in fact may well >>had been less bright than the reflection from snow on Mt. >>Rainier.

>As with suggestions that White Pelicans are not indigenous to >the Western Cascades, or can't travel south in June, it's also >surprising that anyone would think such as basic factor as the >local conditions would never have been investigated.

Clearly the local conditions HAVE been investigated... ad nauseum.

>This was discussed with people who do actually understand the >nature of light being reflected from feathers and have many >years experience observing birds, as opposed to guessing from a >vehemently predisposed position.

>I have published much of this material before, although not all >of it. The following is part of extensive discussions with local >ornithologists and begins after I had first raised the topic of >Arnold's sighting. The question was - does local expertise >recognise anything in Arnold's descriptions which indicates the >ormation of nine objects might have been an indigenous bird >species:

Only part of the question was asked,.

>[BEGIN]

>James Easton writes, re UFO's:

>>On 24 June, 1947, Kenneth Arnold, a successful salesman and
>>experienced search and rescue pilot, took off in his small plane
>>from Chehalis, Washington en route to Yakima. Close to Mineral,
>>Washington and about 25 miles from Mount Rainier, he noticed a
>>formation of 9 unusual objects flying from north to south.

><snip>

>>"They didn't fly like any aircraft I had ever seen before...The
>>elevation of the first craft was greater than that of the last.
>>They flew in a definite formation but erratically. ...Or maybe
>>it would be best to describe their flight characteristics as
>>very similar to a formation of geese,

><snip>

>>Arnold dismissed geese as an explanation due to the reflective
>>nature of the objects and his estimate of their speed and
>>distance.

><snip>

>>"At the time I did not get the impression that the flashes were
>>emitted by them, but rather that it was the sun's reflection
>>from the extremely highly polished surface of their wings".>

>Arthur C. Clarke recounts in one of his 1960's nonfiction books
>(Profiles of the Future?) a similar sighting of 'skipping
>saucers' off the coast of Sri Lanka that (as he knew they would)
>turned out to be gulls with sunlight reflecting off the water
>onto their underwings where it was alternatively visible and
>invisible in a regular pulsating pattern.

>This isn't an uncommon sight, either, though it usually requires
>a particular set of conditions. First, calm water; second, low
>sunrise or sunset angle to the light; third, a slightly
>distorting horizon heat-haze sometimes enhances the illusion but
>it's not mandatory; fourth, the birds, usually gulls, moving
>along the horizon need to be flying just off the water and to be
>sufficiently far off that the observer can't make out any
>features on them including shape. Seen it a ton of times. and I
>expect one could see it at virtually every seaside in the world
>where distant gulls fly over brightly-lit water.

One more VERY IMPORTANT condition not mentioned here. But the
condition is hinted at by the explanation that sunlight had to
be reflected from the water and then onto the bird wings. Note
that this is a grazing reflection off the water (forward gloss
or "glint" which is a strong reflection) followed by a grazing
reflection from the birds underwings (because the birds are
distant and low, nearly on the horizon). The reflection of the
sunlight off the water is quite strong since the angle between
the sun rays and the water surface is small. Of course, the
sunlight is also diminished by the fact that at sunset (or
sunrise) the sunlight is traveling through several hundred miles
of atmosphere and thus being attenuated (you can look directly
at the sun at sunset). Hence the reflectivity of the birds is
"enhanced" (made more obvious) by the lower background level of
light at sunset (sunrise)

[Easton]

>Given the
>location, 25 mi off Mt Rainier's glacial sides, ice would be a
>great substitute reflector and would easily blast enough
>sunlight back up onto birds' underwings to make them reflect
>very brightly. Just look at the excruciating whiteness of the
>underwings of an adult white-headed gull such as a Herring or
>Glaucous-winged flying over snow on a sunny winter day.

Yes, Jim, some of us heard this all before. You are attempting
to create a "sun in the east" by appealing to reflection off the
snow/glacier on Mt. Rainier to act as a source of light to be
reflected from the birds. Your hypothesis of snow/glacier
reflected light then reflecting off the birds would only work as
long as the birds were between Arnold and Mt. Rainier. Would
not explain reflections BEFORE the "birds" got to Mt. Rainier
and would not explain Arnold's claim that he continued to see
reflections as they flew southward from the vicinity of Mt.
Rainier.

You will recall, no doubt, that I produced a small "research paper" which you must have read eagerly, in which I calculated relative brightnesses of white birds illuminated directly by the sun (birds in the east, sun in the west), of the snow on the distant mountain (Mt. Rainier), of the horizon sky to the east and even to the "glacier-reflected" light reflected from the hypothetical birds. That paper is attached. SKIP the first two sections (if you are not interested in flipping and flashing).

However, to make it simple, one finds that the sky and mountain snow/glacier are of roughly comparable brightness. Now, consider this: any reflection off a surface cannot be brighter than the light source itself. So even a 100% specular reflection (like that from a mirror) of light from the snow/glacier from a hypothetical (metal!) bird could not appear brighter to the observer than the brightness of the snow/glacier. But Arnold did not refer to blinding brightness of the snow/glacier on the mountain. And this is not surprising since the mountain was over 20 miles away at the time. Brightness of the mountain was reduced by atmospheric absorption and by the distance.

>Given the time of year, and that, if Arnold were looking at
>birds whether or not he knew it, what would they likely be?
>Canada Geese come to mind immediately, most other large
>waterfowl being in the North, and he mentions geese as a
>possibility. But what would Canada geese be doing high up over
>Mt Rainier in late June? Heading for a molting lake, probably.
>Could they reflect that much light? Certainly, particularly if
>over ice. How about gulls? Well, which gulls are likely then?
>It's a little ways inland, so Glaucous-winged Gull isn't likely,
>but California Gull would be.

Actually they wouldn't have been "high up over Mt. Rainier/"
They would have been about at Arnold/'s altitude at a distance
of about 20 miles from Rainier (several miles less than Arnold).

SKIP candidate birds suggested

>>I'd submit that the hypothesis of a small southbound flock of
>>failed- or non-breeder American White Pelicans observed by
>>someone unfamiliar with underwing reflectivity would provide the
>>same phenomena and be at least as good an alternative
>>possibility than seeing artefacts from another planet.

>Darn it.

>>Appreciating this is perhaps something of an unusual query to
>>the list

>And a pleasure to think about. Lots of fun. Thanks, James!

>Michael Price.

(Dear Michael, your submission is duly noted. But so what?)

>In a message dated 97-11-20 07: Michael Price writes:

>>>There's another possible candidate species in the area at that
>>>time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile
>>>and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high
>>>altitude would even more produce every detail of the
>>>phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-
>>>breeder southbound White Pelicans.

EVERY DETAIL of what Arnold reported? I guess poor Mr. White
wasn't told "every detail."

>Oh no! Another myth debunked. But, you've just gotta believe.

>Yikes Michael! Are we of like minds or what?! When I first
>read the original post from James Easton, White Pelicans was the
>first thing that came to mind as I was reflecting back on an
>ultra-high flying southbound formation I saw a few years ago
>over the Barancas in western Durango, Mexico, east of Mazatlan.
>It was a fluke that I detected them at all by unaided eye. Even
>in the bins, I was perplexed about what they were for awhile, at
>first not even sure they were birds. Strange lighting and angle
>it was.

>I spend more time than just about anyone out exposed and looking
>at the sky. Much to my dismay, I've yet to see anything that
>couldn't be explained. I'm taking it personal by now, and am
>convinced that I've been singled out and left out. :-/

>Richard Rowlett.

>>>There's another possible candidate species in the area at that
>>>time of year (sporadically) whose color, size, flight profile
>>>and proclivity for formation flight at sometimes quite high
>>>altitude would even more produce every detail of the
>>>phenomenon which Arnold observed: a flock of non- or failed-
>>>breeder southbound White Pelicans.

>Michael, my first thought when I started reading your analysis
>was white pelican. Several years ago, when training a good
>birder in the finer details of splitting migrating hawks into
>species, age, etc at long distances at the beginning of the fall
>migration season (i.e. training him to run our count), we saw
>distant white "blurps" fading in and out of visibility many
>miles north. This was at the Goshutes, i.e. on the Utah/Nevada
>border. It was near sunset. It was obvious that the sun was
>reflecting on their underwings. They'd disappear momentarily and
>then reappear in sequence. They were flying east-to-west and we
>first spotted them somewhat to the northeast. I pegged them as
>white pelicans almost immediately, as the whole cadence of the
>thing matched the way white pelicans will soar in line (in this
>case - they'll also "V" up), and rather than flap all at once,
>often will each begin to flap as each reaches the position where
>he previous bird began to flap. Same with turning, etc. Of
>course, they'll also do this in more of a synchronized
>formation, too, but I'm sure you've all seen white pelicans flap
>and glide in the kind of pattern I'm describing.>

>I couldn't think of any bird that would show such a cadence and
>literally twinkle white while switching from soaring to
>flapping.

Any arc bright reflections?

>As they continued heading west, of course the northerly component
>of their distance from us diminished (i.e. they got closer :) and
>the squat battleship like profile of the pelicans were
>noticeable.

>It was very cool, actually. Among other things, the trainee
>started believing me when I told him a distant accipiter was a
>sharpie, not a Coop (or vice-versa).

>>I'd submit that the hypothesis of a small southbound flock of
>>failed- or non-breeder American White Pelicans observed by
>>someone unfamiliar with underwing reflectivity would provide the
>>same phenomena and be at least as good an alternative
>>possibility than seeing artefacts from another planet.>

>Having spent a lot of time watching pelicans, I'm convinced they
>are artefacts from another planet :)

>Don Baccus.

>James Easton writes:

>>This is obviously of great interest and I'm extremely grateful.

>>If the "gap" Arnold mentions is a known feature of Pelican
>>formations, perhaps someone could kindly confirm for the record.>

>Fortuitous, in my opinion; all line-abreast, -diagonal and -
>astern flocking birds develop gaps and fill them in randomly.>

Wonder about the spacing of th birds. Arnold said the length of
the chain of objects was about the same as the length of a
mountain ridge which was about 25 miles away and about 5 miles
long... angular size about 1/5 radian. For birds at 10,000 ft (2
miles) this corresponds to 2000 ft. With 9 objects there are 8
gaps between the birds,..... so the average spacing would be
2000/8 = 250 ft. I have seen large birds fly in a flock. I'd say
the spacing is no more than 10 times the length of a bird. More

like 25 ft than 250 ft.

[ARNOLD WROTE] >>"What startled me the most was the fact that I could not find >>any tails on them".

[Easton]

>From a small plane, looking for such relatively small body
>features as tails is like a grown man standing above a penny on
>the ground and trying to make out the date.

>>Arnold stated that, "the time was about 3:00 PM and the sun was
>>just slightly to the southwest of being directly overhead" and
>>also estimated that the objects "were pretty much on the horizon
>>to me which would indicate that they were near the same
>>elevation as me".

>They're on the horizon and he's looking for _tails_? Holy Nelly,
>hat's ambition for ya. Well, that would be 2 PM without
>Daylight Saving Time, so the sun position would be as he said.
>Assuming he was looking at birds, the flipflop appearance of
>these birds would be visible whether higher, same altitude, or
>lower as the sun might be reflecting strongly and directly off
>white upper and/or underwing surfaces, but the underwings might
>be catching light from the same source as caused the flashes
>mentioned further on.

[...]

>>You do realise, I'll never convince the 'true believers'.
>>PELICANS!!! It's an outrage!!

>Reality usually is. They'll get over it. Or not. That's their
>problem.

>Michael Price
>[END]

>Indeed it is...

>So, as you see, the issue was comprehensively covered.

>But surely you knew that already.

Yes, comprehensively covered... and comprehensively
rejected.

>Here's one more example of how light reflecting onto feathers
>can produce a reflection of such 'brilliance' it contrasts with
>the snow.

>"One would think a pale gray and white adult male harrier would
>blend into the whiteness, but this is far from truth. There is
>some contrast in the bird's coal black wing tips and two bright
>yellow eyes in a face that rotates, turns, scans the ground and
>glances my way. But it is the sunlight, reflecting from the snow
>below, that turns the white feathers of the underparts and
>underwings from soft and light into a surreal brilliance of such
>white purity it seems to shine luminously, contrasting with the
>snow".

>See:

><http://www.utahbound.com/12042000/stories/50701.htm>

Ho, hum. He doesn't say anything about blinding brightness.
Nor is he viewing the birds from a distance of 2 miles or so.

[Maccabee wrote]

>>Finally, without parsing Easton's statement.... again.... (see a
>>zillion emails in the archive from years ago)...let me reiterate
>>my Pelican Mantra:

>>Draw A Map.

>If discussing the existence of Pixies, you could only go so far
>with someone who has written a book called, "Pixies Are Real:
>Here's the Pictures" and steadfastly proclaims how scientific
>research validates that those 'photographs', plus others which
>exist, are assuredly 'proof ignored by the world of science'.

>Similarly, no conceivable amount of theoretical, speculative
>mapping would have any affect on a foundation of Bruce
>Maccabee's 'UFO' convictions.

I think we should take a poll on this, since you think it is impossible to "draw a map." I did it. Others have done it. ISince you are proposing the pelican explanation the burden is on you to prove that it does not fail to account for Arnold's inability to get close enough to the pelicans to identify them. we know they couldn't have been more than about 4 miles away initially, and Arnold couldn't have gotten closer bthan 1 mile or so, or he would have realized what they were.

Pelican: 50 mph (top speed... not likely in any case)

Arnold: 110 mph he said (reasonable)

Pick a starting point for Arnold = somewhere near Mineral.

Pick a starting point for the pelicans according to the beginning of the sighting (appeared to be north of the direction to Rainier) relative to Arnold's initial position (for example 20 degrees north of th direction to Rainier at a distance of 4 miles). Pelicans fly south.

Arnold flies east (or use your own direction compatible with what he said...might not be due east) Now plot Arnold's position and the pelican positions every 15 seconds for 2 1/2 minutes of time. A challenge to the analyst.

>>As you're well aware, there are so many ambiguities and unknowns
>i>nvolved. What next; do we draw maps to argue how possible or
>i>mpossible it was that Arnold's 'second sighting' can reasonably
>>be explained as ducks?

Yes, there are ambiguities... but there are also bouds on the ambiguities.

And the second sighting has NOTHING to do with the first.
(If we were arguing about the second sighting then we would have to take into account the first)

>>He claimed, "I saw a cluster of about twenty to twenty- five
>>brass coloured objects that looked like ducks".

>"They seemed about two or three feet in diameter".

>"As the group of objects came within 400 yards of me they veered
>sharply away from me and to their right, gaining altitude as
>they did so and fluttering and flashing a dull amber color".

>Is it, seriously, argued these were also possibly 'alien
>spacecraft'?

Irrelevant. Let's concentrate on the first sighting first.

>They statedly came within 400 yards and Arnold attributed them
>to be 'UFOS', exclaiming how "excited" he was that they, "had
>he same flight characteristics of the large objects I had
>observed on June 24".

>In total, during his flying days, Kenneth Arnold claimed to have
>had some eight encounters with 'UFOs'.

>>For those newcomers, this refers to drawing a reasonable map
>>showing how Arnold could have been flying in a plane at 100-110
>>mph and have a flock of pelicans pass his plane going from north
>>to south without him realizing that he was gaining on the
>>birds... i.e., traveling faster than they were.

>Which version of Arnold's story do you want to begin with - you
>do realise there are at least four of them?

>[A] "That area is located at about, it's elevation is about
>10,000 foot, and I had made one sweep in close to Mt. Rainier
>and down one of the canyons and was dragging it for any types of
>objects that might prove to be the Marine ship, uh, and as I
>come out of the canyon there, was about 15 minutes, I was
>approximately 25 to 28 miles from Mt. Rainier, I climbed back up

t>o 9200 feet and I noticed to the left of me a chain which
l>ooked to me like the tail of a Chinese kite, kind of weaving
>and going at a terrific speed across the face of Mt. Rainier. I,
>at first, thought they were geese because it flew like geese,
>but it was going so fast that I immediately changed my mind and
>decided it was a bunch of new jet planes in formation".>

>Source: KWRC radio interview

>[B] "I made a 360 degree turn to the right and above the little
>city of Mineral, starting again toward Mt. Rainier.>

>"I trimmed out my airplane in the direction of Yakima,
>Washington, which was almost directly east of my position and
>simply sat in my plane observing the sky and the terrain".>

>"The sky and air was clear as crystal. I hadn't flown more than
>two or three minutes on my course when a bright flash reflected
>on my airplane".

>Source: Letter to Air Force

>[C] "It was during this search and while making a turn of 180
>degrees over Mineral, Washington, at approximately 9200 feet
>altitude, that a tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces
>of my aircraft".

>Source: 'The Coming of the Saucers'

>The first story is of merely observing objects crossing the face
>of Mt Rainier - to Arnold's left. Was Arnold heading south at
>this time?

>Then, he claims to have made a 360 degree turn over Mineral and
>was heading in the direction of Yakima - and had been for 2-3
>minutes - when the incident began. So, now he's heading east?

>Next, it's a 180 degree turn and he's in the process of doing so
>when the first 'flash' is noted. This time, he's heading...
>where?

>There's one more version I located and you previously didn't
>know about. In July last year, I posted on UFORL:

>Looks like I may have come across another account of Arnold's -
>it's confirmed as his own voice and apparently taped from a TV
>program - in which he claims:

>"I could see way off to the right, coming in the vicinity of Mt.
>Baker, a whole chain-like string of very... of aircraft...".

>That's a different story!

>Now, the objects were first noticed "way off to the right" and
>not, as stated elsewhere, to his left.

>This could make sense and explain some things which I suspected
>were possible.

>As previously noted, we have quite different versions of where
>Arnold actually was and his heading when the objects had first
>been noticed. [END]

>The interview I'm referring to is online at:

><http://www.iufomrc.com/arnold.htm>

>Perhaps someone can source and date it.

>Therefore, with Arnold now claiming he first saw the objects on
>his right-hand side. Was he heading north, rather than south, or
>east?

>We do know he turned his aircraft around - "I kept looking for
t>heir tails, and they didn't have any tail. I thought, well,
>maybe something's wrong with my eyes and I turned the plane

>around and opened the window, and looked out the window, and
>sure enough, I couldn't find any tails on 'em".

>It's an important fact only mentioned in that KWRC interview - I
>wonder why Arnold never included it again?

>So, we don't know where Arnold was when the incident began, what
>direction he was heading and what his speed was. We don't know
>where the objects were first sighted, what Arnold did next and
>when he turned his plane around. We have no idea how long that
>turn took and whether Arnold subsequently reduced or increased
>speed.

>What we do know is that no sooner had he seen the objects, then
>Arnold believed they passed behind a 'jagged peak' on Mt.
>Rainier and that's now almost certain been identified as 'Little
>Tahoma'. However, it's on the eastern side and as the objects
>flew down the western side, they couldn't have travelled behind
>it.

>They must have passed in front of it, so almost straight away,
>Arnold, having relied on this peak as a '25 miles away' distance
>marker actually has no idea how distant the objects are, what
>size they are and where exactly they are heading.>

>Although Arnold thinks he does.

>To the extent he decides to 'clock' how long it takes the
>objects to reach Mt Adams, or so he perceives.>

>This mess is entirely separate to what the objects might have
>been.

>Taking all of the above into account, why are you still bleating
>that nobody's drawn you an 'accurate' map?

>Tell you what... here's a simple question.

>Is it possible that there's enough variation here to choose
>from, so that it illustrates one of many obvious scenarios why
>Arnold never recognised the true situation.

>Yes or no?

>Yes?

>Good. Now draw a map which clarifies this and then consider it
>came from myself with best wishes.

>Result!

>You have a map and I haven't wasted my time.

>What's the problem now... despite a map, you still don't believe
>it...

>We're truly astonished...

I prefer the Air Force account. But I have already done the
map exercise.

If you want to defend your explanation you should pick whichever
you want and follow the prescription I gave above to find out how
Arnold and the pelicans may have moved relative to one another
in such a way as to give Arnold the general impressions he gave
(that they were initially north of the direction to Rainier,
ended up being far south of the direction to Rainier... in fact
in the direction of Mt. Adams, managed to cross in front of his
aircraft while he was flying along.

NOTE THE CARDINAL RULE FOR EXPLANATION:

a conventional explanation must be consistent with conventional
physics. We know the physics of bird flight and the physics of
airplane flight. Therefore one CAN DRAW A MAP.

>>I have watched large birds (geese and others) fly in formation
>>and have noted that they are spaced by a few feet to perhaps 20
>>ft. They do this, presumably, so that one bird can "ride the the

>>wave" produced by a bird just ahead of it. (The lead bird has
>>the roughest flight).

>Have you ever seen how White Pelicans uniquely operate this
>characteristic?

>>So 9 in a line might cover a distance less than 200 ft. Arnold
>>claimed that the string of objects was about comparable in
>>length to a ridgeline about 5 miles long. From his position the
>>distance to that ridgeline was about 25 miles.

>However, as you're aware, there is yet another setback here.

>In his 'official' report to the Air Force, Arnold claimed:

>"I observed the chain of these objects passing another high
>snow- covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams and as,
>the first one was passing the south crest of this ridge the last
>object was entering the northern crest of the ridge. As I was
>flying in the direction of this particular ridge, I measured it
>and found it to be approximately five miles so I could safely
>assume that the chain of these saucer like objects were at least
>five miles long".

>Unequivocal - Arnold relates how _at the time_ he was heading in
>that direction and so could accurately make this determination.

>When we come to the account in his book, it's another story;
>Arnold didn't make any such judgement until _after_ the
>sighting. He writes:

>"Between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams there is a very high
>plateau with quite definite north and south edges. Part of this
>chain-like formation actually dipped below the near edge. As the
>first unit of these craft cleared the southernmost edge of this
>background, the last of the formation was just entering the
>northern edge. I later flew over this plateau in my plane and
>came to a close approximation that this whole formation of
>craft, whatever they were, formed a chain in the neighborhood of
>five miles long".

>Big, big, difference...

Huh?

Seems to me he said he measured the length of the plateau. Does
it matter when he did it? Seems obvious he did it after the
sighting.

>Draw A Map.

>Good idea. Instead of ignoring it, let's see you show, on a map,
>which 'jagged peak' Arnold was talking about at the altitude he
>confirmed - naturally, it can't be 'Little Tahoma', otherwise
>there's zero grounds for any 'enigmatic' incident in the first
>place.

>Correct?

Incorrect. You can draw a map showing the relative locations vs
time of Arnold and the Pelicans without reference to Little
Tahoma... unless you want to pick a certain time during the
flight when one or more pelicans were between Arnold and Little
Tahoma (presumably at the time the pelicans, one after another
as they passed, flipped on edge so they became temporarily
invisible).

This would be perfectly acceptable in drawing YOUR map of the
event.

>As matters stand, Arnold's perception of distant, fast, objects
>are essentially proven to be a result of his, above, gross
>error.

Only a gross error if he saw pelicans several miles away.
However, you have not yet taken your opportunity to modify the
sighting information as necessary to make your pelican
hypothesis fit the dynamics of the situation. ARnold was moving
(unless you wish to make him stationary) and the pelicans were
moving. How did they move?

>What could Arnold therefore have observed which so perplexed
>him?

>As demonstrated, there is an obvious answer.

>I said there were some new references which further evidence
t>hat White Pelicans do exhibit 'brilliant' reflections and
>'flashes' from sunlight:

>"When viewing these huge birds at water level its difficult to
>imagine them getting airborne, much less soaring to heights on
t>he thermals that renders them invisible to the naked eye. At
t>imes, as the birds spiral upward on bright sunny days, the
>entire flock will turn such that the sunlight reflects off the
>white back and wing feathers and contrasting black band
>producing a brilliant display against the blue sky".

Are they 4 miles away or 2 miles away or a few feet away?
And how bright is "brilliant"? Light an arc? Like a mirror
reflection from the sun? No way.

><http://amrivers.localweb.com/missourim/whitepelicans100.pdf>

>"I live on Lake Conroe and have seen white Pelicans for several
>years in the fall. Nov.27 my neighbor and I noticed a white
f>lash in the sky and it turned out to be a flock of about 40
>white pelicans at over 1000 ft. circling like buzzards...

Altitude 1000 ft. But at what range?

>Quite an amazing sight the sun would reflect off of the feathers
>at different points in the circling".

><http://www.ecocanada.com/seepel/messages/345.html>

Where was the sun relative to the birds? How bright is a "white
flash?" Like a mirror reflection from the sun? These bird peopl
ought to try looking at a solar reflection from a distant mirror
sometime. I did. I've also looked at white birds in the
sunlight. Pleasant to look at. Solar reflection from a mirror is
NOT pleasant to look at.

>"Glancing out my window this morning, I saw twenty or thirty
>little bright white spots against the blue sky. I thought it was
>my eyes, or a balloon release, until they wheeled and turned
>like a flock of birds. Looking a little harder, I could see they
>were indeed birds, very BIG white birds".

>"Now, I've enjoyed seeing a lot of Brown Pelicans around here,
>but this was my first sighting of the once endangered American
>White Pelican. Sometimes almost twice the size of their brown
>cousins, these breathtaking birds have beautiful black wingtips
>contrasting with their white bodies and their super long yellow
>bills. They are often seen in flocks of 20 or more. These guys
>probably numbered around 30, and they put on quite an aerial
>show. First they flew in close formation, swooping this way and
>then circling around the other way, blinding flashes of sunlight
>as they turned".>

><http://www.cccucc.org/light/thursdayjuly011999.html>

Would be nice to know how they were oriented with respect
to the sun.

>"Camera buffs will find the rapids an unforgettable sight, with
>brilliant white pelicans soaring over the river as it winds its
>way past island channels".

><http://www.virtualfortsmith.com/welcometoexcitement.asp>

>"An occasional flock of white pelicans drifts in wide circles,
>flashing back silver light from their wings, or disappearing as
t>hey turn".

><http://www.caller.com/2000/october/10/today/birdwatc/6228.html>

>As should be abundantly clear by now, White Pelicans - and

>uniquely this species - exhibit the characteristics Arnold
>described:

>- an echelon formation - the undulating flight - 'fluttering and
>then sailing'

>The following contains a clever metaphor for that undulating
>flight:

>"We saw a number of osprey, oyster catchers and large flights of
>pelicans; 50 or more flying by following the leader. The leader
>changed altitude from the surface-skimming glide to a few feet
>higher to flap wings without touching the water. The rest would
>follow, creating a sine wave of birds".

>http://homestead.juno.com/kalendr1/files/97_lsup/j21Fernandina.h
>t ml

>Arnold's 'fluttering and then sailing' is equivalent to
>'flapping' and then 'gliding', or a combination of 'flapping'
>and 'sailing', etc. Here's some descriptions of White Pelicans:

This is your hypothesis. Arnold did not refer to "flapping."

>"Two species are native in the United States. The white pelican,
>with a body about 5 feet long and a wingspread of from 8 to 10
>feet, is one of the largest American birds.

.[...]

>When traveling, a flock forms a straight line or a V and they
>alternately flap and sail, all in unison".

><http://www.newton.dep.anl.gov/natbltn/600-699/nb612.htm>

>"Pelicans often fly together in long lines of several or more
>birds. They will flap their wings and then glide. The wing flaps
>are not at the same moment, but in sequence, starting with the
>leader. Each bird will flap when he reaches the same spot where
>he lead bird began to flap".

><http://www.marine.usf.edu/pjocean/prog/sp99/wimat/les2.htm> or:
>www.marine.usf.edu/pjocean/prog/pdf/s99u31e2.PDF

>"It is remarkable enough that the birds are able to follow one
>another in a perfect single-file or V-formation. But their
>ability to flap their wings in perfect synchronization makes
>them seem telepathically linked. Furthermore, the ability of
>such a bulky bird to glide effortlessly, for minutes at a time,
>hundreds of feet above the surf, looks like a violation of the
>laws of aerodynamics".

>http://www.fulcrum-books.com/html/florida_stacked_3.html

>"A flock of migrating American White Pelicans is a majestic
>sight -- a long line of ponderous birds, flapping and coasting.
>Each bird seems to take it's cue from the one in front of it,
>beginning to flap and starting a glide when it's predecessor
>does".

><http://www.superiorphotography.com/wpelican.html>

>What was it Arnold said; "Another characteristic of these craft
>that made a tremendous impression on me was how they fluttered
>and sailed".

>He also compared the formation as resembling "the tail of a
>Chinese kite". Others have made similar comparisons with White
>Pelicans:

>"I could still clearly discern the massive forms of maybe a
>dozen American white pelicans. The pelicans were gargantuan in
>scale, dwarfing all of the other birds around them, but still
>they took flight and landed with surprising grace. Whenever a
>few of these birds took wing, they spread out their immense,

>black-tipped wings and soared high into the sky with amazing
>>ease, often joining other pelicans in formation.

>At one time, I actually saw maybe 60 or 70 pelicans stretched
>across the sky in a giant, twisting ribbon that glowed with the
>morning light".

><http://www.calphoto.com/sunny.htm>

>"Then I realize about thirty birds trail in a line, and second
>and third squadrons move up, to the left and right. Bombers,
t>hey are too large for fighters, yet more graceful, flying in
>perfect formation".

>"The sun burns the whites of their perfectly rigid backs upon
t>he negative of my mind, blinding my eye to all else".

>"They appear as crepe paper strips, tied to an invisible wind.
>Rising and falling as much as a hundred feet in the air, all
f>ollowing the slightest twitch to the left or right as they
>glide effortlessly through the morning sky".

><http://home.earthlink.net/~avirden/pelicans.htm>

>The fact they are also associated with aircraft is commented
>upon in the following:

>"A flight of pelicans glides overhead like a squadron of WWII
>bombers setting off across the English Channel on a nighttime
>raid...".

><http://www.messingaboutinboats.com/archives/mbissuejune15-98.htm>

1

>"Then I realize about thirty birds trail in a line, and second
>and third squadrons move up, to the left and right. Bombers,
t>hey are too large for fighters, yet more graceful, flying in
>perfect formation".

><http://home.earthlink.net/~avirden/pelicans.htm>

>"...he glanced up at the sky and watched a squadron of pelicans
>returning from one of their aerial expeditions".

>"The squadron looked like old bombers with outstretched wings as
t>hey swept down to the very edge of the sea, inches above the
>water. Heads held high, wings fixed and bodies streamlined for
>maximum glide".

><http://www.nywcafe.com/wings/Archives/LIPSTOCK.HTM>

>Of course, the strict terminology for any formation is a
'>squadron of pelicans' - see:

><http://www.birding.about.com/hobbies/birding/library/weekly/aa032700b.htm>

>It's not the unattainable intention to persuade any 'saucer
>devotees' that Arnold didn't actually see 'flying saucers'.

>Arnold himself, eventually, admitted that.

>This recapitulation is primarily to clarify, explain and address
>some issues which require to be highlighted and updated.

>Conclusions - you can draw your own, and a 'map' if so inclined.

>Without question, the most profound material I have come across
i>n some three years related research concerns 'GUS, The Avid
>Flyer'. Although something of an aside, it's not actually
>disparate to a new, astounding, appreciation of White Pelicans
>and their rapport with aircraft.>

>Warning - this is a story with a tragic ending - have a hanky

>ready and read the extraordinary tale of 'GUS' at:>

><http://www.groverweb.com/nwva/NWFlyer/Archives/Art100900.html>

>Lest we should take the case of Kenneth Arnold's remarkable
>encounter too seriously...

>After all, it's not as if all the recent factual revelations
>have threatened to destroy the foundations of a religion.

This is more pelican knowledge that one can ever hope for and you are to be complemented for your diligence in digging it out in an attempt to support your hypothesis. However, the optical situation is just not right for blinding reflections from pelicans several miles distant (so far away as to be unresolvable by Arnold even though he claimed he could see the spacing of engines on a large airplane at some distance - he thought 15 miles - away. See the attached "research paper" on brightness.

Also, the dynamics just don't work. UI have tried several "maps" in the past, in a vain attempt to make the pelicans move in such a way relative to any reasonable Arnold path such that they travel from the north of the direction to Rainier southward to the direction to Adams in 2.5 minutes at 50 mph (allowing you the best possible chance for success; the probability that pelicans would actually be flying that fast is not known by me) while Arnold travels at 100 miles per hour.

I haven't been able to make it work. Several others contacted me in the last year with the same problem for the pelican hypothesis. So now it is your turn.

Polish up your pelicans and draw a map.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 06:46:41 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:09:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>Hello Everyone,

>One of Whitley Strieber's most interesting claims
>involves the sound of nine knocks in three series of
>three. Strieber associates the sounds he heard in 1986
>with his own abductions and presents several cases in
>which the nine knocks form part of other people's
>visitor->related experiences (see Breakthrough and
>The Communion Letters).

<snip>

Whilst searching for clues on the internet I think I may have found something we have all been missing.

See:

www.threethrees.com.au/myweb/information.htm

Chris Aubeck

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Mars - It's Stranger Than You Thought

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:20:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:36:45 -0500
Subject: Mars - It's Stranger Than You Thought

Hello, all .

I find this in Spock like terms, "Interesting"

http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/solarsystem/mars_weather_000223.html

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 08:33:39 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:38:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:55:52 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 03:57:07 -0000
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:17:18 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Easton

>>All I know is that before he decided these were jets, Arnold
>>thought they were Snow Geese. And that's all we need to know.

>The explanation is simple: First there were flashes, exact
>location unknown. Then the bright objects were spotted north of
>Rainier, but no flashes initially. Then a flash and more flashes
>were seen to come directly from the bright objects.

<snip>

>The sequence of events was all but reconstructed by you in the
>following UFO UpDates postings, quoted as follows:

- >1. A "tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces of my
>aircraft".
- >2. He spent, "the next twenty to thirty seconds urgently
>searching the sky all around".
- >3. There was a further flash.
- >4. He then (some more seconds having elapsed), saw "a formation
>of very bright objects coming from the vicinity of Mount Baker",
>which was to the north of Mt. Rainier.

> <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/jul/m18-001.shtml>
> <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/jul/m22-009.shtml>

>It was at stage 4 that Arnold thought they might be geese --
>until he saw that intense flashes were coming straight from the
>objects. Until then he had no idea these "bright objects" had
>anything to do with the previous flashes.

Brad, Jim, List:

Thanks, Brad, for the posting on the Skeptics List which refers to U.S.G.S. data on pelican sightings, etc. This is data that one can get one's teeth into. However, I wonder what the situation was 50 years ago? For example, the patterns for Canadian geese have changed dramatically in my area of Pennsylvania in that time. They are now found year-round and not just during and in the directions of migrations.

I'm leaning toward Phil Klass's fireball meteor explanation, see points #1, 3 & 4, above.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 13:40:54 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:47:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:03 -0000

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Serious Research
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>I am using your message to try to zero in on where we agree and
>disagree, but I can go along with at least 95% of what you say.
>Since I'm very busy at the moment, this is a bit of a hasty
>posting. Please make due allowances.

Hi,

Absolutely. I appreciate your taking the time to do so.

>There is no way that study of 12 or 25 cases is going to
>convince anybody of anything.

I believe we should not aim too high. For a start I - personally
- don't know if the premise of this experiment is even
potentially provable or not. I am truly open minded on the
possibility either way. And I personally would much rather seek
to prove to science that there are genuine, unrecognised
scientific phenomena behind some UFO cases because I am myself
satisfied that there are. Whereas I don't know the answer to the
ETH question (although I do accept it is a totally reasonable
question to ask).

But I think the primary goal here should be to argue a more
specific thing - the credibility of the ETH - which is really
how the debate started on this list, of course.

You are absolutely right - not 12 cases (probably not even 120)
will convince most scientists that the ETH is true. But the
point is to get them to accept that it is a bona fide working
hypothesis backed by hard data and that points in this (rather
than any other particular) direction. Even a dozen cases that do
that should be enough to make the argument that this is a
credible scientific basis for future research. And that limited
goal should be our intention since right now most scientists
reject the ETH as completely unsupported by the UFO evidence.

We would be seeking to discover if that was, or was not, a valid
argument.

It would be perfectly possible to come up with many unsolved
cases. But that is not good enough because some unsolved cases
can and do eventually get solved.

It would be perfectly possible to come up with quite a few cases that suggest something truly interesting and unknown to science may lie behind them. But again that is not good enough because this vagueness is at the heart of Ufology's problems (where we debate the roles of psychology, atmospheric physics, etc. etc) in seeking out what may well be several different unrecognised or little understood phenomena at work.

If we set our sights on the ETH then we need to find those cases that argue in that precise direction as well as being unsolved and seemingly insoluble in terms of known science.

There are some. But are there hundreds? I doubt it. But I may be wrong.

In any case, if we find a good number of strong candidates that point starkly at the ETH as the most logical possibility to explain them to the satisfaction of an objective researcher or scientist then this experiment will have done its job.

In my view, it will do its job better by finding 12 strong, well supported cases that point unequivocally in that direction than by finding 120 that could be open to all sorts of ongoing debate as to whether they do or do not - or whether they are really hallucinations, or psychological aberrations or earthlights or whatever.

That's why I believe we should really focus ourselves on cases that seem to demonstrate the ETH and pretty well nothing else as a reasonable answer.

The narrower the focus of what we do the more useful the outcome. Ufology's suffers from a surfeit of theories and a spectrum of possibilities. What it needs is a smorgasbord of cases that scream out - 'Hey! This one really looks like the ETH at work'.

Because if we set that goal then success or failure will be equally enlightening and I right now don't have a clue whether this experiment will succeed or fail.

>First, I think we need to make a
>stronger distinction (you do make the distinction) between
>trying to demonstrate (a) that UFO reports are describing
>something important and unexplained, and (b) that the reports
>strongly support an ETH interpretation. I would much rather try
>to demonstrate that, on the basis of the best evidence, the ETH
>hypothesis is a reasonable one.

I think we are completely agreed upon that point.

>>Basically I am suggesting that we create a team of people
>>willing to devote some of their net time over the next (say) six
>>months. Devote it to vetting and commenting upon case data
>>submitted to them in an effort to find those cases to most
>>strongly recommend via ufology as the ones most positively
>>arguing towards the reality of the ETH.

>No, toward the reality of an unexplained UFO phenomenon worthy
>of careful scientific study. Secondarily, that the ETH is a
>reasonable hypothesis.

I have explained why I disagree here in my comments above. Establishing that certain cases demonstrate an 'unexplained UFO phenomenon' is scientifically correct procedure and in any other context I would back that totally. It is also what right now I personally believe that the data does establish. But it is what I believe many previous ventures like this one have already achieved (not least Condon, which persuaded several scientists there was something to Ufology's).

The idea for this experiment started off as a debate about the ETH and that's why I focused it towards establishing (or not) the evidence that exists to support this hypothesis above all others. Anything less is in a sense a cop out from that fundamental question back into the wishy-washy area of UFO discussion.

Yes, we could do that. Yes, in my view it would be much easier to succeed in proving that less arduous premise. But there are

merits in tackling the credibility of the ETH since it answers a very specific question that a more vague project would not.

Think about where we might be after this experiment concludes. If we find dozens of strong cases that seem to infer something interesting but unidentified lies behind certain UFO cases then neither you nor I would be surprised. I would be amazed if we didn't, in fact.

But this will not really advance us very far from where we stand right now and will not offer science anything it hasn't got out there already. We could - in effect - send a report today saying - read Condon, read the Sturrock report and read your own superb new book, Dick. Since they all do that job more than adequately.

So if we do this then it ought to be with the intention of doing something new. And - whether we find a strong data base of cases that imply the ETH to advance before science or we do not - we will at least have something that we do not have right now as a consequence of doing this experiment. Making the doing worthwhile.

>>Perhaps sixteen is an unrealistic number but I suggested it as a
>>way to ensure that as broad a spread and balance of viewpoints
>>is represented. I would imagine 8 or 12 (that is 2 or 3 each of
>>the pro, anti, ETH, the uncommitted and the outsider scientist
>>perspective) would be achievable if that is all we can aim
>>towards. But the exact number involved in the council is less
>>important than actually creating it as the temporary entity that
>>it is intended to be.

>Here is where we begin to run into problems. I am sure everyone
>will want to know who will be on the council and what the
>procedures will be, and even hashing that out is very difficult.

Which is why I suggested a simple way around this in my original post. We define four categories of researcher - the ETH supporters, the skeptics, the Ufologists who accept UFO reality but not necessarily the ETH, and scientists involved in the search for ETI but who are not in any way Ufologists. Then we divide whatever number we agree should form the council by four (hence it has to be 8, 12, 16 etc members in total) and let the community formed by these four groups of researchers nominate their own equal number of representatives.

This way all strands are represented equally and since they - themselves - elect, nominate, cajole, recommend, or use whatever process they chose to come up with to find the council members - they cannot complain about fair representation since it was down to their own colleagues as to who was put forward.

We just post messages to the appropriate lists (we can surely decide which lists best represent each of these four strands) and give these lists a deadline of say a month from now to put forward their own two, or three, or whatever number of representatives would participate in this venture.

Of course, there will be those who disagree even with such democratic process of creating this team. Some who wont work with others. But the criteria must include the deal that anyone agreeing to take part in the council also agrees to work with any other nominated people whoever they may be. If they wont then they don't qualify and those lists will have to recommend someone else who will take part on this simple premise of mutual understanding and cooperation.

But by turning over the formation of the council to the different facets of Ufology's and to let them nominate their own representatives then nobody can seriously argue they were not given a chance to have some say in the make up of this panel.

That's all we can offer. Fairness.

>I have been through this sort of thing several times before, and
>achieving a "spread and balance" that is acceptable to everyone
>could take months or years. Which is why I advocate a simpler
>and more streamlined approach.

Why should it do so - especially given the power of the net? We can widely publicise this plan in days. We can invite the relevant lists to start the process of selection immediately.

Surely any list could within a month come up with a nominee to the panel by whatever method they then chose. There is no reason why a representative council could not be up and running by Easter.

>>After all, the main work lies with everybody else who would be
>>charged with the task of finding the cases that they believe
>>would convince science.

>Here is where I strongly believe that the task of selecting
>cases should be done by a committee of advocates and proponents
>(by my terminology) and I volunteer to be a member of that
>committee.

You would certainly have my vote to participate.

But my concern about a self elected committee doing the choosing (not to mention one of advocates only) is really - ironically - the one you make before when suggesting we do this. Any self elected team will be setting itself up as a ruling elite of Ufology's. Maybe not intentionally but there are sure to be some who will see it that way - introducing tensions and jealousies from day one. Not to mention alienating groups of researchers who will not then support the project. We need to minimise that.

That's why I suggest we avoid this by allowing Ufology's to make its own choice in the balanced way I propose - giving disparate strands a voice provided they all agree on what the aim of the experiment is - to find (not utterly exclude) data that can be put forward to science.

But - as I think we all know - science is going to take more notice of a balanced team including skeptics than it ever will of a selection made only by advocates - no matter how fairly done. Its a fact of life we should take into account in the planning of this experiment IMO.

Also, once the council is created - if it alone makes the selection of cases then it means that, in effect, a small number of individuals are making a judgement call on which cases to put forward on behalf of Ufology's with no one else getting a say. Inevitably some are going to say - hey, but you ignored such and such because member A or B had a bias against it (or included a case because they had a bias for it). Or whatever. We tarnish the project by making it appear like a closed shop . I think this should be a UFO community project in as many senses as possible.

That's why I suggest we let ufologists - including panel members of course - put forward what they consider their own strongest cases that seem to support the ETH and offer them to the council for consideration. Then all options are reviewable. Nobody is excluded from offering a candidate case. It becomes a venture not just of a few individuals - and democracy continues to guide the experiment.

This does not prevent what you want from happening, in reality, since any council member can put forward their own cases or urge the investigator of another case that they want to see debated to put it forward. And the council will do the primary discussion and vetting of all submitted cases, before turning over a summary of their views to the rest of the UFO community (via the participating lists) so as to make it transparent what is going on and make the council fully accountable to the rest of us.

>I have a serious problem with allowing "every working ufologist
>out there" to submit cases for consideration. I strongly believe
>that case selection should be done by senior, recognized people.

Well, in a very real sense that is what I am suggesting. All people have the chance to submit cases for consideration. Anything less would leave sections of the UFO community left unheard. And who knows - the real gem of a case that might make all the difference could be out there in the hands of a ufologist who isn't well known or experienced enough to be invited onto the panel. I think they should have the chance to put forward their evidence if this is an experiment that is truly to reflect the global data for Ufology's and not simply what a few individuals (however experienced) consider that data to be.

But in any event the council will vet each submitted case and make the final recommendation to ufology as to which are the strongest cases to then submit to science. So - in essence - what you are suggesting is what will ultimately happen, but without excluding the opportunity afforded to everyone to put forward a case of their own into the pot - ones that they really think offers evidence for the ETH.

>Every local investigator tends to think his or her case is the >most important one that ever came down the pike. And if this >seems elitist, then whatever nominating committee is >established, its members can and should consider strong cases >from lesser known investigators and can recommend them for >consideration.

We seem to be pretty well agreeing here - then. The only difference is that I say - let anyone who feels they have a case put it forward. Whereas you seem to be saying - only let that happen if the case or the investigator is known about by one of the panel. That would make the submission process exclusive and would be a failing of the experimental protocol, I suspect, because it would make the data skewed towards friends or acquaintances of the council.

Many investigators may feel their own cases are the greatest. But what they are being asked to do by my suggested protocol is submit the evidence to a panel of experienced investigators who will obviously vet its scientific credibility, its value as support for the ETH and the competence of the basic research. So they will need to be sure of themselves and I expect few will send in half baked cases for fear of public rejection. If not - well, okay, they still deserve the chance to be heard.

>>When a case has been discussed by council then one person from >>the council (presumably the one with the most free time over the >>next six months!) could be charged with summarising the overall >>views on that case (and each other case as it is submitted by a >>ufologist during the period that the team operates) in a message >>to the UFO community.

>Again, serious practical problems. Not just anyone can best >summarize cases.

For the purposes of reporting speedily back to the UFO community via the lists then I am sure the council could agree upon someone willing and able to do this and who has the freedom of time to do it swiftly (and legibly!)

I am not talking about the responsibility for summarising the data to science. That comes 'after' the experiment and will need more time and expertise - I agree - and does not need to be done so speedily. But regular reports to the UFO community via the participating lists do need to be regular and not suffer long delays and, of course, be just summaries. I think we could trust the council to decide between themselves who is best able to do this task.

>I don't tend to think that a day-to-day or even week-to-week >reporting to the List is either necessary or desirable.

More precisely I mean a case by case summary. In other words, when case 1 is vetted by the council, its interim findings on its suitability could be posted. That will allow the individual investigator to chase up new data if he/she feels that any problems can be ironed out in this way or that new leads can be pursued.

And it means the rest of the UFO community can see the problems that the council is having with certain cases as to determining why they might not be suitable to include in the final report as part of a pro ETH argument. This will help to guide those who might submit further cases to the panel so that they can see the strengths being sought in the submitted cases and the kind of data needed to fulfil the criteria. So this feedback process helps progress the experiment and eliminate from submission cases that will not work out.

>>Then - at the end of the six months - the council could agree a >>statement to be issued to the UFO community summarising the sum >>total of the case data it has evaluated and the overall

>>conclusions they reach about it - recommending which cases to
>>ask the original investigators to work up into a proper format
>>and to become part of a submission by ufology to science.

>Again, the council's summarizations and recommendations will
>only be as good as the quality of the case input, and I for one
>don't care to leave that to amateurs.

But we are all amateurs, Dick. And the UFO evidence is only as strong as its individual components. Neither you, nor I, nor anybody else is any better / worse than others in coming up with the goods. We all have the same goal. We all chase the data. Some do it more vigorously than others. Some are natural born investigators. Some work harder. But we all should have the chance to make our data heard rather than assume anyone has a superiority over anyone else simply because they are more experienced.

The council will decide what cases go forward to science. The council will obviously put forward its own cases too. So this process really isn't being left to 'amateurs' even by your description. But it is giving every person a chance to let their cases enter the arena and be debated. And I don't think anything less than that would be considered objective or fair. It would in some respects be elitist in my view and this would make the project lose credibility in the eyes of certain people.

The more this can be seen to be a community project in which all people felt they were fairly represented and had a say in what cases were considered then the more it is likely that the final report will be endorsed by a majority. We don't want it to be a report created and written by 8 people - since judgement of its merits will then inevitably be built around what folk think about these individuals.

You have seen what has happened regarding prejudgment of a UFOIN report on one case because certain people have problems with some of the investigators in that team. We need to ensure this experiment doesn't get judged on the people who are involved but on the data it produces.

>>The principle which I am suggesting allows this project to
>>eschew giving power to individuals and to truly become a UFO
>>community experiment that is harnessing the latent power of the
>>internet. Rather than - as now - using the net only to engage in
>>debate with no end purpose.

>With this I strongly agree. Too many people appear to get their
>kicks merely out of trying to score debating points rather than
>trying to contribute to a resolution of the issues.

I hope we can come up with an agreed formula, perhaps developing your ideas and mine and any thoughts by others on this list, into a working experiment. Something that will give us all a focus to move away from the bickering.

It will be worth doing just to achieve that end result.

>Fine, if this "idealistic" council can be formed and accepted by
>everyone, which seems to me more far-fetched than alien
>visitors! Let's do it.

It can be formed. It wont be accepted by everyone. Nothing can ever be so easy in the world of ufology. But if we guard against anticipated complaints and try to do this experiment democratically and to let the council be self elected and broadly representative then we have to have a fighting chance of pleasing more people than we antagonise. I think we should agree to be happy with that!

>Again, a dozen cases will not convince anyone of anything, and
>my suggestion of a larger number should have included the
>proviso that they are well-known and well-reported cases
>internationally, so that exchanges of case material would not be
>a serious problem. Again, if less well-known strong cases exist
>out there, the nominators could and should take them into
>account.

If 100 strong cases turn up that the council feels ufology could recommend to science as supportive of the ETH - then, of course, terrific. We should put them forward.

>Relatively speaking, I agree. But 12 strong cases is not going
>to hack it.

Depends on what we are trying to hack. We are aiming to build a case only to the extent that it will persuade science that there are objective grounds within the evidence to support the ETH and thus to back further research. But I agree that there should be no arbitrary total submitted. We submit whatever the data decrees to exist for us to submit.

That maybe 12, or 100, or 20 or 1 (hands up at the back who added 'none'!)

At this stage we would just have to wait and see what would emerge.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 15 Mar 2001 06:13:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:50:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Hamilton

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:41:44 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:24:13 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>John and Bill,

>I would also be interested in listening to both examples of
>taped beeps. Lindy let me have a copy of her tape several years
>ago and the five beep sequences are very, very similar. In one
>case the beeping came out of a video camera that was turned off,
>while a dark triangle was flying over the witness's house.

>Several other cases have cropped up in my research that involve
>beeps and the tape is very good for comparison purposes. The
>question is whether the beeps are what you hear both external to
>yourself and internally as some experiencers have at times
>reported. Maybe we can communicate further about this.

I was afraid someone was going to ask to hear the tape I have because it is buried in a box in my garage, but now is the time for me to hunt it up. I also have a friend in Sacramento who may have a copy of this same tape. deally I could record the tape onto an audio file and place it on my website so I could just direct people to listen to it.

The beeps Brian has heard usually seem to originate from a BOL (ball of light) or were present when he was in a beam when he would fall into a trance.

Bill H.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:15:25 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:53:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:12:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:03 -0000

>>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>Dick, Jenny, List:

>Have there been serious attempts to bring together a wide range
>of views for a colloquium, since the 1969 American Association
>for the Advancement of Science Washington affair, co-chaired by
>Carl Sagan?

>I don't mean something like the sessions that the Society of
>Scientific Exploration sponsored, where only one side was
>presented, but a full-blown colloquium with skeptics and pro UFO
>researchers.

Bob,

Yes, a colloquium was held at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., with both advocates and sceptics/debunkers participating. I don't recall the year without digging through my files, but think it was the 1980s. Bruce would know, or Jerry Clark's wonderfully useful encyclopedia(s) might have the information. The recent Rockefeller-sponsored meeting also might qualify.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

'Alien Baloney'

From: Kelly <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:59:02 -0500
Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin

http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

Alien Baloney

A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange objects from people who think they were implanted by space aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalynn Campbell

"Here's to happy feet!" reads Jerry Lewis's signed head shot, hanging from the wall of podiatrist Dr. Roger K. Leir's modest office. It's accompanied by glossy, toothsome portraits of Johnny Carson, Patrick Swayze, and Larry Hagman.

The dapper, diminutive Dr. Leir has been in practice since 1964. Before opening his own clinic, he was on staff of up to 27 different emergency rooms at the same time. "It took a lot of running," he says. State medical records show he hasn't been reprimanded or even sued in years. But Leir isn't your typical overachieving foot doctor. For the past two and a half years, he says he's been surgically removing bizarre, unexplainable objects from patients who believe the objects were implanted by extraterrestrials.

"I've been the consummate skeptic," says Leir, who runs two clinics in the Ventura County suburbs of Thousand Oaks and Camarillo. "My background is scientific, and to be honest, I didn't have much faith in what we would find....I'm interested in physical evidence." Leir became interested in the idea of alien implants in 1995, when he attended a UFO convention at a hotel near LAX. There he met Derrel Sims, a hypnotherapist and self-described former CIA operative, who'd been investigating purported UFO abductions for 30 years. The Houston-based Sims displayed what he said were x-rays of a supposed abductee's foot, showing two unexplainable objects in the big toe. "I was intrigued by the evidence he presented," Leir says. "And being familiar with foot radiographs, I thought it was indeed coincidence."

Leir was so fascinated that he offered to remove the objects for free if the patient could journey from Texas to Southern California. She accepted immediately. Another Texan with an abduction story and a mysterious object in the hand contacted Leir, who assembled a support team and operated on both patients on August 19, 1995. (As a podiatrist, Leir is licensed to operate only from the ankle down.) From the first patient, he claims, he recovered a T-shaped metallic object, as well as another object shaped like a cantaloupe seed. An identical seed-like object, Leir says, was removed from the second patient's hand. Many people wind up with foreign objects lodged in their bodies -- and not because they were experimented on by some intergalactic Dr. Mengele.

Since then, Leir claims to have performed or presided over five other surgeries in which strange objects were sliced out of a

chin and a leg, as well as hands and feet. The last operation took place in June 1996. "To date," says the podiatrist, "we've removed three [objects] that are metallic and covered with a shiny, dark gray membrane, three grayish-white balls, the T-shaped object, and one with the appearance of crystal." According to a 1993 Roper Poll, between three and five million Americans believe they've been contacted, abducted, or otherwise toyed with by extraterrestrials. The high figure represents more than two percent of the population. "We figure that's conservative," says Leir. "Because most people don't want you to know."

The podiatrist says he subjects potential patients to a battery of psychological tests to make sure they're not mentally unstable. Those who want to be considered for implant removal surgery must meet other criteria as well. "Firstly, they have to have some kind of alleged abduction experience, and secondly, they have to have a demonstrable object," says Leir. "If you can't see it on an X-ray, CAT scan, or MRI, it's not for us." Leir hopes to carry out another set of surgeries in the next few months. And with over 100 qualified candidates on his waiting list, it would seem that he could franchise his work. To his knowledge, he and his team of volunteer physicians are the only ones performing implant-removal surgeries, though he's certain many other doctors have inadvertently taken implants out of their own patients.

"I've been contacted by numerous physicians who say, 'I know this sounds crazy' and proceed to describe an x-ray they've taken of an unexplainable object," says Leir. "Some have actually volunteered to participate." As for Leir's regular patients, most are aware of his hobby, and are curious rather than worried by it. "Not one single person has laughed," he says. "They don't think it's funny any more." Leir says his phone "rings constantly" with people asking about his surgeries. It rang for three days straight, he says, after he and his now-partner Sims were interviewed by Nevada-based radio personality Art Bell, the Oprah Winfrey of the unknown. Although the foot doctor says he receives no payment for his removal surgeries, he and Sims accept donations for their nonprofit research organization, the Fund for Interactive Research in Space Technology, or FIRST. The money, Leir says, is used to pay patients' transportation costs to L.A. and to run scientific tests on recovered objects (the tests often cost up to \$10,000 apiece, he says). Naturally, this being L.A., Leir is negotiating to sell possible film rights to his work.

So. Here we have a self-proclaimed man of science, cautiously and even skeptically exploring a strange medical phenomenon with profound implications for the human race, right?

Well, not exactly. Start asking hard questions about Leir's work and his story begins to reek of a certain popular lunch meat.

Can he supply the names of the surgeons who've assisted him, so the supposed removal surgeries can be verified? Well, that's not possible, actually. "It could damage their careers if they were connected to this," says Leir. How about patients' names? Well, they'd prefer to remain anonymous, too. OK, how about the identities of the researchers who Sims claims have examined the mystery implants? Um, they're kinda shy, too. "They've made some remarkable discoveries, but they're highly tenured academics," says Leir. "They're afraid of losing their reputations." Uh-huh. Can New Times at least photograph some of the purported implants? "They're all at labs being studied," says Leir. But as a reporter's questions continue, his manner gradually turns from polite and cooperative to petulant and demanding.

"I've given you a tremendous amount of material, free of charge," he huffs at one point, weeks after a single, one-hour interview. "I refuse to put forth any further effort unless a charitable contribution is made to our nonprofit research organization....Any TV producer would pay big bucks for that info."

Leir claims the mystery implants have undergone complicated tests at a variety of laboratories, including those at Stanford, the University of San Diego, the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and most recently, a private lab in Dallas. So far, he says, the mountain of data derived from the tests is inconclusive about whether the

objects are truly extraterrestrial in nature, although Leir clearly thinks there's a good chance they are. But, he says, "We won't know until we get the last piece of data."

After a week of deliberating with his Hollywood agent, Leir reluctantly passes on the name of a single researcher: Paul Fuierer, a materials engineer at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, who examined some of the objects two years ago. Leir and Sims had reported on their Website that Fuierer's data pointed toward extraterrestrial origins. Contacted by phone, Fuierer indicates he rues the day he got mixed up with Leir and Sims. "Unfortunately, my name is still associated with them," he says.

"I found nothing particularly unusual about the objects," says the engineer. "I was told virtually nothing about their origins. At the time, I said certain characteristics -- mineral deposits -- were similar to those found in meteorites. But that was turned around in their report. My statements were taken out of context, I was misquoted. The samples I examined could have been nothing more than slivers of iron -- perhaps from a wire hairbrush -- that the body had calcified. That scenario is much more probable."

Indeed, says Dr. Leonard Knudson, an L.A. podiatrist in practice for 16 years, many people wind up with foreign objects lodged in their bodies -- and not because they were experimented on by some intergalactic Dr. Mengele. "We might find a needle broken off inside, or splinters of some kind. Usually when something is in the body for a length of time, it gets a fibrous coating, or scar tissue," he says. "Sometimes [people] remember how or when it got there, sometimes they don't. If it happened a long time ago they will often forget about it."

If Fuierer is no help to Leir's cause, neither is the famed Los Alamos lab in New Mexico, where the first atomic bombs were developed. Leir insists some of his mystery objects were tested by researchers in Los Alamos' chemical science and technical division. "They even went to the expense of building a laser microscope to do mass spectrometry on them," says the podiatrist.

But Los Alamos chief spokesman James Richtman says he has "absolutely no idea what this is about." He says he's never heard of Leir's foundation or the names of the project's supposed funders. "We have no connection to this work," says Richtman.

Even some Ufologists scoff at Leir and Sims.

"There's a lot of fakery, money grubbing, and ego in the UFO community," says Jim Mosely, editor of Saucer Smear, a gossip watchdog publication for UFO buffs. "There's a decided lack of skepticism among people who follow the UFO community."

Mosely bluntly characterizes as "garbage" Leir and Sims' claims to be harvesting alien implants.

"People can get some strange stuff lodged under their skin without even knowing it," says Mosely. "The purpose of the implant would be to monitor or control the person; it would have to have some kind of mechanical semblance. Leir's [objects] have weird chemical formulas, but no indication of being tracking devices or having been formed unnaturally by intelligent beings." Predictably, Leir won't comment when confronted with these responses. Money is still flowing to his foundation, and he plans to present his "findings" in July or September, once all his test results are in. And there's a good chance he can bamboozle unsuspecting UFO fans around the globe into thinking he's the greatest scientific pioneer since Galileo.

"If [Sims] and I are successful with what we're doing -- if we prove the objects were implanted by extraterrestrial entities -- that's the end, the ultimate," says the foot doctor. "What will be done with that information remains to be seen, but I know life as we know it will never be the same."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: About Whitley Strieber - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 07:37:58 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 12:04:09 -0500
Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber - McCoy

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:53:46 -0800
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber

>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 01:40:49 EST
>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 12:49:44 -0800
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber

>>>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>>>Date: Sat, 10 Mar 2001 02:00:36 EST
>>>>Subject: Re: About Whitley Strieber
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>The so called Antartica Ozone hole, and the one at the North
>>>>Pole was discovered in 1958 by the US Navy. The flux of the
>>>>Ozone hole opening big, closing etc has been monitored ever
>>>>since then.

Hello, all Jim, Robert

1958 was, as I recall, the International Geophysical Year or IGY and the Navy's effort was Operation Deep Freeze, a Coordinated effort by several Branches of Government and most of the developed world to understand the geophysical world.

I'd do a web search if I had time this a.m. I have known a P-2V Pilot who had one miserable 6 mos. at McMurdo base. Those guys were real pioneers.

Well, guys I hope this helps.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 12:10:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>>a Council could work in practical terms.

>Basically I am suggesting that we create a team of people
>willing to devote some of their net time over the next (say) six
>months. Devote it to vetting and commenting upon case data
>submitted to them in an effort to find those cases to most
>strongly recommend via ufology as the ones most positively
>arguing towards the reality of the ETH.

<snip>

>The concept is simple. The execution a little less so

not just "a little"

>, for the
>reason that you set out. Lack of time and committment to other
>ventures.

and the requirement that each person on the "review panel" be
completely "up to speed" on every aspet of each case reviewed so
that arguments that ebb and flow will be understood by all and
not just by one expert on a particular case.

>But this is not a fatal flaw if we value the
>opportunity that such a venture provides.

<snip>

< Eight people willing to
>commit wholeheartedly to this experiment - as they must do.

>After all, the main work lies with everybody else who would be
>charged with the task of finding the cases that they believe
>would convince science.

I think the main work would be fior the panel members to find
ponts or aspects about individual cases that they can agree upon
and then to arrive at a conclusion they can all agree upon. It
should be a worthwhile conclusion: up or down, unidentified? up
or down, ETH? something else? no waffling (or pelican
fluttering) allowed.

>It is up to these people (which means every working ufologist
>out there who thinks the ETH may be true) to summarise their
>investigation, the data and its findings and submit it to the
>council. All the council would have to do

you make it sound easy... "all" they would have to do...
(HAHAHAHA. pardon my stifled laughter. Could such a council
arrive at a conclusion about the Arnold case? Or Rendlesham? Or
Bentwaters?)

>is debate this data -
>on a case by case basis - offering their opinions about the
>scientific potential of the evidence.

When a case has been discussed by council then one person from
the council (presumably the one with the most free time over the
next six months!) could be charged with summarising the overall
views on that case (and each other case as it is submitted by a
ufologist during the period that the team operates) in a message
to the UFO community.

Ufology - via UpDates, for instance - would thus be aware - on a
day to day basis - of just what was going on in the council
discussions as the project developed, and could discuss the
council's views, feed in its own input and further the eventual
debate leading towards the final report. The same could - and
should - be true of skeptics lists. The whole point of this
experiment is that this be a community effort and we recognise
the differing opinions that exist.

The council would not be the kings of this project - only one
part of it. Literally every one of us would have a role to play
to whatever extent we felt willing or able to commit to the
venture.

Then - at the end of the six months - the council could agree a
statement to be issued to the UFO community summarising the sum
total of the case data it has evaluated and the overall
conclusions they reach about it - recommending which cases to
ask the original investigators to work up into a proper format
and to become part of a submission by ufology to science.

In this way, the burden is shared. Yes, the people elected onto
the council have an individual responsibility to offer some time
to debate the cases. Yes someone on that council has to take the
responsibility to summarise the findings and post them regularly
so you can all see what is going on and feed back your opinions
into the debate. But all other ufologists have an equal
responsibility to come up with the goods - their first hand case
work. And make this a genuine group effort involving anyone who
wishes to participate - since the comments of the council, the
final selection of cases to be submitted to science and the form
of that submission will be openly discussed by anyone who wants
to do so.

The principle which I am suggesting allows this project to
eschew giving power to individuals and to truly become a UFO
community experiment that is harnessing the latent power of the
internet. Rather than - as now - using the net only to engage in
debate with no end purpose.

We can easily say - it's not possible or it is too hard. But
ufologist needs to put defeatism and differences aside and try
to make this happen.

I hope there are enough people committed to making progress in
this area - rather than maintaining the status quo - to give it
a chance of success. But we will not know unless we try. And
really that is all I am proposing. That we give this a try.

That surely has to be preferable to doing nothing. We have been
very good at that for a long time and a fresh approach seems
called for.

>Therefore, I propose that UFO advocates and proponents be
>asked to nominate, say, 100 hardcore cases to focus on. Then
>all sceptics and advocates can have a go at the nominated
>cases.

>The problem with this is that we will soon get bogged down in
>wrangling over countless threads on multiple cases all going on
>at once. We need more structure behind the project to prevent it
f>rom degenerating into chaos. I think we need to limit the
>numbers - although setting no arbitrary total.

>If we create the council first we could then ask people to
>submit their own cases (and they 'must' - in my view - be first
>hand research that they have conducted and not cases they think
>will stand up based on what they have read in a book)

I agree with this. In the field of ufology, where the impossible
is claimed to have happened, the only person you can believe is
yourself.... and sometimes you can't even believe that person!

>This step, to me, is a vital prerequisite since it means the
>ufologist has to be confident enough in the calibre of their
>submitted work to let it be vetted by the council - which I
t>hink will limit us to the strongest candidates and impress
>science more than simply again reading digests of cases from old
>UFO books. We have been there, done that. Now it is time to make
t>he T shirt.

Yes, every ufologist who investigates a case should do so as if
the most skeptical scientist were looking over his/her shoulder,
ready to pick up on mistakes, ignored information, failure to
report accurately, bias one way or another in data/information
selection, etc.

>I dont imagine this way we will get more than a dozen cases in
>the mix - although we may all be pleasantly surprised - but if
>so that is a manageable number for the council - and for the UFO
>community in general to debate each one in turn in a six month
>window.

>A dozen or so is also a fair number to submit in depth to
>science at the end. 100 cases could not be the basis of this
>kind of submission without creating a report the size of a phone
>directory and I dont think most scientists will wade through
>t>hat . Besides which we should give the impression of
>r>ecommending the best candidates not scraping around just to
>fill an arbitrary number of 'berths' and make it look as if the
>argument can be made by strength of numbers alone.

>We will be better served by fewer, stronger cases presented to
>science in the end in considerable depth. That is the
>consequence to which I think my idea would naturally lead.

That is true. In fact ONE case that everyone could agree upon
was absolutely unexplainable in conventional terms would be
worthwhile. Even more worthwhile if th information contained
therein clearly points toward OI/NHI/AFC (Alien Flying Craft)

>>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>>Balloonism, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission
>>of where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.>

>With respect, Richard, we will not do so if we fall back on
>polemics and stand by our entrenched positions. This project is
>not about fighting. It is about ius tolerating one anothers
>opinions and trying to work together. It needs a lot of people
>to show guts and determination and to put aside past prejudices
>and let the evidence be the only guide to the ultimate
>conclusion. I would hope there are plenty of people out there
>ready to accept that challenge.

>What this needs is sufficient strong willed people to forget
t>heir own opinions about UFOs (whatever they are - and that
>means skeptics and believers alike) - and to see the sense of
>this venture and its potential value for the long term health of
>ufology .

>After all, if only 8 people create the panel and only another
>dozen submit one strong case each that they have investigated -
>t>hen the concept can work.

>That means finding just 20 people in the entire UFO world -
>believers, skeptics, pelicanists, ETHers, investigators,

>scientists etc, etc - who see the worth of spending six months
>doing meaningful objective and scientifically orientated net
>based work like this as opposed to spending the same six months
>in more endless chit chat on personal theories or hobby horses.

>I would hope that the UFO world has more than 20 such people.
>Because if it hasn't, it would be very worrying.

OK, let's cut through to the heart of the matter (the Heart of Darkness?)

We need at least one case for which everyone agrees

1) there is no possibility (probability = $P = 0$) of a hoax

2) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a delusion

and

(the toughest one) 3) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a misidentification

Anyone got a case for which they are willing to say 1-3 are true?

(I don't see any hands waving in the air.) Remember, that even if a group of ufologists arrives at such a case the outside world is going to say.. "you've got to be wrong, There must be a possibility of either 1, 2, or 3 explaining the case."

Consider the Arnold case: since no one has argued for 1 or 2, I may as well assume that people agree that $P = 0$ for hoax or delusion. (Outworlders, coming from outside the discussion group, will have to be convinced of that.)

The problem comes with (3). Can anyone state there is no possibility of a misidentification? The best one can honestly do is assign a low probability "for the following reasons:" (followed by a list of reasons). Easton would assign a high probability to misidentification. In fact, to make the pelican explanation THE explanation he has to conclude "Pelicans: $P = 1$." If he doesn't make this conclusion then he must compare relative probabilities to make the "better choice." This requires assigning a probability to other choices, including "not pelicans". But if "not pelicans" is given a probability greater than 0 and if all other explanations are assigned $P = 0$ (Easton seems to have rejected all other explanations), then the comparison of probabilities must be with an "otherworldly" or "unconventional" explanation such as OI/NHI. (the specific ETH comes later).

Easton ends up with the "wimpy" response... "Well, the pelican explanation is more likely than the OI/NHI explanation." To justify this "better than" comment he has to provide evidence that could lead to a P value for OI/NHI. Simply because the scientific community says "there is no proof" is not sufficient. The scientific community hasn't really looked (this exercise is to provide valid information to the scientific community, after all... and to everyone else). The appeal to the astronomical argument (they can't get here from there) is also not sufficient. So, in order to state with scientific authority that $P(\text{pelican}) = 0.9$ and $P(\text{OI/NHI}) = 0.1$ and so it is MORE LIKELY that Arnold saw pelicans, one must come up with good reasons for each probability.

The argument leading to $P(\text{pelican})$ must be based on known physics. (UFOs can do "anything" but conventional phenomena are constrained by what we know) In my own approach to the "pelican problem" I have argued that for various reasons the pelican explanation fails to explain what Arnold claimed he saw.... it fails to satisfy his descriptions. Hence $P(\text{pelican})$ is very low or zero.

Easton handles this "problem" by saying Arnold's observations weren't accurate so one can reject certain claims and thereby "make" the pelican explanation fit. (Note: this is the time honored approach followed first by Hynek and then by Menzel; if you modify the sighting information enough you can make flying cows fit! Arnold did say, after all, that if he saw a barn flying through the air he wouldn't report it.)

He then has to assign (3) above a high probability, in fact $P =$ nearly 1 (near certainty) for a misidentification. And this must be based on more basic probabilities such as the probability that Arnold didn't know the general direction of his airplane, the probability that Arnold didn't know which way he was looking, the probability that Arnold over estimated the brightness of flashes, the probability that Arnold couldn't identify pelicans at a distance of a mile or two miles or three miles or four miles, etc. Each element of information in a case has a probability assigned to it (probability of being correct, in some sense). Then all these more basic probabilities must be multiplied together to get an overall probability for the misidentification.

So, it gets complicated. It appears to me that the Bayesian approach (start with initial probabilities for various things, look at the data and see how the probabilities change, and ultimately arrive at a final probability) will likely have to be followed, implicitly if not explicitly.

Then the BIG question is, even if you arrive at $P = 1$ that some case indicates OI/NHI/ET, _will anyone believe us_? Will anyone change their lives in some way in response to this new conclusion? Certainly some will....probably (uh, oh, that "p" word again) most will not.

The most we can do is lead the horse to the water.....

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:04:05 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 12:11:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

><snip>

>List, interested parties,

>>What interests me right now is whether it can be
>>demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds'
>>phenomenon were published in the UFO literature
>>prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be
>>forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find
>>evidence of it?".)

>Not necessarily in the UFO literature, this particular
>phenomenon of knocks or beeps or chirps, in multiples
>of three, often three sets of three, is well known in
>the demonic literature. See, for example:

>The Haunted by Robert Curran (St. Martin's Press,
>1988)

>The Demonologist by Gerald Brittle (Berkley Books,
>1980)

>True Tales Of The Unknown by Sharon Jarvis (Bantan,
>1985)

>This is not to suggest in any way that abductions
>are tied up >in the occult or demonology, but only
>to point out that this idea of the three knocks, six
>knocks, or nines knocks (three sets of three) does
>appear in wide spread areas of occult literature.

Hi Kevin,

Thanks for the note on the three 3s. These are my thoughts about
what you and others have commented on UpDates.

1) I know about the demonic tradition of 3-3s but it's very important to find the earliest UFO reference. It's like finding the first mention of a Grey in UFO reports. Whether folkloric references to Greys exist or not and they do, I can tell you is neither here nor there. Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses absorb published material and regurgitate it in their stories or under hypnosis. The job of a historian that is, the task of anyone doing serious research is to seek out the earliest reference to an element within the context he or she is investigating.

The 3-3s question is a puzzle in that this particular phenomenon coincides in time and space with the earliest UFO reports but the first UFO mention of it apparently dates to the 1980s. I would deem a lack of 3-3 reports in pre-Strieber UFO literature highly indicative of something, and I doubt any analytically-minded researcher would think otherwise.

2) Kevin, you list several books wherein 3-3 experiences are mentioned. I am unlikely to get the chance to consult them for a long time. Could you send me photocopies of any relevant pages in those works? I would gladly reimburse for any cost involved.

3) The number nine is often thought to be Satanic as it represents Christ's death on the one hand (he spoke his last words at 9:00, according to Mark 15:34-37) and, on the other, as W.W. Wescott says in his book on the mystical meaning of numbers, it stands for "the earth under evil influences." It is also an inversion of 6 (as in 666), the difference between the two numbers being 3 (as in 3 threes).

In a sense this is an irony in Strieber's books as he tries to show the Greys are more goodly than evil, although their traits are clearly demonic even in his descriptions of them. If you visit his website you find so much doom-and-gloom news coverage that it is obvious that he sees the 'visitors' as our salvation in a rotten world.

4) It seems to me that Strieber tries hard to entangle the reader in lofty thoughts about meaning and occult symbols in a bid to steer us away from the more down-to-earth task of deciding whether to believe him at all. 200 years ago this kind of thing would have quickly turned him into a mystic, someone like Swedenborg or Jane Lead.

Chris Aubeck

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:05:26 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 12:17:31 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan@aol.com>

=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 6, Number 11
March 15, 2001
Editor: Joseph Trainor

<http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

REPTOID SIGHTED IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

An alien was sighted on the beach in Rosarito, in Mexico's state of Baja California on Wednesday, February 29, 2001 by two Mexican policemen.

According to Urak Pavlov, director of UTRENE, a UFO research group based in Tijuana, B.V., Mexico, The two policemen were on patrol near the thermoelectric plant in Rosarito when "they saw what appeared to be a reptilian creature walking on the beach with a black suit on and with glaring red eyes. The creature was seen at 3:17 a.m. At first they were too scared to talk to anyone about the incident and preferred not to speak of it."

The Reptoid sighting is only one of many UFO incidents that have taken place in Baja California recently, Pavlov said.

There has been "a wave of sightings in Baja California, especially in the mountains and along the coast."

On Monday, March 5, 2001, Pavlov reported, "There were 50 sheep mutilated on ranches near Tocate, B.C. All of the sheep were left without any blood"

On Wednesday, February 28, 2001, "in the evening, my wife and I closed the office, and she said, 'Look! What is that!?' I said, 'Let me get the video camera.' So I did," he recalled.

"This big luminescent object reflected all the colors of the spectrum--yellow, red, blue, white, etc. and stopped at one place in the sky in Tijuana."

Elsewhere in Mexico, a new flurry of UFO sightings took place last week over Mount Popocatepetl, a large volcano located 60 kilometers (36 miles) east of Mexico City.

According to the Spanish news agency EFE, "residents of the (Mount) Popocatepetl area, reported seeing lights that 'fly over the volcano,' which has been erupting since December 1994."

"The lights were seen last night (Monday, March 5, 2001) over Popocatepetl, and dozens of residents from local communities called radio stations to make this known," according to Radio ACIR in Puebla, a city 125 kilometers (72 miles) east of Mexico City.

"According to the reports by Puebla radio stations, the alleged sighting could be seen in particular from an area near the volcano known for its accumulations of energy that interfere with the operation of compasses."

"Eyewitness Guadalupe Carrillo told a local (radio) station that 'the object had movement, passed over the volcano, turned around and rotated.'"

"A resident of San Francisco Totlmihuacan pointed out that one of the lights remained fixed in the sky while another moved around it. Another person claimed to have captured it all on videotape and make it available to the public."

"Popocatepetl has an elevation of 5,542 meters (18,288 feet) and is one of the places in Mexico where there is talk of suspicious lights and unidentified flying objects (UFOs) and a number of such reports have emanated from the mountain" since the current cycle of active volcanism began in December 1994. (Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales, auto de los libros Chupacabras and Other Mysteries y Forbiggen Mexico, y Gloria Coluchi para las noticias de EFE. Muchas gracias a Urak Pavlov para las noticias de Baja.)

DAYLIGHT DISC APPEARS OVER THE CAPITAL OF HONDURAS

On Thursday, March 8, 2001, at 11:30 a.m., a daylight disc appeared over the southern end of Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras, and was seen by two dozen motorists.

"Just around 11:30 a.m., with the sun shining in almost its noontime glory, an oval unknown artifact, gray in color, appeared and occasionally vibrated with intense whiteness over a region on the city's periphery in a contrail which seemed to reach from the (hilly) Cristo del Picacho area."

The UFO's appearance "was witnessed by two telephone technicians, one of whom happens to be an employee of (the Honduran newspaper) La Tribuna."

"When Gerardo Aceitano and his assistant Juan Francisco Mairena claimed to have had 'the experience of their lives' noting that the starship (UFO) might have been search for a power source (some 400 meters down the road is an electrical substation) we are reminded about what researchers and ufologists have told us about the way in which extraterrestrial civilizations enter our planet."

Aceitano and Mairena "were heading back to our main offices in a Siemens Fiorella-type van panel truck and had barely passed a few meters in front of a gas station" on the Paseo Kennedy "when the UFO appeared in the sky at an estimated altitude of 300 meters (1,000 feet)."

"Similarly surprised were college student Juan Flores and amateur photographer Juan Carlos Molina, who managed to snap photographs of the UFO, the first one over Cristo del Pichaco, and the second one over the Parque Nacional La Tigra (Jaguar National Park--J.T.) from their residences in barrio Santa Lucia."

"'We were driving along the Paseo Kennedy back to the La Tribuna offices and, passing the filling station, we were chatting in the truck. Upon looking ahead, we saw something moving back and forth, up and down, some 300 meters up. At first we thought it was a piece of paper in the wind, but when we stopped the vehicle, we could see that it was a flying saucer,' stated Gerardo Aceitano."

"'We stopped the truck and saw that the UFO was gray, oval and with a whitish intensity, and while it was far away, we could see that it was about 5 meters (16.5 feet) in diameter,' he described, while Juan Francisco Mairena corroborated the account, adding that he was 'overcome by the sighting' and which had lasted about three minutes."

"A row of 20 cars behind the Siemens vehicle stopped, and the occupants got out and watched the UFO's movements until it vanished by speeding away to the southeast."

"Its velocity was amazing, perhaps faster than sound," said Mairena, who confessed to still being stupefied by the unusual event." (See La Tribuna of Tegucigalpa, Honduras for March 9, 2001, "Dozens of citizens see another UFO." Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Gloria Coluchi para eso articulo de diario.)

STUDENT CAMPERS SEE A UFO NEAR ARICA IN CHILE

"George Calderon, 20, a college student, was enjoying two days of camping with his sweetheart, Katty, and a couple of friends near Villa Frontera," a wilderness area near Arica in Chile, "on (Friday) February 9, 2001 at 8 p.m. when he experienced one of the most startling incidents of his life."

"The campers had decided to stay one more day for no particular reason. However, they had been advised by the campground's owner that a group of persons would be coming that same evening and stated that they (George and friends--J.T.) should not go beyond the perimeter of their campsite."

"Without hesitation, the young campers accepted the owner's terms, but their curiosity was piqued. While roasting a piece of meat at around 9:30 p.m., they saw a group of about 10 people, including children, moving toward a nearby location. The group was clad in white tunics, added the college student."

"George stopped preparing the roast with his friends upon hearing the sound of bells. He walked four meters (13 feet) into the woods, where his girl friend joined him. And then he claims to have seen 'a large circular object irradiating a powerful red light' The object hovered over the white-robed participants, who held hands and chanted prayers and canticles that the student was unable to understand."

"The UFO, added George, was 40 meters (165 feet) away from the event, moved in a in a different direction and then its light bathed the whole area."

"The object moved over the persons every time they caused the bells to ring," he said."

"The young man and his girl friend witnessed this phenomenon for approximately one-and-a-half hours (90 minutes). Then they returned to their tents and the company of their friends. The sky turned slowly cloudy afterward."

"What he had seen was not a dream. Nor was he able to make out the outlines" of diagrams the sect members had drawn on the ground, "although 'one of them featured a triangle, and a circle' with a bottle with the label Lira with the picture of a little old man on it."

"I'm positive it was a UFO. It went up and down and every which way," George told the newspaper.

"When they were ready to leave the campground, they explained to the manager what they had seen the previous evening. The startled owner confirmed that the youngsters had witnessed the event and told them that what they had seen was 'something beautiful.' but that they hadn't seen everything and that these were things that would be seen in the future."

"But that very same evening (Saturday, March 10, 2001) the students' (cell) phones refused to work--no dial tone could be established. Katty, George's girl friend, suffered a stomach ache. Ingrid, one of their fellow campers, took ill with a headache, and Oscar felt dizzy. George, a mechanical drawing student from the University of Taracapa, felt intense pain along his spine."

"The campground manager confirmed the sighting but requested that his name be kept in the strictest confidence, adding that this is not the first time such supernatural events have been recorded" in Villa Frontera "and that the very same events will be seen in the future." (See the newspaper La Estrella de Arica for March 4, 2001, "UFOs over Arica--phenomenon reaches city."

Otra vez, muchas gracias a Scott Corrales y Gloria Coluchi.)

MYSTERIOUS MASS DEATH OF BIRDS IN LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

"A mystery of sorts dropped onto the Montauk Highway in Bridgehampton," Long Island, New York state, "shortly after 7 a.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2001. A flock of dying starlings fell from the utility wires and hit the road in over just a few minutes."

"'No one has any idea what could have killed them,' said Virginia Prati, director of the Wildlife Rescue Center of the Hamptons, who went to the scene to look at the bird kill."

"'I saw a lot of smashed birds,' she said."

"She estimated that more than 100 dead birds were on the road and the shoulders, so many that any single cause of death would be unlikely."

"Prati said that if the birds had been chased into the path of a truck by a predator, such as a hawk, only a few would have been hit. If they had been poisoned, they would have died over a longer period of time, and not all in one place."

"Michael Lowndes, a spokesman for the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) said the birds were found just east of the LIPA substation in Bridgehampton and "said the only way a bird on a power line could be electrocuted is if it were grounded, and it would be highly unlikely that a hundred birds would be grounded at once."

"'I've never heard of it happening,' he said."

"An eyewitness, Francis Hernandez of Sag Harbor, N.Y., said he was driving in the area about 8 a.m. on Tuesday and saw birds spiraling down from the wires and onto the roadway."

"'They were just spinning down,' he said, 'falling down like leaves onto the road and dying. I've never seen anything like it.'"

"He drove back the same way a few minutes later and saw dozens of birds on the ground. 'They were still struggling. They were hitting the blacktop (asphalt road--J.T.) but still moving. I picked one up. They were still warm,' Hernandez said."

"Prati said there were no burn marks on the feet of the dead birds, but it appeared that every one she looked at had blood at the back of its throat." (Editor's Comment: Sounds like a fast-acting virus.)

"But the idea that they were poisoned raises a different question. Starlings are commonly found with grackles and red-winged blackbirds, and none of these species were found at the scene."

"Several of the dead birds were collected and sent to to a state Department of Environmental Conservation laboratory upstate for analysis. But test results are not expected for several days." (See the Long Island newspaper Newsday for March 7, 2001, "Mystery on Montauk Highway: 100 dead birds." Many thanks to Louise A. Lowry for forwarding the newspaper article.) (Editor's Note: So now we have another mass death of birds, like in Oklahoma City recently and in Bastrop, Louisiana in 1998. This may be a natural phenomenon. Charles Fort listed many instances of the mass death of starlings during the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. See The Complete Books of Charles Fort, Dover Publications, New York, N.Y., 1974 for more information on this baffling phenomenon.)

LUMINOUS SPHERICAL UFO SEEN IN LECCE, ITALY

Hundreds of residents of Italy's Lecce province spotted a luminous spherical UFO on Sunday, March 4, 2001 after nightfall.

"Numerous residents witnessed a large object with flashing lights in both Lecce and Gallipoli. The large luminous globe hovered to the west of both cities. Several witnesses observed the object closely with binoculars and telescopes. They watched it change from a luminous sphere to a shape that was more

triangular. As it departed, it left a brilliant gleaming trail. The phenomenon lasted for two or three hours and was witnessed by hundreds of people at 10 p.m.. The object departed at a high rate of speed." (See the Italian newspaper Gazzetta di Mezzogiorno for March 6, 2001. Grazie a Eduardo Russo di Centro Italiano di Studi Ufologici per questo rapporto.)

HUGE ORANGE UFO STREAKS THROUGH OKLAHOMA SKIES

KFOR-TV in Oklahoma City reported "that a huge bright object was seen by hundreds of people in central and northern Oklahoma."

The KFOR-TV newsroom "was flooded with calls," Oklahoma ufologist Jim Hickman reported, "The 'object' was described as being an orange sphere with a red-blue 'streak.' It was seen from Oklahoma City all the way to the Kansas state line. The National Weather Service was contacted ' and they said "it was 'most likely rocket debris.'"

The overflight took place at 11:18 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2001.

An eyewitness, "Deborah H. from Elk City, Okla. reports, 'I was leaving the parking lot at my workplace. I was traveling north, slowing up for a stop sig. I saw the cloudy sky directly in front of me turn light blue and I saw an orange tail race across the sky in front of me. The object was moving from the southeast to the northwest. It had a long trail of yellow sparkles.'"

'The sighting lasted only for a couple of seconds as it was moving very fast. Within about 15 minutes of my sighting, I heard over my scanner one of our local (Elk City) police officers say, 'Did anyone else see that?' Another police officer replied, 'That's a big affirmative.' The sky was very overcast,' she added, 'and I felt like the blue flash was the object reflecting off the underside of the clouds.'" (Many thanks to Jim Hickman for this report.)

TRIANGULAR UFO SEEN OVER LAKE ERIE

On Sunday, March 11, 2001, at 9:40 p.m., Brian Long was outdoors in his hometown of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada, about 40 miles (64 kilometers) south of Toronto. when he spotted a triangular UFO flying over Lake Erie.

"The UFO went from the west to the northeast, heading towards the Niagara Falls area" Brian reported, "The object came over Lake Erie and flew from one end of the Fort Erie skyline to the other in just a few seconds. Four or five seconds, at the most. Triangular shape; three lights, one in each corner, and completely silent. The color blended in with the night sky." (Email Form Report)

(Editor's Comment: The eastern end of Lake Erie is sometimes called "the Mary

DISCOVERY FERRIES RELIEF CREW TO SPACE STATION

"Space shuttle Discovery lifted off Thursday," March 8, 2001, on a mission to replace the weary crew of the International Space Station," also known as Station Alpha, with three fresh workers. Russian cosmonaut Yuri Usachev and American astronauts Jim Voss and Susan Helms moved into the station for a four-month stay," following the shuttle's docking with the station two days later.

"Besides a new station crew and four other astronauts, the Discovery is hauling 10,000 pounds of supplies."

Susan Helms will be the first woman to live aboard Station Alpha.

"Just before lift-off, she waved and said, 'Bye, Mom!' to the television cameras." (See USA Today for March 9, 2001, "Shuttle enroute to replace station crew," page 3A, and the Chicago Tribune for March 9, 2001, "Shuttle Discovery travels to space station with new crew," page 6.)

READER FEEDBACK:

VARGINHA WAS IN 1996, NOT 1997

Cynthia Newby Luce writes, "In the last page of your report talking about the microwave weapon (see UFO Roundup, volume 6, number 9 for March 1, 2001, "U.S. Marines unveil a microwave weapon," page 11) you mentioned at the end that a UFO crashed in Varginha, Minas Gerais, Brazil. I think you have the date incorrectly written as 199 when it happened in 1996. January 20th, 1996 was when the three girls saw the odd being which was given wide coverage in the news media."

(Editor's Comment: You're absolutely right, Cindy. It was my typo. Sorry. Readers who want to check out the original coverage of the event should go to UFO Roundup, volume 1, numbers 12 through 16.)

MORE SECRETS OF THE BURNES FAMILY REVEALED

Barbara Price writes, "Your article was wonderful about David Burnes and (Pierre) L'Enfant and the tunnels underneath D.C. (For more on the ancient tunnels beneath the USA's diamond-shaped District of Columbia, see UFO Roundup volume 6, number 4 for January 25, 2001, "1791--Hillary's Haunted Neighborhood," page 7.) I'm a descendant of David Burnes, and he may have known of those tunnels from his father and his grandfather, as they owned land in this area dating back to 1721, when the first David Burnes made the purchase."

NOT EXACTLY A METEOR

Donnie Shevlin writes, "The meteor story that you posted in UFO Roundup, volume 6, number 10 ("Small meteor hits a garden in York, UK." page 9) had a later rendition by the Associated Press. What followed a brief investigation was a power line explosion underground. The rush of air Sylvia Mercer felt was a clod of dirt passing her face. She was somewhat relieved to hear that it was not a meteorite, but worried that a power line could do such a thing.

From the UFO Files...

1958: A FIRE POLTERGEIST IN GLENDIVE, MONTANA

Another strange case involving a "fire poltergeist" took place in Glendive, Montana in 1958. Like the one in Bladenboro, North Carolina twenty year's earlier (see UFO Roundup for March 8, 2001, "1938: North Carolina's Fire Poltergeist," page 8) the Glendive case also had a teenaged girl living on the premises.

"On January 10, 1958, at 8 a.m., a Mrs. Charles King of Glendive, Montana walked into the living room of her home and a window curtain burst into flame. After putting out the blaze, she decided that an electrical spark must have been responsible, and she disconnected all appliances attached to electrical outlets in the room."

"Half an hour later another fire broke out in the living room. Mrs. King called the Glendive Fire Department which extinguished the blaze. Damage was not extensive. "

"At 4:20 p.m. Jack Shearer was installing storm windows when he looked through a window and saw a wastepaper basket burning. He ran into the house and doused the fire with a bucket of water."

"Two hours later, two teen-age girls, who were watching" a rerun of My Little Margie (a TV situation comedy of the 1950s starring Gale Storm and Charles Farrell--J.T.) "on the television in the living room, noticed smoke. They found a curtain ablaze in a bedroom."

"This time Fire Chief George Smith carefully inspected the house, but could find no reason for the (fiery) outbreaks. Materials in which spontaneous combustion might possibly occur were either removed or exposed to the air. Electricity into the house was disconnected. Members of the family took turns sitting up all night."

"During the next seven days, five more fires broke out. They were in the bedroom of a granddaughter, Wendy - one destroying all the clothing in a portable wardrobe; another in a storage

closet; another burned a tablecloth and still another was in a dresser drawer. Mrs. King's married daughter was burned about the hands while fighting one fire, and the daughter's husband was overcome by smoke. An expert from the (Montana) state fire marshal's office came and departed, shaking his baffled head."

"Then, as is usual (in these cases) the phenomenon ended just as suddenly as it had begun." (See the book Mysterious Fires and Lights by Vincent H. Gaddis, Van Rees Press, New York, N.Y., 1967, pages 184 and 195. Also The Missoulian of Missoula, Montana for January 17, 1958, "Another Mysterious Blaze.")

Well, that's it for this week. Join us in seven days for more UFO and paranormal news from around the planet, brought to you by "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you then! UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2001 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their websites or in newsgroups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan@aol.com> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

http://ufoinfo.com/forms/form_sighting.htm

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>

UFOINFO: <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives of the UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences,
UFO + PSI Magazine also available, plus archives of
Filer's Files and Oz Files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 08:41:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 17:09:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Tonnies

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 06:46:41 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

<snip>

>Whilst searching for clues on the internet I think I may have
>found something we have all been missing.

>See:

<http://www.threethrees.com.au/myweb/information.htm>

This is hysterical. John - have you noticed the smell
of dill pickles around your house, by any chance?

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 15](#)

Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:24:37 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 18:32:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:57:51 EST
>Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:50:33 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure

>>>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 22:15:26 -0800
>>>Subject: Heroic Astronaut's Ambiguous Alien Disclosure
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Previously, Kurt posted:

>>>A prime time audience saw Glenn in a scenario that had him
>>>baring his soul into the microphone of a radio broadcast studio
>>>and comedically unaware that he was being taped: "We know what
>>>we saw out there and we couldn't really say anything. The bosses
>>>were scared of this. They were afraid of 'War of the Worlds'
>>>type stuff and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep
>>>quiet."

>Hi Roger, Kurt, Everybody:

>Has it occurred to anyone that this was a TV sitcom?

Dear Bob, Clear, Kurt, bListers and of course, Errol:

Nah! Think about it, por favor. Bob, I am somewhat surprised at you. At how you can think such a thing. Shows me even my heros can be all wet (with Pelican guano). Say, have you spent any time on Mt. Raining?

OK, enough silliness. Here's the straight poop.

This was a "reverse conspiracy!" It was counter to the usual deNile we get from the government. This is what they did to us. The government, specifically MJ13 (that's quite right, there's another member and rumor has it it's Gesundt), anyway, MJ13 contacted the aforementioned "heroic astronaut," the network and producers and the writers and told them what to do. Then in an heroic act of American Patriotism, everyone cooperated. To a man, woman and astronaut.

There is the other possibility that the government used coercion but we discount that. And the word on the street was that the government infiltrated everything, you know, producers etc., and planted the seeds for this program. And the heroic astronaut of course, cooperated because he is really a CIA handler for a famous and popular American comedian... Letterman.

Thre you have it. The straight poop, from the john. That's me.

John Mortellaro

President and Prince of the Abductees, without portfolio

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 15:10:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 09:39:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 13:40:54 -0000

I'd like to make a suggestion that seems radical, but to me is only common sense.

>Which is why I suggested a simple way around this in my original
>post. We define four categories of researcher - the ETH
>supporters, the skeptics, the Ufologists who accept UFO reality
>but not necessarily the ETH, and scientists involved in the
>search for ETI but who are not in any way Ufologists. Then we
>divide whatever number we agree should form the council by four
>(hence it has to be 8, 12, 16 etc members in total) and let the
>community formed by these four groups of researchers nominate
>their own equal number of representatives.

>This way all strands are represented equally and since they -
>themselves - elect, nominate, cajole, recommend, or use whatever
>process they chose to come up with to find the council members -
>they cannot complain about fair representation since it was down
>to their own colleagues as to who was put forward.

>We just post messages to the appropriate lists (we can surely
>decide which lists best represent each of these four strands)
>and give these lists a deadline of say a month from now to put
>forward their own two, or three, or whatever number of
>representatives would participate in this venture.

This, to me, relies too much on the objectivity and good will of people who -- like every other group of humans -- have shown that they've subject to all kinds of personal and professional jealousy, not to mention posturing to look good in public. Please understand that I'm not trashing ufologists or skeptics. I'm just saying that this is how people of all kinds much too often behave, and that the groups you want to involve in this wonderful process aren't likely to be much different.

So here's my suggestion. The two of you, Richard and Jenny, should organize this panel. You should pick the people on your own. You shouldn't tell the world who you've picked. The panel should then meet secretly -- ideally in person (see if you can get funding somewhere) -- and do its work. Only after it's finished, and some kind of report is available, should any of this be announced to the public.

And you should have a facilitator -- someone whom everyone involved recognizes as neutral and objective, who can chair the discussions, to make sure they stay on target.

Maybe this seems secretive, undemocratic, and unfair. But I was once involved in something like this -- in another phase of my life -- and watched with delight as people you'd think would never say a civil word to each other debated controversial topics with a lot of heat, sometimes, but always reasonably. The key was keeping the discussion entirely out of the public eye.

By picking people yourself, you avoid another problem, which is

the presence of people who really aren't reasonable, but who have such stature in their area that they're sure to be chosen in any public process. I'm sure we could all think of some names, on all sides of this debate. If the two of you make the choices, you'll avoid having people like that participate, and the discussion can proceed with relative calm.

Greg Sandow

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Council Proposal

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:41:11 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 09:41:29 -0500
Subject: Council Proposal

Jenny and List,

No time for a more detailed reply right now, but I admire your strong democratic leanings. Perhaps recent developments in the U.S., not to mention a lifetime of fighting for more critical analysis of UFO data, have left me somewhat cynical.

How do we know anything about the quality of cases that parties of unknown critical faculties would submit to the council? Why burden busy people with having to do a screening of, perhaps, dozens of such cases when the initial screening could be done much more easily by you, me, and other experienced investigators?

My logic is that advocates and proponents naturally would seek out the strongest cases they could find, and would be happy to learn about any they might have missed. Would it be possible to build in some compromise way of deciding which cases should go to the council?

In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless opinion-mongering.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/15/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:35:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:11:15 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/15/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 15, 2001

**RESPONDING TO DOMESTIC TERRORISM
**CRS DOCUMENTS ONLINE
**AVNER COHEN UPDATE

RESPONDING TO DOMESTIC TERRORISM

"The ability of the United States Government to prevent, deter, defeat and respond decisively to terrorist attacks against our citizens... is one of the most challenging priorities facing our nation today," according to a recent counter-terrorism planning document.

In the waning days of the Clinton Administration, government agencies developed a plan to coordinate their response to domestic terrorism, and particularly to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

The plan is premised on the assumption that "a terrorist incident may occur at any time of day with little or no warning, may involve single or multiple geographic areas, and result in mass casualties."

The plan identifies the responsibilities and authorities of various agencies and "outlines an organized and unified capability for a timely, coordinated response by Federal agencies to a terrorist threat or act."

The January 2001 "United States Government Interagency Domestic Terrorism Concept of Operations Plan" is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/conplan.html>

CRS REPORTS ONLINE

"Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Terrorist Threat" is also the subject of a December 1999 report of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) that is now available online in PDF format:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS20412.pdf>

After years of fruitless debate over whether the public should be granted direct access to online CRS products, the impasse has been partly overcome as the result of a pilot program in the House of Representatives.

Under the House initiative, the CRS still will not provide direct public access (and therefore remains immune to utterly hypothetical liability lawsuits). But instead, individual members of the House can now grant public access to a select archive of CRS reports through their own web sites. Congressmen Mark Green, Christopher Shays, and others have done so.

At their best, CRS reports synthesize an entire body of

literature in concise form, identifying salient issues and key players, and presenting a spectrum of opinion. Even the best reports, however, are short on original analysis and tend to be excruciatingly even-handed.

Less inspired products merely compile and summarize mainstream press reports about a particular issue and are largely devoid of insight. Even so, they can serve as useful introductions to a particular policy topic. Anyway, there was never any good reason why most of them should not be easily available online. A few notable new reports, all in PDF format, include:

"Intelligence Issues for Congress," updated March 2, 2001:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/IB10012.pdf>

"North Korea's Nuclear Weapons Program," Issue Brief, updated February 27, 2001:

<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/IB91141.pdf>

"V-22 Osprey Tilt-Rotor Aircraft," Issue Brief, updated March 7, 2001:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/IB86103.pdf>

"China/Taiwan: Evolution of the "One China" Policy -- Key Statements from Washington, Beijing, and Taipei," updated March 12, 2001:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL30341.pdf>

For links to selected other new CRS reports on national security and foreign policy issues, see:

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/index.html>

AVNER COHEN UPDATE

Avner Cohen, the Israeli scholar who has written a political history of Israel's nuclear weapons program, arrived in Israel Monday without incident.

But on Tuesday, he was subjected to over eight hours of interrogation by Israeli security authorities, according to an article in yesterday's Boston Globe. (Israel has not officially acknowledged its possession of nuclear weapons.) And the questioning was still not over. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/bg031401.html>

Sources close to Avner Cohen said the Globe article itself reflected a breach of confidence by Israeli Defense Ministry officials, since all parties had agreed to proceed on a confidential basis.

From the Israeli government's point of view, it is not engaging in a campaign of intimidation directed at a critic of its nuclear policy. Rather, it is investigating whether a specific security violation involving the illicit transfer of certain information out of the Defense Ministry took place. Since Avner Cohen did not commit any such violation, the sources said, a speedy resolution to the present ordeal might be anticipated.

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message:

subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

To unsubscribe, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message:

unsubscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>Gentlemen,

>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>they would be UFOs.

This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of 'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth. Also we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm.. do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans? Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

A lot of people on this list aren't happy when sceptics find it "safe to assume" things, so pardon me if I don't find it "safe to assume" what Arnold may or may not have been familiar with.

In another posting today Don Ledger says:

>No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact
>that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import.
>The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all
>you need to know. The objects were stated by Arnold as too fast
>and too far away to be birds. He did the math. If birds, then
>their very size would make them too small to resolve on the
>retina at that distance. You are making presumptions unsupported
>by any facts.

Again the assumption is that Arnold (and by implication any other witness) as "the man on the scene" is giving a full and accurate account of everything that happened when they had their 'UFO' experience. Any estimates of distance or speed cannot be challenged; 'math' based on estimates made on the hoof in rushed circumstances and based on fragmentary observations are not open to reassessment. After all they have been 'proven' to be UFOs.

It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests, is feasible in current circumstances. If a re-investigation of

the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters, can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a mundane explanation.

>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>inconclusively.

[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be 'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs - that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry, but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other than UFOs.

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:06:55 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:19:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>OK, let's cut through to the heart of the matter (the Heart of
>Darkness?)

>We need at least one case for which everyone agrees

>1) there is no possibility (probability = $P = 0$) of a hoax

>2) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a delusion

>and

>(the toughest one) 3) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a
>misidentification

>Anyone got a case for which they are willing to say 1-3 are
>>true?

>(I don't see any hands waving in the air.) Remember, that even
>if a group of ufologists arrives at such a case the outside world
>is going to say.."you've got to be wrong, There must be a
>possibility of either 1, 2, or 3 explaining the case."

>Consider the Arnold case: since no one has argued for 1 or 2, I
>may as well assume that people agree that $P = 0$ for hoax or
>delusion. (Outworlders, coming from outside the discussion
>group, will have to be convinced of that.)

>The problem comes with (3). Can anyone state there is no
>possibility of a misidentification? The best one can honestly do
>is assign a low probability "for the following reasons:"
>(followed by a list of reasons). Easton would assign a high
>probability to misidentification. In fact, to make the pelican
>explanation THE explanation he has to conclude " Pelicans: $P =$
>1."

Hi,

All true, Bruce. I don't dispute what you say in the least and it
will - indeed - prevent us from ever proving UFO reality, I
suspect.

But that should not be what this experiment is designed to do.
Our aim is not to find cases that have 'no possibility' other
than the ETH (or even no possible but UFO reality) since that's
never going to happen.

This venture was suggested as a test of the plausibility of the
ETH as a credible scientific hypothesis. To establish this we do
not need to all agree on whether case 'A' might be a pelican, a
policeman's hat or a pot plant. Or even that we - personally -
think that is the most likely answer for this incident. Or for
any of us to be convinced the ETH is true.

We only need to agree that the ETH is a credible interpretation of the data for a specific case / or set of cases.

This is a less onerous task but would establish the basic requirement of the project - the credibility of the ETH as a working hypothesis. We might all say - well of course we know that already. But the point is that many out there who shun Ufology do not accept it at all. That's why this experiment should aim to persuade them of the viability of the solution rather than to prove the reality of it.

This project is never going to win over most Ufologists who dispute the TH - let alone convert skeptical scientists. But it isn't meant to do so. Only to really set out several things.

(1) An agreed data base of cases that pro ETH Ufologists can use to argue as the basis for their support of that possible interpretation of the evidence.

(For example, the Arnold case is not broadly accepted as being a flock of pelicans, whether it turns out to be one in the end, or not. But it is also very unlikely to be broadly considered as a case that one would credibly argue as offering strong support for the ETH as the primary resolution - so agreement in principle here even between disparate viewpoints is likely to be easier than you might expect since many will share a mutual set of conclusions about it)

(2) A set of data we can put forward to science as offering a basic case that the ETH 'might' be a credible way to interpret UFO data. Not that it 'does' resolve the data in this way. That isn't necessary. Remember the project is intended to argue only the credibility of the ETH as a feasible resolution that science should consider more seriously because this experiment has demonstrated its viability in the face of the agreed evidence.

I am - for example - open minded with regards the acceptance of the ETH. I am not certain whether any cases do exist out there that would strongly affirm it as the certain answer. But I do expect there will be cases where I could agree that we do not currently have an adequate explanation in terms of hoax or imperception and where therefore the ETH offers a truly credible interpretation of that case.

As such I could find myself persuaded by the experiment - not that the ETH is proven - but probably that it is a reasonable, scientific hypothesis that we can agree does match sufficient evidence to be regarded as a viable possibility by fair minded people.

That's 'all' we should set out to do and that is a worthwhile and an achievable objective in of itself.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 03:24:49 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:32:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>>I have been giving some thought to Jenny Randles' online
>>"council" idea, which dovetails with my (undoubtedly too
>>idealistic) notion of all the Centrists (those interested in
>>serious research) working together to resolve the controversy.
>>We all tend to have severely limited time, mostly due to
>>financial pressures, which immediately poses problems about how
>>a Council could work in practical terms.

>>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>>the focus.

Hi Jenny,

I feel that you and Richard have made good proposals. I do agree that the way you have structured your proposal goes further than Richard's and has a better ability to reach its goals. I would like to see some discussion of this on UFO Updates.

>Hi,

>Absolutely, Richard that was my intention with this idea.

>Cases, hard data - the prime evidence for the ETH that working
>investigators out there believe should be submitted to science
>in order to make the prima facie argument that the ETH should at
>least be taken seriously. That should be our goal.

>So the focus should not merely be on cases but on cases that:

>- have strong evidence to support their actual reality

>- have strong evidence to support the ETH interpretation of that
>reality

<snip>

>A dozen or so is also a fair number to submit in depth to
>science at the end. 100 cases could not be the basis of this
>kind of submission without creating a report the size of a phone
>directory and I dont think most scientists will wade through
>that. Besides which we should give the impression of
>recommending the best candidates not scraping around just to
>fill an arbitrary number of 'berths' and make it look as if the
>argument can be made by strength of numbers alone.

>We will be better served by fewer, stronger cases presented to

>science in the end in considerable depth. That is the
>consequence to which I think my idea would naturally lead.

<snip>

>>Having observed the constant rebirth of Pelicanism and Hot-Air
>>Balloonism, which has amounted more to constant restating of
>>scoffing positions than to a real give and take and admission
>>of where the relative arguments may be weak or strong, I have
>>serious doubts that we will get anywhere with this.

>With respect, Richard, we will not do so if we fall back on
>polemics and stand by our entrenched positions. This project is
>not about fighting. It is about ius tolerating one anothers
>opinions and trying to work together. It needs a lot of people
>to show guts and determination and to put aside past prejudices
>and let the evidence be the only guide to the ultimate
>conclusion. I would hope there are plenty of people out there
>ready to accept that challenge.

The above is an excellent statement, Jenny. In an ideal world that should be one of the standards in this field. I don't want to sound like an elitist, hard ass, know it all - but I am <VBG>).

What I mean is that so many in the field of popular ufology seem to have no inner standards that would help keep us out of the muck we wallow in and help put us on the road to some real truth and not make us look like a laughing stock to people trained in science or other professional fields in which there are definite standards of attempting to proving a claim, which include peer review, etc.

For a long time I have wondered how serious (what I call scientific) ufology could some how be separate and disassociated from popular ufology. Different organizations have tried to be serious about finding answers but have had their own problems. I was not involved in ufology other than being a curious reader when NICAP was around. Many years ago I joined MUFON, started a local UFO study group, and we put on some public forums. I also held regional MUFON positions in California over the years.

Until the early 1990s I attended UFO conferences. What circuses! even most of the ones that were supposed to be more serious would have a few legitimate researchers and also many poseurs who were just making astounding claims with no real evidence. Over the years I belonged to two MUFON chapters. The public MUFON meetings were just the same. They presented some good speakers but many more who had the same lack of standards of serious ufology. The meetings were public and I was told that it was hard to get speakers. But presenting speakers to the public who seemed to be nutcases did no good for the public's education in ufology.

I also started seriously questioning MUFON as an international organization with their handling of Gulf Breeze and many later cases. There were also a great many people in the field who had no idea of investigative standards and just wanted sensationalism. We still have the same problem. I really feel that Dick Hall made a fine effort of outlining standards in his UFO Magazine columns. I hope he was not mostly pissing in the wind because many people are nut able to do more than lipspeak about standards at best. Jenny, I also feel you hold to strong standards and I admire your efforts.

MUFON field investigator training is good for investigating reports in the field and interviewing witnesses. Even that NAZI nutcase (whose name I can't recall - maybe Ernst Zundel - who was involved with the postwar old and neo Nazis) wrote the book claiming that postwar Nazi saucers were flying out of a hole in Antarctica, printed the worst UFO investigator identification I have ever seen. It said UFO Investigator, had lines for you to write in your name and address, and was printed with alleged Nazi saucer drawings with SS twin lightning bolts all over this so called identification. It's even on his internet site for anyone to print out and carry as a "UFO investigator". No training necessary. Give me a break!

The best thing I did for my standards besides University was to graduate from a licensed private investigation academy. That is a professional field with strong detective standards, licensed

and administered by the state. The school standards are set by the state and after graduation one must put in many hours working under a licensed detective before one can take the stiff examination to be licensed. I'm not saying that one needs to go to that extent to become a UFO field investigator. But besides balancing an open mind with its critical aspects and using logic, reason, and rationality, there are many detective standards that should be taught as part of the field investigator training.

I started steadily pulling back from any public UFO activities for the above reasons. Now I have not anywhere the expertise on cases as do people to be proposed for candidates to a council. But there are a few people who I greatly respect for the standards they hold in their investigations, writings, and public statements. I'll put in their names at nomination time.

>What this needs is sufficient strong willed people to forget
>their own opinions about UFOs (whatever they are - and that
>means skeptics and believers alike) - and to see the sense of
>this venture and its potential value for the long term health of
>ufology .

>After all, if only 8 people create the panel and only another
>dozen submit one strong case each that they have investigated -
>then the concept can work.

>That means finding just 20 people in the entire UFO world -
>believers, skeptics, pelicanists, ETHers, investigators,
>scientists etc, etc - who see the worth of spending six months
>doing meaningful objective and scientifically orientated net
>based work like this as opposed to spending the same six months
>in more endless chit chat on personal theories or hobby horses.

>I would hope that the UFO world has more than 20 such people.
>Because if it hasnt, it would be very worrying.

>Best wishes,

>Jenny Randles

Jenny, I am glad you have structured your proposal so that it will have listwide participation. However, I still wonder if, in view of the lack of major UFO organizations to hold realistic standards to scientifically investigate the phenomenon and separate it from all the crapola out there, if some coalition of what you are proposing as a council could be joined with NIDS, SSE, etc. to move away from popular ufology and determine ways to present what has been investigated to science, the government and the public. We have a number of groups like CAUS, CUFOS, etc. that may have an interest in such a coalition to separate the wheat from the chaff. This would not be a coalition of the public but of researchers who hold to agreed standards. We have some good journals like IUR, JSE, etc. that reach a select few. Perhaps a professional publication of research and findings could be produced by such a coalition, advertised and made available to the public.

Steven Greer proposes next month to have his witnesses with clearances go public. Mr. Greer has taken positions and made statements I very much disagree with. It makes me wonder what the heck he has tried to present to the government in his briefings in the past. Stephen Bassett is lobbying in Washington but looking at his site I feel his standards are rather loose. I wonder what he is presenting on the hill? We had the Rockefeller briefing document presented to Washington. Right now we don't have much new to go on unless Dr. Greer's witnesses give evidence that makes a breakthrough of evidence. We need a new effort with higher standards.

I really wonder if there is a way to form a much more professional, serious wing of ufology that can stand apart from the crowd of popular ufology? How do we get ourselves unstuck from the muck and on the road that has the best chance of finding answers in the ufo enigma? Your proposal is excellent for this List but unfortunately most of ufology is really on the Fox TV, Art Bell show level. Unfortunately that is the level that most of the American public interested in UFOs get their information from. Many are not educated enough to have developed standards above the tabloid level. But those looking beyond deserve to have an alternative that does have high standards and

is well known to the public.

This has gotten to be pretty wordy as food for thought. I would like to see comments on Jenny's proposal and any ideas as to how ufology can put on a better face.

Take care,

Josh Goldstein
("wondering Josh")

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Dung Rains from the Skies

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:35:26 -0500
Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies

Ladies & Gents:

Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

<http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

Evidence of OI/NHI?

Very Clear Skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Keith Basterfield Is Back!

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 21:19:36 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:38:04 -0500
Subject: Keith Basterfield Is Back!

New Catalogue from Keith Basterfield

Keith has recently compiled A Catalogue And Analysis Of
Australian 'Angel Hair' Cases

<http://www.project1947.com/kbangel.htm>

A rare phenomenon sometimes associated with UFO sightings is
"Angel Hair," a thin fiber-like material that in some cases
resembles "spiders' web." Keith Basterfield has produced a
detailed collection of "Angel Hair" cases and analyses that adds
considerably to the study of this peculiar aspect of UFOlogy.

Project 1947 is proud to host another of Basterfield's catalogues!

Jan Aldrich

Project 1947
<http://www.project1947.com/>
P. O. Box 391
Canterbury, CT 06331, USA
(860) 546-9135

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

From: **Josh Goldstein** <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:22:32 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:40:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:03 -0000

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Serious Research
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>>>Also, anyone who is serious about this subject knows full well
>>>that it all comes down to individual cases and their
>>>investigation and interpretation. Case studies would have to be
>>>the focus.

Hello Dick and fellow Listerions,

I just want to provide clarification. In my most recent post to the List and in my personal post to you, I was referring to your original proposal. I had not yet seen this post. I will give it much thought.

Tschus,

(bye in German)
Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:53:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 22:00:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:04:05 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:12:24 -0500
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 09:13:03 -0500 (EST)
>>>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>>Subject: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>><snip>

>>List, interested parties,

>>>What interests me right now is whether it can be
>>>demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds'
>>>phenomenon were published in the UFO literature
>>>prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be
>>>forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find
>>>evidence of it?")

>>Not necessarily in the UFO literature, this particular
>>phenomenon of knocks or beeps or chirps, in multiples
>>of three, often three sets of three, is well known in
>>the demonic literature. See, for example:

>>The Haunted by Robert Curran (St. Martin's Press,
>>1988)

>>The Demonologist by Gerald Brittle (Berkley Books,
>>1980)

>>True Tales Of The Unknown by Sharon Jarvis (Bantan,
>>1985)

>>This is not to suggest in any way that abductions
>>are tied up >in the occult or demonology, but only
>>to point out that this idea of the three knocks, six
>>knocks, or nines knocks (three sets of three) does
>>appear in wide spread areas of occult literature.

>Hi Kevin,

>Thanks for the note on the three 3s. These are my thoughts about

>what you and others have commented on UpDates.

Hello Gary,

You wrote:

>Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses absorb
>published material and regurgitate it in their stories or under
>hypnosis.

Geez, is this what this is all about for you? To revert back to expressions of my youth, "What a bring down and a stone cold bummer man!"

John Velez,

Disappointed (but not surprised. Been dere, don dat.)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

The Lost Haven

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:47:51 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 22:01:29 -0500
Subject: The Lost Haven

Dear Colleagues,

In my strive to bring you, and the World public a varied aspect of written articles on the UFO subject, I am pleased to present to you a new article for my site by Malcolm Robinson of SPI England.

You can find the article here:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/Milabs.html>

Best Regards,

Roy..

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 16](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:57:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 22:05:01 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 08:41:04 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 06:46:41 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

><snip>

>>Whilst searching for clues on the internet I think I may have
>>found something we have all been missing.

>>See:

><http://www.threethrees.com.au/myweb/information.htm>

>This is hysterical. John - have you noticed the smell
>of dill pickles around your house, by any chance?

Hello Mr. Smarta** ;)

If those guys from 'Three Threes' have been following us around
all these years playing beeps in a clandestine attempt to plant
subliminal messages that communicate the "Brand name," all I can
say is;

"These guys have to be _THE_ most aggressive pickle salesmen
on the planet! <LMAO>
Funny stuff. ;)

Regards,
Johnny 'Pickles' Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney'

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:52:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 05:07:02 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>From: Kelly <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin
>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>Alien Baloney

>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyynn Campbell

<snip>

Hi Kelly,

I agree with the bulk of what was said here. I am completely outraged to learn that in spite of the fact that none of the surgical procedures performed thus far has turned up any hard evidence, Doc Lier has over 100 surgeries scheduled.

Isn't there a medical review board in the State of California? Are they -all- on vacation? Maybe the whole review Board died! Somebody ought to tell em.

I hope it all gets stopped before another person is cut. I've been pissed at both Sims and Leir since 1995.

Regards,
John "Duck hunter" Velez, "Quack! Quack!!!"

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:54:29 +0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 05:10:24 -0500
Subject: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

Dear Colleagues,

I am happy to announce that Larry Hatch has won the Lost Haven book quiz.

The question was: What was the Medieval date that the Citizens of the Swiss town of Basel described seeing strange globes in the sky?

The Answer: 07 August, 1566,

Larry will be receiving his book prize in due course.

To answer the new quiz question go to:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

Kind Regards,

Roy..

* Web Master- The Lost Haven *
(Editor -Down To Earth Magazine on The Net)
<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:54:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 05:09:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>Date: 15 Mar 2001 06:13:15 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 19:41:44 -0600
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 13:24:13 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>John and Bill,

>>I would also be interested in listening to both examples of
>>taped beeps. Lindy let me have a copy of her tape several years
>>ago and the five beep sequences are very, very similar. In one
>>case the beeping came out of a video camera that was turned off,
>>while a dark triangle was flying over the witness's house.

>>Several other cases have cropped up in my research that involve
>>beeps and the tape is very good for comparison purposes. The
>>question is whether the beeps are what you hear both external to
>>yourself and internally as some experiencers have at times
>>reported. Maybe we can communicate further about this.

Hi Bill,

You write:

>I was afraid someone was going to ask to hear the tape I have
>because it is buried in a box in my garage, but now is the time
>for me to hunt it up. I also have a friend in Sacramento who
>may have a copy of this same tape. Ideally I could record the
>tape onto an audio file and place it on my website so I could
>just direct people to listen to it.

Great! And thank you. Please post the URL when the page is up.
I'll let you know if it sounds 'familiar' or like a 'Pickle ad!'
<LOL>

>The beeps Brian has heard usually seem to originate from a BOL
>(ball of light) or were present when he was in a beam when he
>would fall into a trance.

In a "beam"? (UFO?) Trance? Could you elaborate for the
'squares' a little please?

Regards,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."

www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

John Carpenter Resigns

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 05:12:44 -0500
Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:29:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Evans

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:41:11 -0000
>Subject: Council Proposal
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Richard wrote:

>My logic is that advocates and proponents naturally would seek
>out the strongest cases they could find, and would be happy to
>learn about any they might have missed. Would it be possible to
>build in some compromise way of deciding which cases should go
>to the council?

>In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree
>that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless
>opinion-mongering.

Hello, Richard, all...

For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I find a problem with the above statement on two points:

1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find" when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical evidence that can be examined?

and

2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone else about something that has never been proven to exist, at all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part of "the council".

This isn't "Survivor", you know.

Roger Evans

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:27:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:31:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:15:25 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:12:51 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Yes, a colloquium was held at the Smithsonian Institution in
>Washington, D.C., with both advocates and sceptics/debunkers
>participating. I don't recall the year without digging through
>my files, but think it was the 1980s. Bruce would know, or Jerry
>Clark's wonderfully useful encyclopedia(s) might have the
>information. The recent Rockefeller-sponsored meeting also might
>qualify.

September 1980, I believe.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:28:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:33:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 08:33:39 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:55:52 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>The sequence of events was all but reconstructed by you in the
>>following UFO UpDates postings, quoted as follows:

>>1. A "tremendously bright flash lit up the surfaces of my
>>aircraft".

>>2. He spent, "the next twenty to thirty seconds urgently
>>searching the sky all around".

>>3. There was a further flash.

>>4. He then (some more seconds having elapsed), saw "a formation
>>of very bright objects coming from the vicinity of Mount Baker",
>>which was to the north of Mt. Rainier.

>Brad, Jim, List:

>Thanks, Brad, for the posting on the Skeptics List which refers
>to U.S.G.S. data on pelican sightings, etc. This is data that
>one can get one's teeth into. However, I wonder what the
>situation was 50 years ago? For example, the patterns for
>Canadian geese have changed dramatically in my area of
>Pennsylvania in that time. They are now found year-round and not
>just during and in the directions of migrations.>

This is an interesting point not discussed before. Urbanization
and changes in the weather patterns could affect birds.

However, the mere possibility that there could be some birds in
the area is sufficient to make it mandatory that the potential
explanation be investigated. Since TRue UFOs are an
impossibility (from the point of view of conventional science)
anything which is possible must be investigated. Of course, as I
have pointed out in another message, any conventional
explanation is constrained by conventional physics. Therefore,
even though initially one might consider pelicans as a
possibility, after analysis one might conclude the pelican
explanation doesn't work (is impossible as an explanation; P =
0) for one or more reasons (show me the mylar coated pelicans
and DRAW A MAP!).

>I'm leaning toward Phil Klass's fireball meteor explanation, see
>points #1, 3 & 4, above.

You mean you don't buy pelicans? Tut, tut,. And I suppose you
oppose motherhood and hate apple pie and drive a Ford (instead

of Chevrolet).

Well, anyway, I wouldn't lean very far, if I were you. You might find a tilted stance to be highly unstable, especially if you accept Arnold's claim that the sighting lasted perhaps 2.5 minutes, but certainly more than the 103 seconds Arnold reported as the time to travel from Rainier to Mt. Adams. A meteor would over that distance in 1/10 of the time. And meteors in a nominally level trajectory at an altitude less than 2 miles is "unheard of." (They would slo down,. cool down and not glow anymore... and furthermore, would fall to earth.)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 16 Mar 2001 10:41:47 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:41:39 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:05:26 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

><Masinaigan@aol.com>

>=====

> UFO ROUNDUP
>Volume 6, Number 11
>March 15, 2001
>Editor: Joseph Trainor

><http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

>REPTOID SIGHTED IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

>An alien was sighted on the beach in Rosarito, in Mexico's state
>of Baja California on Wednesday, February 29, 2001 by two
>Mexican policemen.

Is this a mistake? I do not have February 29 on my 2001 calendar
signifying a leap year in an odd-numbered year.

Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

From: skywatcher22@space.com
Date: 16 Mar 2001 11:08:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:43:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hamilton

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 23:18:58 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>Date Wed, 14 Mar 2001 164656 -0500
>>To updates@sympatico.ca
>>From John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject Re Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

<snip>

>>I gather you have photos to back up this claim that a
>>camera lens or the film it contains can "see parts of an
>>event" that our eyes are not sensitive to?

>I have some video of strange zipping objects, some of which are
>the same as Barry Taff captured on daylight video at a CA
>location. Light darts and fast moving fuzz balls for lack of a
>better description.

>One still picture came from a friend in AZ and looks like a
>glowing window in the air. Another picture looks like a stick on
>fire. Nothing was seen at the time.

Question: Was the picture taken by Linda Bradshaw on the
Bradshaw ranch?

-Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Hamilton

From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 16 Mar 2001 11:14:25 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:49:01 -0500
Subject: Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive - Hamilton

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:24:05 -0800

>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:46:10 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 00:32:25 -0500
>>>Subject: THE WATCHDOG - Roswell Exclusive
>>>To: @snipe.prod.itd.earthlink.net
>>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>><snip>

>>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM presents an exclusive interview with UFO X Files
>>>about its claim of having material from the Roswell UFO crash.
>>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/roswellex.html>

>>Hi Royce!

>>After I read your exclusive interview, the name Dr. Russell
>>VernonClark who was with the University of California, San Diego
>>came to my mind. Is Dr. VernonClark the name of the scientist
>>involved with these Roswell UFO crash artifacts? If so, check
>>out the URL below for Dr. VernonClark's initial incredible
>>findings.

>>http://members.tripod.com/~Dr_VernonClark/talk.html

>Thanks for the info and the link. I do remeber this scientist
>and others have mentioned this to me. UFO X Files is not
>releasing any names or other information concerning the alleged
>Roswell debris one way or the other and I have been pressing for
>more info. My initial assumption is that it may not be that same
>piece of material as the informaion I have received is that
>there are 3 to 5 pieces of material. However, I have not been
>able to confirm that information as of yet.

I was in Roswell for the 1997 50th Anniversary event when Derrel
Sims and Dr. Russell VernonClark made their announcement.
Producer Chris Wyatt of UFOxfiles (now) was also part of this
event so it is logical to assume that the artifact given to Sims
in 1995 may be the one or one of many that were examined. Also
Dr. VernonClark did lose his job at UCSD.

Here is the info I received from a confidential source while
checking on this:

"Dr. VernonClark was employed by UCSD until a couple of years
ago (last reference is 24 July 98). He was not on the faculty
but rather a member of the staff employed as an Environmental
Health and Safety officer. He is, however, a Ph.D. chemist who
was probably able to perform the tests he claimed but this was

not his field at the university. Apparently the reason he got into trouble with UCSD was because he may have been less than forthright about his representing the university on his statements regarding his UFO findings... the university apparently knew nothing of what he was doing and disavowed any association.

"I understand he is now employed at UC Riverside as a Laboratory & Research Safety Specialist. Enter his name on the following and he can see his name referenced.

<http://search.ucr.edu/>

I did a search on the current staff/faculty phone directory and his name did not appear, perhaps he no longer works there. (?)

Do a search for his name "VernonClark" on the following UCSD website and you will see that he did a lot of web page writing, but I can find evidence of nothing else.

<http://www-chem.ucsd.edu/swish/SwishSearch.cgi>

This information was gathered from individuals that worked with him and is not "officially" from the university. I am told he is remembered as a very likable person."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:39:35 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:50:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34
>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:28:20 -0000

>Hi,

>Georgina, once again you strive to create friction when the need
>for none exists.

Jenny, I will get back to your marathon post when I have answered
Larry Warren's marathon post.

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

From: **Georgina Bruni** <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:39:38 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:52:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People' -

>Date: 14 Mar 2001 01:35:12 +0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: **Joe McGonagle** <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: Larry Warren On 'You Can't Tell The People'

>Hello Georgina/list,

Joe

>I regret having to play the role of grand inquisitor, but if
>what Larry suggests is not true, then we should be presented
>with the opposing evidence.

You don't have to play the role of inquisitor. I shall respond to Larry's original 21 questions and his ramblings as soon as possible. I have just tonight got back from the country and more pressing things need my attention - so please be patient.

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

The Watchdog - 03-16-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 07:59:42 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

OF INTEREST

REED HOAX RETURNS

For those of you already familiar with this hoax, Jonathan Reed is set to appear once again on Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell tonight.

UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's tall tale

<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

Among having some bogus alien and UFO photos, Reed has lied about having a conversation with Peter Davenport regarding his 'alien in the freezer' story...Why Art Bell claims to support Ufology and then stabs it in the back with a fraud like Reed defies logic...

COMING SOON

UFOWATCHDOG.COM interviews former AFOSI agent Richard Doty...

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 09:00:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:04:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Hatch

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>they would be UFOs.

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO.

Uh, John?

Is that the attitude you believe most people over here have,
that "No further investigation or analysis is needed once its
been determined that the witness saw a UFO" ? -LH

>To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

Sure! From the dimmer lights. Who cares what they think?

>Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

>A lot of people on this list aren't happy when sceptics find it
>"safe to assume" things, so pardon me if I don't find it "safe
>to assume" what Arnold may or may not have been familiar with.

>In another posting today Don Ledger says:

>>No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact
>>that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import.
>>The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all

>>you need to know.

<snip>

>Again the assumption is that Arnold (and by implication any
>other witness) as "the man on the scene" is giving a full and
>accurate (sp) account of everything that happened when they had their
>'UFO' experience. Any estimates of distance or speed cannot be
>challenged; 'math' based on estimates made on the hoof in rushed
>circumstances and based on fragmentary observations are not open
>to reassessment. After all they have been 'proven' to be UFOs.

>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which
>makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests,
>is feasible in current (sp) circumstances. If a re-investigation of
>the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters,
>can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened
>without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a
>mundane explanation.

>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>inconclusively.

>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of
>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>than UFOs.

Hello John:

I must really be missing something here. I have always
assumed, presumed, (whatever) that UFO was simply the
abbreviation for Unidentified Flying Object, period.

This is the first hint I have ever heard in my life that there
is any difference whatsoever, except a modest savings in time,
ink and bandwidth .. the very purpose of commonly agreed-upon
abbreviations like UFO/UFOs.

If there is some difference between UFOs and Unidentified Flying
Objects (capitalization issues aside) please let me know what it
is.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

PS: I wish I could lift a pint with you and discuss these
matters in greater, uh, depth. [burp!]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:12:19 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:05:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Hatch

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ladies & Gents:

>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

>Evidence of OI/NHI?

Hi Bob!

I enjoyed the article. So, its raining terdlets in Utah. I'm hardly surprised. Did you know there are only two or three liquor stores in the entire south end of that very arid desert state? I looked all that up once, just in case.

Odd as it may sound, I wonder if they don't have twisters in Utah sometimes. Not your full blown Kansas tornado mind you, but something greater than a dust devil.

I have a case listed here of a dirt-sucking tube-tornado which came down from some UFO (supposedly) which was pulling up all sorts of dust, sand and what have you.

Sevier County is about as close to the geographical center of Utah as one might get .. maybe Sanpete County takes that prize. My tube-tornado-UFO was near Pelican Lake in Uintah County however, maybe 125 miles NE of the Richland,UT terdlet affair .. and 33 years earlier.

If they do have mini-tornados, one might have passed over a cow pasture or sheep range. That's my armchair theory for various frog falls, fish from heaven and similar forteana. I'm sure no twister ever wrecked a brewery in Utah, not that it would much matter.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:25:43 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:08:25 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Hatch

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:52:15 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin

>>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>>Alien Baloney

>>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyyn Campbell

><snip>

>I agree with the bulk of what was said here. I am completely
>outraged to learn that in spite of the fact that none of the
>surgical procedures performed thus far has turned up any hard
>evidence, Doc Lier has over 100 surgeries scheduled.

>Isn't there a medical review board in the State of California?
>Are they -all- on vacation? Maybe the whole review Board died!
>Somebody ought to tell em.

>I hope it all gets stopped before another person is cut. I've
>been pissed at both Sims and Leir since 1995.

Hello John V:

I'm sure there is some sort of review board or whatever for foot
doctors, but they are probably overloaded with infected toenail
cases and such.

Leir and company don't quite fit this regulatory model, and
may have 'slipped between the cracks' so to speak.

I'm only armchair guessing at this point, having no expertise in
such matters. But, I would posit that there are so many horny
hot-tub head-doctors under review in this balmy state, that
regulators have little time for foot doctors claiming removal of
metallic space alien shards and splinters from the feet of our
august, forthright and sober population.

[burp!]

If people have certain doubts about abduction matters, you might
at least credit the likes of Leir and Sims for clouding matters
beyond recognition.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[This space intentionally blank.]

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:53:26 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:11:13 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:54:29 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>Dear Colleagues,

>I am happy to announce that Larry Hatch has won the Lost Haven
>book quiz.

>The question was: What was the Medieval date that the Citizens
>of the Swiss town of Basel described seeing strange globes in
>the sky?

>The Answer: 07 August, 1566,

>Larry will be receiving his book prize in due course.

>To answer the new quiz question go to:

><http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

Dear Colleagues:

Maybe you should wait for me to examine the prize from the first
contest, before you send in your nominations for the second
prize.

I once swiped a live tarantula from my dad's science classroom.
I put this lovely arachnid into a gaily decorated box and left
it on the doorstep of the only registered democrats on this
block of Jeter Street, in Redwood City, California.

That was almost 50 years ago, and I remain virtually unforgiven
to this very day.

I'm sure Roy would never stoop to such shenanigans, [even
though I once did] but I would examine any actual prize for
hoof-and-mouth or mad-cow disease.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

PS: I once received a nice book about "Candle Magic" from
France. It was simply wretched of course, and entirely in
English, facilitating my instant nausea.

What saved the day were the \$60 in USA banknotes tucked into the
pages, plus a little note. The sender wanted a copy of my
database, and was not about to pay the idiotic charges (50 FF or
more!) for an international money order.

Vive le difference. -LH

= = = = = = =

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 13:02:31 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:12:49 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hatch

>Date: 16 Mar 2001 10:41:47 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:05:26 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>>Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>>Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

>><Masinaigan@aol.com>
>>=====

>> UFO ROUNDUP
>>Volume 6, Number 11
>>March 15, 2001
>>Editor: Joseph Trainor

>><http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

>>REPTOID SIGHTED IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

>>An alien was sighted on the beach in Rosarito, in Mexico's state
>>of Baja California on Wednesday, February 29, 2001 by two
>>Mexican policemen.

>Is this a mistake? I do not have February 29 on my 2001 calendar
>signifying a leap year in an odd-numbered year.

Hello Bill:

I have something even better.

Please write to me offlist.

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:44:20 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:34:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

Now that's a spicy meataball.... Thank you.

<snip>

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth. Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

Oh come on, Josh. Enough already about the freaking pelicans and
the geese and the ducks and the schmucks. Investigation and
analysis are two things, but continuing to beat the dead horse
of flying pelicans, quite another. No one shall accomplish
anything with a continuance of posturing and postulating
theories when they've been postured and postulated to tears!.
Pity us.

>A lot of people on this list aren't happy when sceptics find
>it "safe to assume" things, so pardon me if I don't find it
>"safe to assume" what Arnold may or may not have been familiar
>with.

One may manage assumptions up the ying yang, but there must be
some resolution, some direction, something positive to
contribute to the problem. Nothing is revealed by a continuation
of Pelican theories. If I'm lyin, I'm dyin'.

>In another posting today Don Ledger says:

>>No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact
>>that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import.
>>The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all
>>you need to know. The objects were stated by Arnold as too fast
>>and too far away to be birds. He did the math. If birds, then

>>their very size would make them too small to resolve on the
>>retina at that distance. You are making presumptions unsupported
>>by any facts.

>Again the assumption is that Arnold (and by implication any
>other witness) as "the man on the scene" is giving a full and
>accurate account of everything that happened when they had their
>'UFO' experience. Any estimates of distance or speed cannot be
>challenged; 'math' based on estimates made on the hoof in rushed
>circumstances and based on fragmentary observations are not open
>to reassessment. After all they have been 'proven' to be UFOs.

>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which
>makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests,
>is feasible in current circumstances. If a re-investigation of
>the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters,
>can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened
>without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a
>mundane explanation.

>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>inconclusively.

>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of
>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>than UFOs.

Uh, there is one thing else you need to know. UFO's, (Arnold's)
are not likely pelicans. Having shouted that (EBK doesn't like
yelling) if I hear one more pelican turd dropping, I shall give
up Gripple for life. (SICK) As I like to say.

And deny I ever said that. I was on Gripple at the time.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 23:02:58 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:43:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:53:08 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:04:05 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

<snip>

>>>List, interested parties,

>>>>What interests me right now is whether it can be
>>>>demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds'
>>>>phenomenon were published in the UFO literature
>>>>prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be
>>>>forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find
>>>>evidence of it?".)

<snip>

>Hello Gary,

>You wrote:

>>Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses absorb
>>published material and regurgitate it in their stories or
>>hypnosis.

>Geez, is this what this is all about for you? To revert back
>to expressions of my youth, "What a bring down and a stone cold
>bummer man!"

>John Velez,

>Disappointed (but not surprised. Been dere, don dat.)

Hi John,

Actually, it was me who wrote that.

In fact, you inspired me to write it when you said

"I have tried(to no avail)to keep myself as "unpolluted" by the

reports of others as I could. Because of the nature of my involvement that has been impossible." (March 14th)

But let's not fight, life's too long.

Chris, the Bringer of Stone Cold Downy Bums

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 23:05:38 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:45:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Mortellaro

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ladies & Gents:

>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

>Evidence of OI/NHI?

>Very Clear Skies,

>Bob Young

Dear Young Bob, and all the little bListers, and of course, EBK,

I knew it. All along, I been wondering where that waist, waste, sorry, from our Fresh Wine Plant number six, nearby Salt Lake, was going. It happened when the slop waste bucket blew. Every so often this occurs due to the build-up of gases from our newest product, Pelican Poop Gripple N' Cream. The cream mizes with the guano and other assorted critters which are imported from the streets of Canal and like the famed "Spice Blow" on Dune, it sort of just ... well, it blows. And there's poop all over the place.

This time it was a really big blow. Not unlike some of the posts we read here on UpDates.

Anyway, we here at the fast sillity are real sorry this happened. We've installed a special Poop Valve, designed by our staph of engineers, which will absorb the poop.

And, we are offering this special calve to Errol Bruce-Knapp for use on UpDates, if he chooses. We will, of course, give it to Errol. But we will sell it to you, you listers, you. And, we might (if coerced) give it to some others of you. But you must grovel.

Thank you for using Gripple and it's byproducts (soap, mustard, papier de toilette and other important stuff).

Mortellaro,

Prince of the abductees. I'm working on me portfolio.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 01:09:19 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:50:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>they would be UFOs.

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth. Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

You can bet your sweet asperations he knew John. I've seen a lot of harebrained nonsense spouted about a man who flew three thousand hours in a light aircraft without the type of sophisticated instruments we rely on today. Amnd without a radio. I read where maybe Arnold probably wasn't sure where he was exactly when the opposite is true-he probably knew down to a mile his exact position and when you are in the air at 5-10,000 feet a mile is under your wing and in close. Even at a thousand feet AGL a mile ahead is just on the nose of your aircraft.

Is it your idea that Arnold decided to fly to Yakima and just sort of flew that-a-way hoping he would bump into it? No he would use charts, land marks, checking his speed against ground checkpoints and a line on a 1/500k chart, marked off in 10 mile increments. He'd measure off his progress with an accurate stopwatch and his instrument panel clock to get his ground speed. Check point after checkpoint he made his way through the mountains in a timely fashion so that he would know whether he was in a tail wind, cross wind, or a head wind. The last two force you to use up more fuel which is always in limited supply.

Apparently there was none that day because Arnold mentioned it was one of those days that it was a joy to fly. Thick cold stable air. The kind that does not produce updrafts, thermals and temperature inversion. If you check you will see that temperature inversions are created at low altitudes and not over mountains so there go your "mirages".

Arnold flew this area all of the time and as an experienced pilot he would know the type of birds that fly in an area he was used to flying. When he first started to fly there he would have asked questions about what he was likely to encounter in the mountain areas and would have learned about the habits and types of birds flying there.

All of us VFR pilots do that.

A few days ago Jim Klotz posted a response from a wildlife officer in that area of Washington state shooting down the possibility of pelicans being in that area. He suggested Snow Geese.

With my old eyes I can resolve a full grown American Bald Eagle at about 1,000 yards in the air. A really good pair of eyes could probably add 1,00 feet to that making it about 4/5ths of a mile. If they wing over they are more visible. I know this because there is a nest of them to the west of the airfield I fly out of. There have been at least three of them present for 8 years now.

They are big. Easily seen once you are about 1,500 feet from them then you are banking away to avoid hitting them OR the possibility of them veering into your line of flight.

I can lose a Cessna 172 [36'wingspan by 23'length] at about two miles in Summer air flying away from me. Maybe three if its cold and the air is stable. If it's 90 degrees to my course maybe 4 miles. I can see the wings of a sailplane [50 plus feet] if its winging over from about 6 miles back from our airport if the sun reflects off of it or more likely because it darkens not lightens against the sky.

If a flight of birds [pelicans] flew across my line of flight at say 3,500 feet in front of me between two points fifty miles apart they would be getting tangled up in my prop and coming through the windshield before they could make it across the distance. I'd be on them in 20 seconds at a cruise of 115 mph. Arnold cruised at 105-110 mph.

>A lot of people on this list aren't happy when sceptics find it >"safe to assume" things, so pardon me if I don't find it "safe >to assume" what Arnold may or may not have been familiar with.

>In another posting today Don Ledger says:

>No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact >that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import. >The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all >you need to know. The objects were stated by Arnold as too fast >and too far away to be birds. He did the math. If birds, then >their very size would make them too small to resolve on the >retina at that distance. You are making presumptions unsupported >by any facts.

>Again the assumption is that Arnold (and by implication any >other witness) as "the man on the scene" is giving a full and >accurate account of everything that happened when they had their >'UFO' experience. Any estimates of distance or speed cannot be >challenged; 'math' based on estimates made on the hoof in rushed >circumstances and based on fragmentary observations are not open >to reassessment. After all they have been 'proven' to be UFOs.

And I suggest to you that Arnold had more skills on hand that day than many on this list. Where does it say he made an estimate of the distance. If he knew where he was-and he did- a glance at the chart would give him a pretty good idea of how far away he was from those mountains.

>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which >makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests,

>is feasible in curent circumstances. If a re-investigation of
>the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters,
>can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened
>without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a
>mundane explanation.

Your attitude is - Arnold was a bumbling fool with no skills
whatsoever because if he did have skills your silly pelican or
snow geese thories fall flat. And that's the only reason why so
many debunkers - I guess including you-try to shoot him down.
The fact is he did have the skills to determine the distance
accurately, the speeds accurately and the shapes accurately, the
experience to discard the likelihood of what he saw were birds.

He was on the spot and many of the armchair wonders I've seen
attempt to discredit his sighting just don't have the skills to
dispute it. That's the long and the short of it John. Some of it
comes off looking pretty stupid-even for a Colonial.

Your observation skills aren't too sharp there John. You still
haven't tumbled to the fact that both Dave and I are Canadians.

>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>inconclusively.

>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
'conclusively'.

Second law of debunking. Find a small flaw in your opponent
arguement - like Dave spelling a word wrong-and that makes him
the fool eh. Note the Canadian eh. Just so you don't get
confused.

>Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of too many
>ufologists:

What-debunkers don't have attitudes?

>unidentified flying objects _are_ UFOs -
that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
but I think it _does_ matter, and in many cases unidentified
flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
than UFOs.

Except the ones that cannot. Like the Arnold sighting.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 01:20:08 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:03:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ladies & Gents:

>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

>Evidence of OI/NHI?

Hi Bob,

Talk about being shat upon.

More likely strong [in more than one sense of the word]
updrafts. Or a mini-tornado sucking up manure?

>Very Clear Skies, Bob Young

Apparently not.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Cydonian Imperative: 3-17-01

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 22:55:49 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:05:09 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative: 3-17-01

3-17-01
The Cydonian Imperative

Shape-from-Shading Offers Perspective View of "Glass Tunnel"

by Mac Tonnies and Chris Joseph

For linked, illustrated version:

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

IMAGE

The "glass tunnel" seen by the Mars Global Surveyor.

IMAGE

Preliminary stereoscopic rendering of the "glass tunnel" by Chris Joseph. Relax eyes; images will fuse to provide three-dimensional relief.

Correspondent Chris Joseph is undertaking a closer look at the Martian "tubes," partly in an attempt to demonstrate whether or not they are convex or concave features. It's likely impossible to determine if these features are artificial based on images taken from orbit. Martian geology has posed the planetary community with many unexpected oddities, from the "Swiss cheese" polar landscape to the "bubble-wrap" terrain identified by Efrain Palermo. Are we looking at yet more exotic Martian real-estate? Or are the "tubes" the remains of an alien infrastructure?

"This was so incredibly easy to do," writes Joseph of producing the stereoscopic image. "If not for the lack of better sample data, all I seem to be missing is proper calibration."

Even more accurate results are expected as the shape-from-shading software is fine-tuned. Also desirable is additional imagery of this puzzling formation by Malin Space Science Systems/JPL, which would allow for better representations of elevation. The technique used to enhance the "glass tunnel" is identical to that used to produce the graphic on the previous page (shown below).

IMAGE

The new stereogram was produced using the same algorithm used to produce this rendering. (Surface coloration is purely artistic.)

As noted, the elevation of the ridges seen above (whatever they might be) appears wholly in keeping with what can be discerned from the much more dune-like examples of "tube" terrain. Even taking possible minor elevation discrepancies into account, Joseph's new image appears to very accurately reflect the features under investigation.

A brief hunt through the MGS data shows that the impression of

actual three-dimensional "tubes" is the exception rather than the rule, with most of the anomalous formations falling under the "tube" or "tunnel" label resembling the irregular bright stripes below.

IMAGE

Proponents of artificiality claim that the less-impressive nature of features associated with the "glass tunnel" are merely highly damaged and eroded segments. The "squiggles" to the far left of this image are especially difficult to reconcile with a structural origin.

So what are we looking at? The bright features to the far left of the stereogram appear to be descending the ravine wall, a trait not at all in keeping with the notion that these are "tubes" (decomposed or not), while the mysterious segment boasting the so-called "reflective sphere" is clearly seen poking up out of the ravine. By emerging from the shadows, it catches sunlight in a way that provides the illusion of a bright object "plugging" the alleged "tube" when seen in an overhead context.

There appears to be little doubt that the Martian "tunnels" are three-dimensional features. But seen from Joseph's revealing angle, they appear markedly less cylindrical. They're certainly not "dunes" in any recognizable usage of the term. But while an exotic explanation is most likely in order, the jump to "artificiality" is, in my own opinion, unwarranted pending future insights.

Mars, extraterrestrial ruins or not, has proven itself to be a bizarre planet with a plethora of geological mysteries. Joseph and I agree that this is a legitimate scientific puzzle with no clear answer, and present this ongoing photogrammetric analysis in the intention of democratizing the discovery process: "There comes a time when 'science' needs to be taken away from the scientists, and is given to everyone," Joseph says. "Information wants to be free."

It is our hope to provide objective coverage of this controversy until an answer--be it geological or archaeological--becomes available.

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

-end-

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 02:40:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:07:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Velez

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>they would be UFOs.

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth. Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?

Arrrrghhh!

John, does the word "redundant" hold any meaning for you at all?

Just last week, (for the umpteenth time,) you published another whopping 26 page e-mail treatise on your Pelican theory. I won't even deal with your 'one per post' insults about the gullibility of Americans. But wait a minute, have you recently made a substantial monetary investment in a Pelican guano concern? You sly devil you! It would go a long way towards explaining your obsession with the bird. ;)

Please John, enough already. Pelicans, gotcha. Americans are gullible/dumb. Arnold saw birds. You can't stand Jerry. Roger rover, read you loud and clear, 10/4, over and out. I'm all Pelican'd out. You have single-handedly ruined my enjoyment of the bird. I now retch convulsively and I experience reverse peristalsis at the mere mention of the word Pelican. Every time I see an image of one in print or wherever, I now think of you.

Can I sue you for that?

Regards ,

John Velez ,

(speaking Pelican strictly Pelican for Pelican myself Pelican)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:09:18 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>they would be UFOs.

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

You seem to be referring to "investigation or analysis" only in the sense of eliminating IFO's and other conventional explanations (I will use "IFO" as shorthand for all conventional explanations). Hynek would say that once the IFO-type screening was done that was when the investigation began, scientific investigation to learn more about the UFO phenomenon.

>Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness:

This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynek strenuously objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do" chapter 12 in *The UFO Experience*, 1972). Hynek objected that Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter definition of a case in which a scientifically competent investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms. Condon's definition swamps the core UFO cases in masses of less important or time-wasting IFO cases. The Condon Committee could have made a valuable study of IFO's, something like what Allan Hendry did in his *UFO Handbook*, so that we would have a control study against which to compare the UFO's among other things, but didn't.

This myth also derives from the journalistic mindset in which the focus of a story is whatever the newsmaker says it is,

rather than what it "really" is after an in-depth investigation. This is abused by both sides of the UFO question. Pro-UFO types often hold up witnesses as gods whose every last word and syllable is unquestionable sacred text and woe betide anyone who should question any of it. Anti-UFO types take the opposite extreme and deem the entire case discredited if even a single infallible statement of a witness can be challenged, i.e., is shown to be fallible. These are extremes. The reasonable scientific course is in the middle and is supported by numerous studies in cognitive psychology: Witnesses do generally report accurately but most often report inaccurately on items of information they cannot possibly observe (usually size or distance) and often they are improperly prompted or even pressed to do so by the investigator. As someone recently pointed out, we know witnesses generally are accurate otherwise we not be able to explain so many cases as IFO's etc.

>as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

Again, Hynek would object that the witness is not supposed to serve as the scientist on his own case. What is most relevant and useful are Arnold's sighting data. True, some of it is conflicting but not all of it and the conflicts can be rationally discussed. Arnold's experience in having flown more than 4,000 hours as a mountain pilot as of June 1947 does count for something, it's not completely worthless nor is it completely probative. It's a factor to be given some weight and to be rationally discussed.

As a matter of fact, Arnold almost certainly was familiar with American White Pelicans as he overflew the SE Washington/N Oregon lake habitats of the AWP's many times in his plane, including on his return flight from his famous sighting in June 1947. He would have had no reason to comment upon it any more than he would have had to do so for the many other species of birds in the area -- until Easton splashed the Pelican Brief all over the Internet in 1999. Of course Arnold was deceased fifteen years by then.

>A lot of people on this list aren't happy when sceptics find it
>"safe to assume" things, so pardon me if I don't find it "safe
>to assume" what Arnold may or may not have been familiar with.

>In another posting today Don Ledger says:

>>No, you need to know distance, speed, reflectivity and the fact
>>that Arnold discarded Snow Geese or any bird to be of import.
>>The fact that he discarded them - the man on the scene - is all
>>you need to know. The objects were stated by Arnold as too fast
>>and too far away to be birds. He did the math. If birds, then
>>their very size would make them too small to resolve on the
>>retina at that distance. You are making presumptions unsupported
>>by any facts.

>Again the assumption is that Arnold (and by implication any
>other witness) as "the man on the scene" is giving a full and
>accurate account of everything that happened when they had their
>'UFO' experience. Any estimates of distance or speed cannot be
>challenged; 'math' based on estimates made on the hoof in rushed
>circumstances and based on fragmentary observations are not open
>to reassessment. After all they have been 'proven' to be UFOs.

Wait a minute. Arnold did more than just "estimate," as Don Ledger was trying to get at. He took measurements in real time -- something almost no other witness in UFO history has ever done. He may have made mistakes, that's something to discuss, but let's not ignore the fact that he had sufficient presence of mind while the sighting was under way to clock the objects' movement, count them, and to measure their angular size with a cowl tool -- something I'd only expect an astronomer even to think of. Arnold should be given considerable credit for his thoughtfulness in making these real-time measurements and observations. That doesn't make him infallible or worthless as an observer, but his presence of mind and care should be acknowledged. I am the first to argue that certain of Arnold's conflicting accounts of certain details can be resolved by

analyzing what was physically possible or impossible for him to have observed -- based on his other data which are not in conflict. Thus, parts of his observational database can be applied to the analysis of other parts to see how well they mesh or don't. No human witness can be expected to be 100% accurate and no scientific measurement is 100% accurate.

>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which >makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests, >is feasible in current circumstances. If a re-investigation of >the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters, >can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened >without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a >mundane explanation.

I do have concerns about the response to the re-opening of the Arnold case -- but not as to the pelican theory which contradicts almost every measurement and observational detail, but as to the daytime meteor fireball explanation which merits serious consideration.

>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials >>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven >>inconclusively.

>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be >'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of >too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs - >that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry, >but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified >flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other >than UFOs.

I agree but I think it should also be pointed out that by the same token many IFO cases can be proven to be UFO's. It is not a one-way street that inexorably leads only to the explanation of UFO's as conventional phenomena. McDonald salvaged many improperly dismissed IFO cases out of the Blue Book files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:11:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:06:55 -0000
>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:19:38 -0500
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>All true, Bruce. I don't dispute what you say in the least and it
>will - indeed - prevent us from ever proving UFO reality, I
>suspect.

>But that should not be what this experiment is designed to do.
>Our aim is not to find cases that have 'no possibility' other
>than the ETH (or even no possible but UFO reality) since that's
>never going to happen.

>This venture was suggested as a test of the plausibility of the
>ETH as a credible scientific hypothesis. To establish this we do
>not need to all agree on whether case 'A' might be a pelican, a
>policeman's hat or a pot plant. Or even that we - personally -
>think that is the most likely answer for this incident. Or for
>any of us to be convinced the ETH is true.

>We only need to agree that the ETH is a credible interpretation
>of the data for a specific case / or set of cases.

>This is a less onerous task but would establish the basic
>requirement of the project - the credibility of the ETH as a
>working hypothesis. We might all say - well of course we know
>that already. But the point is that many out there who shun
>Ufology do not accept it at all. That's why this experiment
>should aim to persuade them of the viability of the solution
>rather than to prove the reality of it.

>This project is never going to win over most Ufologists who
>dispute the TH - let alone convert skeptical scientists. But it
>isn't meant to do so. Only to really set out several things.

>(1) An agreed data base of cases that pro ETH Ufologists can use
>to argue as the basis for their support of that possible
>interpretation of the evidence.

>(For example, the Arnold case is not broadly accepted as being a
>flock of pelicans, whether it turns out to be one in the end, or
>not. But it is also very unlikely to be broadly considered as a
>case that one would credibly argue as offering strong support
>for the ETH as the primary resolution - so agreement in
>principle here even between disparate viewpoints is likely to be
>easier than you might expect since many will share a mutual set
>of conclusions about it)

>(2) A set of data we can put forward to science as offering a
>basic case that the ETH 'might' be a credible way to interpret

>UFO data. Not that it 'does' resolve the data in this way. That
>isn't necessary. Remember the project is intended to argue only
>the credibility of the ETH as a feasible resolution that science
>should consider more seriously because this experiment has
>demonstrated its viability in the face of the agreed evidence.

>I am - for example - open minded with regards the acceptance of
>the ETH. I am not certain whether any cases do exist out there
>that would strongly affirm it as the certain answer. But I do
>expect there will be cases where I could agree that we do not
>currently have an adequate explanation in terms of hoax or
>imperception and where therefore the ETH offers a truly
>credible interpretation of that case.

>As such I could find myself persuaded by the experiment - not
>that the ETH is proven - but probably that it is a reasonable,
>scientific hypothesis that we can agree does match sufficient
>evidence to be regarded as a viable possibility by fair minded
>people.

>That's 'all' we should set out to do and that is a worthwhile and
>an achievable objective in of itself.

Hi Bruce, Jenny, Dick & List,

I would like to propose a very simple concept that will cut
through a lot of the hassle and red tape in the selection of UFO
cases to support ETH:

It seems to me that the kind of case that most impresses people
as indicative of spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere are
Daylight Disc cases (DD's - Hynek Classification) involving
metallic-appearing objects. The cases should be long enough in
duration (say 1 minute or longer) and large enough in apparent
size (at least Full Moon or so) so that enough detail can be
observed to enable competent investigation eliminating IFO's
etc. Hynek's rule requiring multiple witnesses should be
included in the screening criteria, and date, time and location
must be known.

These would be general rules not absolute ironclad ones but
exceptions would have to be cogently argued; instrumentation
cases for instance might be a very general exception to these
rules. Nevertheless the general rule would basically exclude all
Nocturnal Light cases and daytime incidents involving objects
that are not metallic-appearing, which are white or luminous
etc. These latter cases may be very powerful evidence for an
unexplained natural phenomenon and ought to be of great interest
to science, but our focus is on the ETH. Most abduction cases
would be excluded as well right at the outset for lack of
multiple witnesses, dates, locations, even metallicity.

Sure, alien civilizations do not have to use metal but the fact
is that many DD cases involve apparently metallic craft and that
seems to be very seemingly indicative of alien technology of
some sort, more so than just luminous phenomena however
seemingly structured. No, metallicity is not conclusive proof of
alien technology either, but it seems to be a stronger
indication than many others and it is a very simple criterion to
apply. If we're focusing on the strongest evidence of ETH we
should leave behind the weaker evidence even if it is
substantial, as that will help us to avoid a lot of interminable
argument.

I have not seen explanations (maybe I missed them) of what the
role of the Skeptics group would be in this council proposal.
Surely they would not be expected to agree that a set of UFO
cases is strong evidence for ETH. I must assume then that the
Skeptics would be able to agree with the others on what UFO
cases would be the strongest and most convincing evidence for
ETH with the proviso that they do not actually think that these
cases at all prove ETH.

I would also like to put in a plug for consideration of Daylight
Disc cases among the Blue Book Unknowns as well as the many
cases rescued from IFO oblivion by McDonald and others from BB
files, etc., including one by the famed aircraft designer
Clarence "Kelly" Johnson who built the U-2 and SR-71. Sightings
by someone of Johnson's caliber are in an entirely different
league than those by say run-of-the-mill airline pilots, however

meritorious, and deserve special consideration. Another example would be mathematician-meteoriticist Lincoln LaPaz whose observational and investigative skills put him in a class by itself and well above the vast majority of the best UFO cases, in effect having the world's best visual observer/investigator as a UFO witness.

Ufologists remain largely unaware of and unconversant with the vast majority of BB Unknowns even after nearly 30 years in which the files have been available (I know a few Ufologists have immersed themselves in the BB Unknowns and they are excluded from this generalization). The situation is so bad that entire controversies have raged for many years on subjects such as Battelle physicist Howard Cross and his so-called "Pentacle Memo" without any realization that Cross is a personal eyewitness in a Blue Book Unknown UFO case, a Daylight Disc on Oct 2, 1951, and surely this affected his whole stance on the subject of UFOs and perhaps the extent of Battelle's involvement with UFOs.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 17](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:13:54 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:41:11 -0000
>>Subject: Council Proposal
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Previously, Richard wrote:

>>My logic is that advocates and proponents naturally would seek
>>out the strongest cases they could find, and would be happy to
>>learn about any they might have missed. Would it be possible to
>>build in some compromise way of deciding which cases should go
>>to the council?

>>In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree
>>that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless
>>opinion-mongering.

>For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET
>visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I
>find a problem with the above statement on two points:

>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>evidence that can be examined?

Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

>and

>2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions
>of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>of "the council".

If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

I see nothing "elitist" about valuing their recommendations
higher than those of John or Jane Doe. I definitely do not agree
that just anyone's opinion in the UFO field is equally valid
with everyone else's, and I have argued that point strongly over
the years. Do you think every self-styled financial adviser or

medical expert's opinion is equally valid? I don't. Some are quacks or incompetents. People with demonstrated standards and principles are needed, as Josh G. observed.

>This isn't "Survivor", you know.

Well, at my age I'm beginning to think it is Survivor.

- Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 06:17:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:19:02 -0500
Subject: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

SOURCE: La Estrella del Loa (newspaper)
DATE: Saturday, March 17, 2001.

U.S. RESEARCH CENTER DISCLOSES INFORMATION ON CHUPACABRAS

Whether myth or reality, the Calama Chupacabras case has marked an era in the city's history and furthermore, disrupted the routine of an entire country which for a brief moment gave serious thought to the possibility of the unknown.

Today, a year after the zoological and sociological phenomenon that prompted civilian and police authorities to wave white flags in El Loa Province, there is new and incredible information coming out, only that this time it doesn't come from private ufologists or isolated witnesses, but from the president and director of the Miami UFO Center, Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo, who wrote the Estrella del Loa from the U.S. to recount the latest information regarding the alleged creature's manifestations in Chile.

According to the expert, tomorrow--Sunday, March 18, 2001--marks one year since the residents of Calama began reporting the massive deaths of their domestic and farm animals, an enigma which has not yet been resolved.

In his essay, this man notes that there are more than 105 sites attacked throughout the national territory, including cities, towns, villages, homesteads, inlets, mines, sectors and valleys, among others. However, he notes that the largest amount has been recorded in "Calama and its vicinity".

He notes that since the genesis of these apparitions, the Calama UFO Center, directed by researcher Jaime Ferrer, has been in operation. Ferrer is in charge of processing reports and securing physical evidence.

*** The Hair Sample ***

He notes that on this anniversary date, the MUC received its first report from a U.S. lab regarding the hair samples removed from a cat exsanguinated in the town of Maria Elena. The document assures that "the samples correspond to an unknown mammal, and no DNA analysis is possible because there isn't a sequenced genetic material study in all of the animals."

He adds that there only exist specific data on a mouse, yeast and a protozoon, and adds that human DNA research has only reached advanced study after many years. He also discards the study of comparative samples commonly applied in criminological practices.

It is clear, he says, that the hairs correspond to a supposedly unknown mammal and adds that reports on hairs and fecal matter from European labs are still pending.

The studies also detect great similarities between plaster casts of Chilean footprints and the ones obtained in both Miami and Spain--samples which show a strange bipedal being with an odd gait. "At first we thought that these entities only had the

purpose of sucking their victim's blood. However, we've discovered that it attacks humans psychosomatically, a situation which opens a new angle we are trying to explain."

The MUC believes that the alleged species is accustomed to the climate and environment of the Atacama Desert, for which reason it undertook a study regarding the climatological and physiological adaptation of these beings. The MUC adds that this research is not sponsored by governmental or private entities, and is conducted under terms of strict confidentiality and pure friendship.

#####

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Gloria R. Coluchi

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Best Case Standards

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:12:23 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:20:29 -0500
Subject: Best Case Standards

Owing to the skepticism about alleged "elitism" in ufology (I've heard this before many times), I wish to elaborate my ideas about what constitutes a "strong case." First, everyone should be able to agree that we should try to present the cream of the crop to science, and that scoffers or sceptics should desire to have us make our strongest case.

The following are among the more important elements that should be factored into the selection process (not that all the elements should necessarily be present in every case):

- (1) Multiple independent witnesses; elementary (at least) character information about them, and evidence of their observing skills.
- (2) Proximity information based on angular size, environmental effects, and/or observed passage in front of known landmarks.
- (3) Geometrical shape and/or structure visible; body lights; protrusions; "portholes"; light beams; etc.
- (4) One or more forms of physical evidence (radar, ground traces, E-M effects, heat...)
- (5) Onsite investigation and reconstruction; thorough witness interrogations; thorough investigation of any possible mundane explanations.

...

No one who has cases of this type should be disallowed from presenting them to the Council. However, the more experienced investigators could easily come up with many dozens if not hundreds of "strong cases" by this definition. Maybe the formation of a screening committee to decide which cases meet a certain set of criteria would help to resolve our disagreements.

- Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01

From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:24:20 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>UFOWATCHDOG.COM
>"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
><http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

>*'OF INTEREST*'

>REED HOAX RETURNS

>For those of you already familiar with this hoax, Jonathan Reed
>is set to appear once again on Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell
>tonight.

>UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and
>they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's
>tall tale

><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

>Among having some bogus alien and UFO photos, Reed has lied
>about having a conversation with Peter Davenport regarding his
>'alien in the freezer' story...Why Art Bell claims to support
>Ufology and then stabs it in the back with a fraud like Reed
>defies logic...

I wrote a recent paper regarding a justification for general
conspiracy based on the for profit actions of the stealth
psychopath.

<http://www.worldwiderenaissance.org/psycho.html>

Perhaps a knife in the back of Ufology is not the illogic it
appears. There are all sorts of profit. There are all sorts of
reasons to have an apparent red herring on a syndicated radio
show, neither of which is at the root and are peripheral issues.
A mainstream look at the monstrous amount of data pervading the
honest record is regarded with reflexive enmity by that
mainstream.

Why is that?!

The reasons for mainstream dismissal of the ufological are not
validated by lack of data (there's plenty), the disrespected
interest of a, so called, New Age community (People want
explanation, and it's a new age after all), or a regretted
retreat from traditional scientific 'values' (which only serve
selected interests). A preponderance of evidence that is
historic, photographic, physical, anecdotal, and personal
dictates a wide aperture ufological interest that demands
intensive mainstream investigation which is not forthcoming.

Again -- Daniel Sheehan seems to have a solid plan for providing
an impetus regarding the mechanism for a quality mainstream

investigation into these perplexing ufological matters. These are matters critical to the sociological, psychological, and physiological health of every living thing on this planet. Mr. Sheehan has had some success in the struggle with assorted Goliaths. I suggest he's tailor made, and has the correct approach for gainful employment in this area. I suggest further, and again, that a measure of his likely success in lancing this ufological boil is how his proposal was so chillingly ignored by the ufological "principals". There are MORE than enough effected individuals to provide for and fund the class-action legal mechanism Sheehan suggests. I remind the reader that Ufology is second in importance only to sex vis a vis habitual users of the internet. This suggests a huge interested base. I think it's worth investigation. There is none.

Regarding UFOWATCHDOG... seems to me that you are, so far, trying to take a balanced alien view on the subject and provide for an energetically evenhanded effort to provide a little more clarity. Thrashing around in the sociopathic's china shop is just what the Doctor ordered, and after my own heart. Just don't be too selective in the sociopaths that you confront and you will have provided a service that has been, and continues to be, very much needed. The stealth sociopath is ubiquitous, everywhere, and on both sides of the ufological fence.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

~~0~~

EXPLORE "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Hostpros URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:14:48 -0700
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:37:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:06:55 -0000

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

Dear Serious Researchers and Other Listers,

Bruce wrote (it was you, wasn't it? They're a lot of >s to follow):

>>OK, let's cut through to the heart of the matter
>>(the Heart of Darkness?)

>>We need at least one case for which everyone agrees

>>1) there is no possibility (probability = $P = 0$) of a hoax
>>2) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a delusion

>>and

>>(the toughest one) 3) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a
>>misidentification

>>Anyone got a case for which they are willing to say 1-3 are
>>>true?

>>(I don't see any hands waving in the air.) Remember, that even
>>if a group of ufologists arrives at such a case the outside world
>>is going to say.."you've got to be wrong, There must be a
>>possibility of either 1, 2, or 3 explaining the case."

Shall we try one more time? How many does this make, Bruce? Even
my doctors can accept the anomaly in my case. They don't want
to, but they do.

What's the problem here on this list?

Is everyone in denial?

What do you need to see...the scar? Come visit. I wear it every day.
The burn(s) went to the bone. They were checked by a burn specialist
MD 2 days after the incident. I got them when I was 13. I'm 55 now.

Get it?

The laser wasn't invented yet. And, I have the memories of how,
when, and where I got the burns, and why there was no pain at
the site of the burns.

Even I wasn't sure what had burned me until 1991, when I was
working in the Civil Engineering Dept at UNM and gave a tour to
a couple of photographers from Los Alamos Labs, and the laser
was turned on in the lab in the basement.

Re: Serious Research

I nearly threw up when I saw the laser. I recognized it immediately. I always wanted to believe it was some manifestation of my mind that had caused the burns (to the bone).

It wasn't.

I'm sure Arnold felt the same way when he saw his 2nd flight of (pelicans?).

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Peterborough

From: Kelly Peterborough <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>

Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:00:11 -0500

Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:43:38 -0500

Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Peterborough

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:52:15 -0500

>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>

>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500

>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin

>>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>>Alien Baloney

>>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyann Campbell

><snip>

>Hi Kelly,

>I agree with the bulk of what was said here. I am completely
>outraged to learn that in spite of the fact that none of the
>surgical procedures performed thus far has turned up any hard
>evidence, Doc Lier has over 100 surgeries scheduled.

>Isn't there a medical review board in the State of California?
>Are they -all- on vacation? Maybe the whole review Board died!
>Somebody ought to tell em.

>I hope it all gets stopped before another person is cut. I've
>been pissed at both Sims and Leir since 1995.

>Regards,

>John "Duck hunter" Velez, "Quack! Quack!!!"

Hi John,

I just posted the article - I don't know about medical boards in California since I am from Canada. However, I would think that if someone had a 'foreign body' so to speak in their body, which was verified by x-ray, cat scan, or MRI then a doctor would be perfectly justified in removing it. That said, I do have a small, hard lump under my tongue (and nope! It's not a piercing!). Years ago, before I heard anything about alien implants I asked my doctor about it and she said not to worry about it as it was a cyst. She said if it ever got sore, or started getting bigger then to see her again. I also asked a ear, throat and nose specialist about it once when I was seeing him for something else, and he said the same thing. I've have it for so long that I only remember it when someone mentions alien implants!

However, if I felt I was an abductee it would more than likely

cross my mind that this cyst was an impant and I would want it removed. And I can't imagine a Canadian doctor who would remove a cyst without good reason. Apparently, they are very common. On the other hand, those doctors of mine that I mentioned were only taking an educated guess, as neither of them X-rayed or could even feel it themselves.

Now, I have never felt that I was an abductee, although I do have Awareness during Sleep Paralysis (ASP) and could probably interpt some 'dreams' as indicative of abduction - in fact, more than a few have spooked me in this regard. I tend to lump most of my weird experiences into the ASP experience, though. I have even heard the beeps that were discussed recently!

On Beeps

Last summer I was working in my office at home one night, and I starting hearing beeps. They were quite distinctive, and I started looking for the source, thinking something was wrong with my computer. But I couldn't figure out where the beeping was coming from. Then it stopped. I didn't think anything of it. Awhile later they started again, and I asked my brother to come into my office and help me find the source. They stopped. Just when he was leaving, they started again and we both searched but couldn't determine where they were coming from. They stopped again. The beeps were not fast but loud with a long pause between them. We both thought it was weird but didn't think anything of it.

Then a few months ago my mother heard beeping in the kitchen and asked me to try and find out where it was coming from. I couldn't. Again, I thought it was weird but didn't think anything of it. (The kitchen and my office are next to each other - however, both times the beeps were clearly only in whatever room they happened in and although I couldn't determine where they were coming from, it was contained to the room. Unlike, I think it was John V. who said they followed he and his wife from room to room.

So, maybe beeping is more common than thought. I find Chris's search for knocking and beeping in literature interesting. I do know one woman from another list who wrote extensively about her experience with knocking - and for her it always was accompanied by the death of someone close to her. These knocks were heard on the *outside* of the house. Beeps seem to be heard inside the house. And Chris, I am sure that in fairylore there are many references to high-pitched sounds and buzzing noises - before the advent of electronic machinery, wouldn't someone who heard a mechanical noise of some type be inclined to describe it this way? So, perhaps people have always heard beeps but didn't have a precise way of describing it. And since there clearly is a difference between a knock and a beep, and since people are still hearing both, maybe it is describing two different types of events. In other words, maybe there is no connection between beeps and knocks if you are proposing that when people used to hear knocks they now hear beeps.

Kelly

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:39:31 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:44:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

<snip>

>I think this sums up the attitude of
>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>than UFOs.

All:

Hear, hear, hear. All the backbenchers are on their feet, over here.

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:52:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:46:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sandow

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth. Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnol was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

Meanwhile, of course, we have Bruce's further analysis --
presented right here, in painstaking detail -- of the Arnold
sighting. Work like this, to anyone familiar with the
literature, is characteristic of the best ufology, American or
otherwise (for American examples, apart from Bruce, think of
Zeidman's work on the Coyne helicopter case, or Brad Sparks on
the RB-47 case).

Poor John.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 12:09:33 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:47:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500

>OK, let's cut through to the heart of the matter (the Heart of
>Darkness?)

>We need at least one case for which everyone agrees

>1) there is no possibility (probability = $P = 0$) of a hoax

>2) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a delusion

>and

>(the toughest one) 3) there is no possibility ($P = 0$) of a
>misidentification

>Anyone got a case for which they are willing to say 1-3 are
>>true?

>(I don't see any hands waving in the air.) Remember, that even
>if a group of ufologists arrives at such a case the outside world
>is going to say.. "you've got to be wrong, There must be a
>possibility of either 1, 2, or 3 explaining the case."

Bruce, List:

This seems a very good statement of the problem.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 12:16:59 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:49:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:27:40 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:15:25 -0000

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 20:12:51 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Yes, a colloquium was held at the Smithsonian Institution in
>>Washington, D.C., with both advocates and sceptics/debunkers
>>participating.

>September 1980, I believe.

Thanks. What was the title of this session? Are there
proceedings available? This might be something good to have
around.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:31:56 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:31:15 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Previously, Royce posted:

>UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and
>they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's
>tall tale

><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

Hi, Royce!

If you look at the photos of the black ship, you will notice that the shadows are on the opposite side than the trees in the background. There's a tree to the far right of the picture as well as one to the far left. If you look closely, you will see that the shadows are on the right side of both trees while the shadow side of the black ship is on the left. Amateur stuff. The guy is a joke.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte

From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:26:33 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:35:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Furlotte

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>Gentlemen,

>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>they would be UFOs.

>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

With no dis-respect to our neighbours to the south, I do trust
that you mean North American when you use the "American" term in
such a cavalier fashion. Us Canadians get a little touchy about
being called American. I did not say that we should stop
investigation when something is determined to be a UFO. I said
that we have to stop the Pelican story. Why? Because it cannot
be proven that what Mr. Arnold saw were Pelicans. In other words,
stop beating a dead horse, please.

>Also
>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

My apologies for assuming that a pilot might be a little more
familiar with observing flying objects whilst in flight. If
anything, he would be watching carefully to make sure he didn't
fly into anything else that might be up in the sky with him,
therefore, I suspect that although he might not be able to tell
you the mating habits of the red-winged blackbird, I would
expect him to be able to readily identify a bunch of them in the
sky as a flock of birds. I also used the word "most" which means
that there might be the occasional item that he might not be

able to identify.

>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which
>makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests,
>is feasible in current circumstances. If a re-investigation of
>the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters,
>can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened
>without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a
>mundane explanation.

No, actually, the Academy that Jenny Randles suggests would
examine the Pelican 'theory' and place it into one of several
possible explanations for the Kenneth Arnold incident. They
would not and should not jump on any one theory and turn it into
some kind of crusade. We've heard the pelican theory, let's
move on.

>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>inconclusively.

>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of
>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects _are_ UFOs -
>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>but I think it _does_ matter, and in many cases unidentified
>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>than UFOs.

You're correct, the proper usage should be conclusive, as the
evidence should be. However, you're incorrect, when a UFO
sighting is proven conclusively to be something else, it no
longer is a UFO, it then becomes an IFO, an Identified Flying
Object.

Cheers,

Dave (Furry) Furlotte

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 19:30:37 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:37:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 09:00:37 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

<snip>

>Hello John:

>I must really be missing something here. I have _always_
>assumed, presumed, (whatever) that UFO was simply the
>abbreviation for Unidentified Flying Object, period.

>This is the first hint I have ever heard in my life that there
>is any difference whatsoever, except a modest savings in time,
>ink and bandwidth .. the very purpose of commonly agreed-upon
>abbreviations like UFO/UFOs.

>If there is some difference between UFOs and Unidentified Flying
>Objects (capitalization issues aside) please let me know what it
>is.

I quite agree. There is no difference between a UFO and an unidentified flying object. But if you re-read the postings by David Furlotte and Don Ledger they are clearly implying that to 'indentify' something as a 'UFO' is an end in itself. Ledger says quite clearly that it "doesn't matter a damn" to try to find out what a UFO might be. Furlotte says we should take the witnesses initial report at face value and should not challenge it.

I certainly don't think all Americans believe this by a long way, but I have only ever seen this assumption coming from your side of the Atlantic.

>Best wishes

>- Larry Hatch

>PS: I wish I could lift a pint with you and discuss these
>matters in greater, uh, depth. [burp!]

Any time you're in London pop along to the Magonia Monthly Meeting in Putney (next one April 1st., 7.15 pm onward at the Railway pub, corner of Putney High Street and Upper Richmond Road) and I'll happily buy you a pint of whatever excellent guest beer that nice Mt Wetherspoon has put on for us!

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hayes

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 19:12:41 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:38:20 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11 - Hayes

>Date: 16 Mar 2001 10:41:47 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 14:05:26 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
>>Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 11

>>Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

>><Masinaigan@aol.com>
>>=====

>> UFO ROUNDUP
>>Volume 6, Number 11
>>March 15, 2001
>>Editor: Joseph Trainor

>><http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

>>REPTOID SIGHTED IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

>>An alien was sighted on the beach in Rosarito, in Mexico's state
>>of Baja California on Wednesday, February 29, 2001 by two
>>Mexican policemen.

>Is this a mistake? I do not have February 29 on my 2001 calendar
>signifying a leap year in an odd-numbered year.

Hello Bill,

This looks like a genuine typo and I think Joe will mention it
in next weeks bulletin. Thanks for pointing it out.

Best wishes,
John Hayes

webmaster@ufoinfo.com

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI
Magazine plus archives of Filer's Files and Oz Files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:55:39 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:41:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - McCoy

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:12:19 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Ladies & Gents:

>>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

>><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

>>Evidence of OI/NHI?

>I enjoyed the article. So, its raining terdlets in Utah. I'm
>hardly surprised. Did you know there are only two or three
>liquor stores in the entire south end of that very arid desert
>state? I looked all that up once, just in case.

>Odd as it may sound, I wonder if they don't have twisters in
>Utah sometimes. Not your full blown Kansas tornado mind you, but
>something greater than a dust devil.

>I have a case listed here of a dirt-sucking tube-tornado which
>came down from some UFO (supposedly) which was pulling up all
>sorts of dust, sand and what have you.

>Sevier County is about as close to the geographical center of
>Utah as one might get .. maybe Sanpete County takes that prize.
>My tube-tornado-UFO was near Pelican Lake in Uintah County
>however, maybe 125 miles NE of the Richland,UT terdlet affair ..
>and 33 years earlier.

>If they do have mini-tornados, one might have passed over a cow
>pasture or sheep range. That's my armchair theory for various
>frog falls, fish from heaven and similar forteana. I'm sure no
>twister ever wrecked a brewery in Utah, not that it would much
>matter.

The last time I was in Utah 1996, to be exact I was working a
fire near Cedar City, about 20 mi out in the direction of
Richfield. Utah seems, in my experience, as a former Aerial fire
fighter, to have some of the nastiest Thunderstorms around, and
as I can attest, Tornado activity along with them- one touched
down just as we were entering the pattern at Cedar, (naturally
we were low on fuel) but it did tear up a Barn and attendant
feedlot! Larry's theory is probably right about the dunglets.
Tornadoes are not uncommon in that area, in fact one tore up
Temple Square in Salt Lake City in Early summer of 99'.

The Fire Crews all had the Liquor store located as that was
where you could by what passed for Real Beer-as opposed to the

stuff that was marginally better than tap water in the local stores. (Why am I thinking of a Monty Python routine?)

I am not enamored of the lifestyle that the southern part (or any part) of Utah affords, When we'd go to the local wine bar (the strongest stuff available at the hotel) they'd cut everyone off at the second glass, and you couldn't switch to Beer! They threw our mechanics out because they were too loud!(none were drunk) as far as I know there were no "private clubs" there. Fortune smiled on us,as the next day it snowed and the Fat Lady sung, and we escaped from the Bosom of the LDS Church, or some such body part!

So, when I fly or drive I try to make it all the way through Utah if I can.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 20:21:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:44:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Randles

>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34
>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:39:35 -0000

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34
>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 21:28:20 -0000

>>Hi,

>>Georgina, once again you strive to create friction when the need
>>for none exists.

>Jenny, I will get back to your marathon post when I have answered
>Larry Warren's marathon post.

Hi,

That's fine by me. Happy to discuss it with you any time.

Sorry it was a mammoth post. My mother has been seriously ill in hospital for a month and I have had to travel long distances every day by public transport, so I had little time to work on an argument and resorted to just pasting a lot of text.

I do apologise for that as I know it can be very frustrating to download. I'll try not to do it again.

I was only trying to set the record straight with regards to your reply to John Rimmer after he had posted the Magonia supplement to this list - as well as to indicate that there is no mystery about either Bob Easton or Kevin McClure.

I certainly am not meaning to have another 'dispute' with you over this relatively inconsequential matter. So I hope you don't take offence. It is not intended. Generally I thought you covered the history of the early days of this case pretty well in your book.

I had already advised Magonia of the problem via another list - as they will confirm. As soon as the supplement appeared (before it was posted onto Updates in fact) I had pointed out that Kevin McClure supposition about Bob Easton being a pseudonym was, in fact, incorrect.

I can, BTW, see how the coincidence of surnames might have linked Bob Easton with James Easton in some peoples eyes - although, in so far as I know, they are completely unrelated and have never met. But I could be wrong as I don't know James Easton personally so maybe he is a distant cousin of Bob's.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 20:27:36 +0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:47:02 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Morris

>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 05:34:23 +0100
>Fwd Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 13:20:30 -0500
>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Goldstein

>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 12:49:10 +0000
>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 04:09:41 +0100
>>>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux

>>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 16:35:31 +0000
>>>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

>><snip>

>>>>I have an enhanced image illustrating this and can post it if
>>>>anyone would like to see it for themselves. Contact me directly.

>Hi Neil,

>Thanks for your reply.

<snip>

>>>If we could get a better
>>>"tweaking" perhaps it would help define whether the person was
>>>writing autopsy notes or something like: Call after film shoot -
>>>Ray Santilli - Will Volker pay for extra scenes? If I remember
>>>correctly there were several people on the list who had
>>>"tweaked" the Ramey message. I wonder if there is any software
>>>or technique that could bring more out?

>>This technique couldn't be applied to the Ramey Message as we
>>only have the one data sample, the single negative.

>I was asking if the clipboard image could possibly be tweaked to
>the point of getting any idea what was written.and if there is
>any technique for that image that could reveal more than your
>technique?

Josh,

Sorry, I was a little confused here as the autopsy notes are just
lying on the table and not on a clipboard, see:

<http://www.thefortworthphotographs.freemove.co.uk/images/>

and checkout the image

06-reel62_00259.gif

in the directory list found there.

This image shows a frame from the AA film where the form is being written on by one of the "doctors". I think it also shows the fact that almost all the text on the page is way below the max resolution the video format can provide, though I could read the "doctor" here had just written a "6".

>On this list I remember all of Bond's images of the markings on
>the debris, fresh and further enhanced. I remember your posts
>comparing them to the alleged AA autopsy. There is something I
>have never understood. Why, after looking at all of Bond's
>images, I could see no more than what looked like splotches,
>perhaps caused by manufacturing. Should I call an ophthalmologist
>for an appointment? I've never seen the markings in the alleged
>AA autopsy pointed out.

>I hope they look better than Bond's did to me.

>Would it be possible for you to post three images?

>1) The best image of the clipboard

See again the above image for the paper and

composite.gif

For the "DANGER" sign.

>2) & 3) Side by side images of the best match in markings
> between the debris and the alleged AA autopsy

<snip>

If you again go to the above web address and pull down the file

symcomp.gif

from the directory listing.

This image is put together from what I guess are the best overall identifiable symbols in both the AA and FW images. Though it's not the most visible symbol, I think it holds the most complex mix of unique features and so should increase the factor of both instances of the symbol being a pure chance set of "smudges".

Note the symbols are not identical but each contain those 4 points which seem to single it out.

The fact they are not identical in form shouldn't really be taken as a "black mark" against them being the same symbol, after all it's common practice to use various "fonts" in the English language, I've included a random sample of types of the lower case "n" as found on my own computer, and which the symbol in question resembles.

Best Regards

Neil

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:43:47 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:48:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Evans

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

Previously, Richard wrote:

>>>In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree
>>>that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless
>>>opinion-mongering.

I replied:

>>For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET
>>visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I
>>find a problem with the above statement on two points:
>
>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>evidence that can be examined?

Richard replied:

>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

So, in essence, I am correct after all. By your own admission
there is no physical evidence that can be examined, which was my
original point. All that's left is a collection of opinions
about something that is as elusive as smoke; worse, we are left
with opinions about other people's opinions.

Regarding such, I had written:

>>2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions
>>of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

>>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>>of "the council".

Richard replied:

>If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
>oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
>examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
>U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
>Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
>the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

>I see nothing "elitist" about valuing their recommendations
>higher than those of John or Jane Doe. I definitely do not agree
>that just anyone's opinion in the UFO field is equally valid
>with everyone else's, and I have argued that point strongly over
>the years. Do you think every self-styled financial adviser or
>medical expert's opinion is equally valid? I don't. Some are
>quacks or incompetents. People with demonstrated standards and
>principles are needed, as Josh G. observed.

Oh, I agree that we need as many experts in the field of UFOs as can be mustered. I simply take issue with the notion that any exist. Financial advisers, self-styled or otherwise, are at least operating within a field where the subject in question, money, has been proven to exist. Therefore, results of their expertise are quite measurable.

On the other hand, the existence of ET craft has yet to be proven. In the end, it would seem, anyone claiming to be an expert would be as "self-styled" as the financial advisers you allude to above. While I am all for some intelligent thought on the matter of ET life, sometimes the common sense of John or Jane Doe can be not only welcome, but invaluable in sorting out what may or may not be the truth about ET life. After all, we don't seem to see thousands of sightings by the "experts" themselves. In that sense, what elevates the councils' views over that of the common folk that seem to experience sightings more often than anyone?

I'll take the word of a bad painter that has actually handled a brush over one that's only speculated what it must be like to paint.

Roger Evans

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - McCoy

From: **GT McCoy** <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:08:19 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:55:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - McCoy

Hello, all.

I hope this drives a stake through heart of "Frankenpelican" that seems to get a, well lighting bolt to the electrode, just when you think it's safe to be on the List.

I decided on a new letter because I have in my possession a book entitled "Birds of the Pacific Northwest" by Gabrielson and Jewett-both Trained Field Biologists for the U.S.Bureau of Biological Survey. Gabrielson was the Chief, and Jewett was the N.W. director.

This book was 40 years in the making, and a superb work as, it more than holds its own with any of R.T. Peterson's Field guides even though it was published in 1970. It is as near as I can tell, out of print. The Book was updated from "Birds of Oregon" Published Earlier.

There are several Habits of Pelicans and Snow geese cited that are blow serious holes in the "Pelicanist" position, enough to fly a Call Air through.

Note the following information I have gleaned from "Birds of the Pacific Northwest":

If Arnold saw Pelicans, they would have to be Juveniles, but the time of year is wrong, because Juveniles fly at least 8 weeks after the late June date, and they couldn't be adults, because it is nesting season. Yes, the Pelican sighting supposedly occurred during the June nesting period, either the eggs are laid or the Pelicans were out looking for food for their young, not joyriding over the Cascade Mountains. Ref. pg. 90. My point: The Pelicans were already in nesting pairs. Period.

Also there was a prolonged Drought during that (1947) time that started in 1934, and also draining wetlands caused a precipitous decline in numbers (which since have rebounded.) making the White Pelican -RARE- then (1947) Ref. Pg..91

Now for the Snow Goose theory: The Snow Goose nests in the Arctic, winters in California and Old Mexico and is to, their credit quite common. However. There is one problem. They aren't anywhere near the Cascades in because it's: nesting season in the Arctic. They can't as in can not be, in the Pac. NW. in any kind of meaningful flocking numbers.

According to Jewett the latest he had seen, ah, in 1902 as a young man, was mid April. Of course in this debate, seeing things as a trained observer doesn't say much, infact it is immediately suspect, if said observer happens to be familiar with things in the sky (Arnold)! Pg. .Ref .131-32.

Now fellow listerons, where do we go from here? Waste bandwidth on what is now a questionable premise? Or IMHO, let's get on with it and move away from the Pelican debate, as proven above.

Pelicans and Snow Geese cannot be what Arnold saw.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Kelly

From: Christopher Kelly <tophar@pacific.net.au>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:04:49 +1100
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:13:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Kelly

Source: The MUFON Ontario Website

<http://www3.sympatico.ca/updates/mufon/index.htm>

"A major problem in the study of UFOs - ufology - is the lack of time available to serious researchers who are employed in some other line of work. It has to be very much a spare time activity. This is one reason why the UFO mystery has remained unsolved for so many years. Government and government-contracted studies have been inadequate for various reasons... and although by far the great majority of research has been conducted by private individuals and groups, we are at it only on a part-time basis."

- Arthur Reid Bray - 'The UFO Connection', 1979

The function of ufology at this early stage is not to diagnose and explain but to observe and describe. Since we know so little about our visitors, any 'expert' who thinks otherwise is in for trouble.

- John Magor, 'Our UFO Visitors', 1977

Hi List,

I have to agree with the comments made by those above. Doing UFO/ETH research can send someone to the poor house very quickly, which is why I guess so many go onto writing books ect. It's a shame so many people out there make lot's of money from the UFO subject and really have nothing to do with serious research.

Now if only we could put a tax on some of the martial being sold relating to UFO's. It would be in the interest of those selling as we would get them more facts and pictures ect to sell. Then we could get a budget up and have some full timers doing research. Yer, ok I know it's wishful thinking.

Apart from all of this, I still question the results of some of the past investigations done by others of noted credibility, On information taken from those that had been abducted.

One that I still laugh over is the so called Anal probe! My research found that this device was more than likely as device us to Anaesthetize a subject. Long talks with Doctors and research into the Mayan and Inca's did result in finding that the quickest and safest way to release chemicals into the body is by this way. This is also the way elephants are given tranquilizers as it is the quickest and safest way to put a elephant to sleep.

So were did this Anal probe thing come from?. Perhaps there wasn't enough researchers giving detailed data for others to consider?.

Anyway, There is plenty of evidence here on Earth to prove we have been visited and are being visited. Why these visitors choose to play this hide and seek game is to me, The most puzzling of questions.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:42:55 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:16:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 01:09:19 -0400
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

<snip>

>Is it your idea that Arnold decided to fly to Yakima and just
>sort of flew that-a-way hoping he would bump into it? No he
>would use charts, land marks, checking his speed against ground
>checkpoints and a line on a 1/500k chart, marked off in 10 mile
>increments. He'd measure off his progress with an accurate
>stopwatch and his instrument panel clock to get his ground
>speed. Check point after checkpoint he made his way through the
>mountains in a timely fashion so that he would know whether he
>was in a tail wind, cross wind, or a head wind. The last two
>force you to use up more fuel which is always in limited supply.

>Apparently there was none that day because Arnold mentioned it
>was one of those days that it was a joy to fly. Thick cold
>stable air. The kind that does not produce updrafts, thermals
>and temperature inversion. If you check you will see that
>temperature inversions are created at low altitudes and not over
>mountains so there go your "mirages".

All very good points Don, especially about how a pilot such as
Arnold would be carefully measuring distances, etc., not just
"estimating." One small point: I think there was about a 10
mph tail wind. If that is the case (I think McDonald, an
atmospheric physicist-meteorologist, checked the weather
records), then it argues against a temperature inversion which
requires calm stable air masses, with essentially no wind.

>Arnold flew this area all of the time and as an experienced
>pilot he would know the type of birds that fly in an area he was
>used to flying. When he first started to fly there he would have
>asked questions about what he was likely to encounter in the
>mountain areas and would have learned about the habits and types
>of birds flying there.

>All of us VFR pilots do that.

<snip>

>If a flight of birds [pelicans] flew across my line of flight at
>say 3,500 feet in front of me between two points fifty miles

>apart they would be getting tangled up in my prop and coming
>through the windshield before they could make it across the
>distance. I'd be on them in 20 seconds at a cruise of 115 mph.
>Arnold cruised at 105-110 mph.

<snip>

Your data on bird visibility from an aircraft highlights the fact if birds were too far away they wouldn't be visible, if too close they'd be recognized as birds and overrun by Arnold's much faster aircraft. On a flight path at right angles to Arnold, the birds' speed becomes essentially irrelevant or zero relative to Arnold, and would only change the direction at which Arnold would intercept their path.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

AA Handwriting

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:45:08 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:18:59 -0500
Subject: AA Handwriting

Hello, all...

A recent thread got me to thinking about (moan) Alien Autopsy, again. There has always been something about the way AA was shot that bothered me and a recent question about analysis of the doctors' handwriting suddenly made me realize what it was.

Here's the problem:

According to AA proponents, the footage was shot on an old Bell and Howell, spring wound Filmo 16mm camera. This camera had a limited run time for each wind of the camera and, as I understand it, film was in short supply which accounts for the type of film used. In addition, the cameraman was wearing protective gear (hood, gloves, etc.) which supposedly made handling the camera harder than usual.

So, if film and run time was at a premium and the gear made handling the camera difficult, then why in the world is the cameraman shooting useless footage of the "doctor" writing stuff down? Each roll of film is only going to last about 2.5 minutes or so. Why waste film on the doctor writing stuff down when such unnecessary footage is only going to mean having to change precious film sooner which, in itself, is going to require removing the cameraman's gloves, etc. A friend has an old Filmo and, try as I may, I cannot load film in the darned thing with rubber gloves on. Film waste aside, why even bother shooting such a thing in the first place unless only for show? After all, AA is supposed to be a documentation of the procedure, not a movie of the paper documentation of the procedure.

Roger Evans

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: John Carpenter Resigns

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:13:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:21:17 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter Resigns

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

Hello All,

This is all well and good. It should have happened months ago. Also, this does not abrogate MUFONs responsibility to conduct an internal investigation to determine if Carpenter compromised the integrity of the MUFON Project Database.

Then at some point in the game, the abductees whose files were sold to Bigelow need to be informed - so that (if) they wish to pursue independent or group action regarding Mr. Carpenter they will be able to do so.

Don't allow Carpenter's resignation to negate the rest of what needs to be done. Carpenter's resignation is just the first step. The objective -should be- to make absolutely sure that the rights of the witnesses/abductees whose files were sold are respected and acknowledged. MUFON now needs to launch a full scale investigation into Mr. Carpenters activities while head of the MUFON databank project.

We're only half way home!

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:22:38 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:23:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

Hello Richard, Roger, List

<snip>

>>For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET
>>visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I
>>find a problem with the above statement on two points:

>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>evidence that can be examined?

>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

<snip>

Agreed.

<snip>

>>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>>of "the council".

>If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
>oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
>examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
>U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
>Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
>the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

>I see nothing "elitist" about valuing their recommendations
>higher than those of John or Jane Doe. I definitely do not agree
>that just anyone's opinion in the UFO field is equally valid
>with everyone else's, and I have argued that point strongly over
>the years. Do you think every self-styled financial adviser or
>medical expert's opinion is equally valid? I don't. Some are
>quacks or incompetents. People with demonstrated standards and
>principles are needed, as Josh G. observed.

<snip>

This process must be as open and transparent as possible.

It would not be wise to put 50 years of ufology in the hands of the few. This would not be realistic and I believe that any process afraid of its people is doomed to failure.

You may find 16 persons who have the time to do the job, but not necessarily 16 persons who should do the job. To state John Patrick Shanley: "I know he can get the job, but can he do the job?"

No one is interested in a Babel Tower. And I don't believe anyone is interested in a Star Chamber. Surely there must be some middle ground between a Communist structure and a Sacred College.

As such, we need a judiciary structure, which selects members who apply the rules of a system. This structure would ideally become a self-sustained recurrent mechanism that would guaranty it's efficiency while using a maximum of available human resources.

One of the main problems of ufology is that people on both sides of the fence are entrenched in belief systems with ample blind spots ignoring contradictory evidence. The deadlock goes on because opposing arguments are seldom addressed or taken into account. This kills all hope for a debate. An alternative approach might look like this:

Make a list of the strong cases, and don't be shy about trimming. My heart goes to airline pilots cases, radar confirmation (not a necessity) and multi-witness military cases.

Show as much material as possible on a web site.

Have people take a crack at it.

All explanations for the case must take into account all the reasonable data. So, if you don't want to draw a map, that's your problem, but suffer the consequences. Let's take the balloon explanation for the Socorro case. The UFO escaped SW at high speed. Yet, Hynek states that, the day of the sighting, there was a strong wind from the SW. Provided the Hynek report is verified, end of discussion... on the balloon.

Bye bye, next. Anything else? Shoot. Hey, you got something there... Bye bye Socorro. Next.

Quite an efficient process compared to ad nauseam back and forth discussions: it's simple, self-cleaning and definitive.

Among the merits of this approach we can mention:

1. The strong cases have already resisted debunkery attempts. This may be evident for most of us, but not evident to the public. Hopefully, this would set the record straight once and for all. The final product should make for a very interesting publication. I propose the title: "Chronicles of the Incredulous"...
2. The job of the Council members is gets easier. There is much less responsibility of their shoulder - as they have to respond to criteria, not people - but still have great power of decision. Exactly like in a judiciary system. This would leave the Council with the burden of applying simple rules, and deciding whether an argument is valuable or not.
3. In the end, we get a neat Compendium of the Strong Cases, complete with details and the list of refuted explanations. Like: why this cannot be a meteor, why this cannot be birds, etc.

Democracy will be happy. Efficiency will be maximized.

I know this will not please everybody, but this allows for an orderly contribution of the majority. Reversed thermodynamics.

This is only schematic, but I guess you get the general idea.

As for who should be part of this Council, this is a discussion that should take place once the proper environment has been defined.

Regards,
Serge Salvaille

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:07:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:26:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:41:11 -0000
>>>Subject: Council Proposal
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Previously, Richard wrote:

>>>My logic is that advocates and proponents naturally would seek
>>>out the strongest cases they could find, and would be happy to
>>>learn about any they might have missed. Would it be possible to
>>>build in some compromise way of deciding which cases should go
>>>to the council?

>>>In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree
>>>that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless
>>>opinion-mongering.

>>For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET
>>visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I
>>find a problem with the above statement on two points:

>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>evidence that can be examined?

>>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

>>and

>>2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions
>>of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

>>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>>of "the council".

>>If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
>>oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
>>examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
>>U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
>>Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
>>the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

Hi Richard,

So far I love the list of names you have suggested. I'd also like to nominate Greg Sandow for consideration as a 'moderator' if you will. I not only liked Greg's suggestion, I think -he- should be the one to do the job. Please give it some serious consideration. My great love and admiration of Greg aside, the man is (literally) the most intelligent, fair, and even handed human being I have ever met.

I hope that this whole idea makes it past the 'talk' stage. It is one of the better ones to manifest on this list in many years.

Regards, and best of luck making it happen.

John Velez

Interested and supportive side-liner ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:41:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:28:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 23:02:58 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:53:08 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:04:05 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>>>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

><snip>

>>>>List, interested parties,

>>>>>What interests me right now is whether it can be
>>>>>demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds'
>>>>>phenomenon were published in the UFO literature
>>>>>prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be
>>>>>forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find
>>>>>evidence of it?")

><snip>

>>Hello Gary,

>>You wrote:

>>>Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses absorb
>>>published material and regurgitate it in their stories or
>>>hypnosis.

>>Geez, is this what this is all about for you? To revert back
>>to expressions of my youth, "What a bring down and a stone cold
>>bummer man!"

Chris wrote:

>Hi John,

>Actually, it was me who wrote that.

Yeah, I know. "Gary" was a slip. I had just responded to a post
from 'Gary Hart' and I still had his name on my brain. It was

you I was talking to however and why I responded in _this_ thread.

>In fact, you inspired me to write it when you said

>"I have tried(to no avail)to keep myself as "unpolluted" by the
>reports of others as I could. Because of the nature of my
>involvement that has been impossible." (March 14th)

You conveniently twist the meaning/context of my statement and call it "inspiration."

"Imagination" is more like it. And if you are attempting to paint any of my own (conscious) recollections as "polluted" or the result of "contamination" boy did you dial a wrong number. Prior to reading Budd Hopkins' "Missing Time" I had no knowledge of anything UFO related (literature etc.) much less about the details associated with abduction reports. I was a ufological 'virgin.' ;)

Just to 'clarify' my statement for you, (that you have so tortuously twisted) I meant _after_ I began to investigate my own experiences. Budd was the first (and only) investigator I have ever contacted and he was very careful to keep me isolated from other abductees for about three months or more. It was because of my 'public' stand and my long association with Budd that so many people write to me sharing their own experiences. I would have preferred to keep all that from myself. I did not "invite it" at first. Once it started it developed a momentum that has continued to this day. I have an archive of letters from people that choke a horse.

That is what I was referring to. _Not_ what you twisted it into. And BTW, I went to Budd with a _lifetime_ of fully conscious memories of waking experiences. It wasn't recalled under hypnosis as you imply. Take the time to get your facts straight before jumping to conclusions or making self serving assumptions as to "meaning."

>But let's not fight, life's too long.

"Sensei" taught me not to fight with anybody. To avoid 'fights' at all cost.

But,... that if I ever found myself in a situation where I _had to_ fight, to make sure I focus, concentrate, and do my best to win.

>Chris, the Bringer of Stone Cold Downy Bums

I'll say! ;)

John Velez, I have had my words twisted more than Dorothy's braids in the Wizard of Oz. ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Velez - E-Mail Problems

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:53:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:30:42 -0500
Subject: Velez - E-Mail Problems

Hi All,

I'm experiencing some serious problems with my e-mail set-up. I may not be able to respond to posts in a timely manner because of it. I'm working hard to get the problem resolved.

Please excuse any delay in responses to anything that is directed at me.

Regards,

John Velez, From the depths of Computer Hell ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Velez - E-Mail Problems

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:53:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:31:10 -0500
Subject: Velez - E-Mail Problems

Hi All,

I'm experiencing some serious problems with my e-mail set-up. I may not be able to respond to posts in a timely manner because of it. I'm working hard to get the problem resolved.

Please excuse any delay in responses to anything that is directed at me.

Regards,

John Velez, From the depths of Computer Hell ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:06:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:33:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynek strenuously
>objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do"
>chapter 12 in The UFO Experience, 1972). Hynek objected that
>Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness
>could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter
>definition of a case in which a scientifically competent
>investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms.
>Condon's definition swamps the core UFO cases in masses of less
>important or time-wasting IFO cases. The Condon Committee could
>have made a valuable study of IFO's, something like what Allan
>Hendry did in his UFO Handbook, so that we would have a control
>study against which to compare the UFO's among other things, but
>didn't.

Brad,

I won't repeat the whole thing, but simply wanted to say that
this is an excellent commentary on witness testimony,
definitions, and attitudes. I commend it to the attention of all
sceptics, doubters, debunkers.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 10:18:14 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:34:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies - Young

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:12:19 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Ladies & Gents:

>>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

>><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

<snip>

>Did you know there are only two or three
>liquor stores in the entire south end of that very arid desert
>state? I looked all that up once, just in case.

Hi, Larry:

Yes, last fall I was hiking down around Bluff for a few days. We had to bring our beer from NM.

>Odd as it may sound, I wonder if they don't have twisters in
>Utah sometimes. Not your full blown Kansas tornado mind you, but
>something greater than a dust devil.

Hadn't thought of this. A good observation. Yes, I've seen dust devils down that way. Once saw eight or nine at the same time out over the Sonoro Desert from the road up Kitt Peak, site of the National Observatory SW of Tucson. Reminded me of the pixs of dust devils on Mars from the old Viking orbiters. The ones that the Mars Face folks thought must be water spouts (this isn't thrown up here to get that discussion going, gain).

>I have a case listed here of a dirt-sucking tube-tornado which
>came down from some UFO (supposedly) which was pulling up all
>sorts of dust, sand and what have you.

<snip>

>If they do have mini-tornados, one might have passed over a cow
>pasture or sheep range. That's my armchair theory for various
>frog falls, fish from heaven and similar forteana. I'm sure no
>twister ever wrecked a brewery in Utah, not that it would much
>matter.

Probably a very good bet.

Clear, cloudless, windless skies,

Bob Young

And take an umbrella and your own beer.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Bassett

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <SGBList2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:23:41 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:38:45 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Bassett

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:25:43 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:52:15 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>>>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin

>>>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>>>Alien Baloney

>>>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>>>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>>>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>>>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalynn Campbell

>><snip>

>>I agree with the bulk of what was said here. I am completely
>>outraged to learn that in spite of the fact that none of the
>>surgical procedures performed thus far has turned up any hard
>>evidence, Doc Lier has over 100 surgeries scheduled.

>>Isn't there a medical review board in the State of California?
>>Are they -all- on vacation? Maybe the whole review Board died!
>>Somebody ought to tell em.

>>I hope it all gets stopped before another person is cut. I've
>>been pissed at both Sims and Leir since 1995.

>Hello John V:

>I'm sure there is some sort of review board or whatever for foot
>doctors, but they are probably overloaded with infected toenail
>cases and such.

>Leir and company don't quite fit this regulatory model, and
>may have 'slipped between the cracks' so to speak.

>I'm only armchair guessing at this point, having no expertise in
>such matters. But, I would posit that there are so many horny
>hot-tub head-doctors under review in this balmy state, that
>regulators have little time for foot doctors claiming removal of
>metallic space alien shards and splinters from the feet of our
>august, forthright and sober population.

>[burp!]

>If people have certain doubts about abduction matters, you might
>at least credit the likes of Leir and Sims for clouding matters
>beyond recognition.

Gentlemen,

An article was just forwarded to UpDates regarding an incident of feces dropping from the sky in Sevier County, UT. I think we now know whence the dung comes.

Neither one of you have foggiest idea as to merit of Roger Leir's work, the implant removals, what they may or may not have demonstrated, and what he has gone through because he dared to stick his neck out and address a known and reported aspect of the experienter/abductee phenomena.

Anyone who enters the fray, particularly those whose careers require any type of certification are easy targets for the debunkers and "offended" mainstreamers scared silly by what the research is unfolding. Nothing works better to knock someone out of the game like taking away a person's livelihood short of taking away their life.

John, over the years I have developed a growing appreciation for the contribution you have brought to the table. You have a fierceness and determination which is activist in style, and you refuse to back down. If something doesn't work out, you try something else.

But for some reason, you are unable to lose your tendency to piss on others who are trying to find the answers to this complex new reality within a context that has been subverted and propagandized by their own government.

You have, as has every other experienter, encountered ridicule and unfounded accusations aimed at you and your work. Those targeting you couldn't care less what the facts are. Worse, they don't feel they need to be confused by the facts, because you are, they might likely say, "a fringe, nut case trying to get attention by fabricating self-serving silliness."

I have yet to encounter anyone in this field of study, either direct or indirect participants and researchers, who is so endowed with wisdom and profound knowledge they are in a position to know with certainty what the motives, intentions, outcomes and prospects are for the others in the field.

When you launch yourself into the mode represented by the above exchange, you engage in hubris. Some thrive on that kind of indulgence, but you are better than that and the people you occasionally target deserve better than that. Many of those same people would unhesitatingly rise to defend you, if circumstance required it.

Regards,

Stephen Bassett

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:41:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>mathematician-meteoriticist Lincoln LaPaz whose
>observational and investigative skills put him in a class by
>itself and well above the vast majority of the best UFO cases,
>in effect having the world's best visual observer/investigator
>as a UFO witness.

Brad, Jenny, Dick, List:

Whatever Lincoln LaPaz's credentials are, or were, this is really not a supportable statement. There is, and was, no such acknowledged category. Intense green fireballs, for example, can certainly be natural in nature. Richard Haines' book, *Observing UFOs*, provides an explanation for this color, and associated color changes, in the chemical functioning of the human eye. I don't think that the research Haines cited had been done in LaPaz's day.

He may very well have been a very good investigator. More is probably a stretch.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:16:40 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:43:07 -0500
Subject: Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 06:17:58 -0500
>Subject: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on Chupacabras
>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl@juno.com>

>SOURCE: La Estrella del Loa (newspaper)
>DATE: Saturday, March 17, 2001.

>U.S. RESEARCH CENTER DISCLOSES INFORMATION ON CHUPACABRAS

<snip>

>but from the president
>and director of the Miami UFO Center, Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo,
>who wrote the Estrella del Loa from the U.S. to recount the
>latest information regarding the alleged creature's
>manifestations in Chile.

Scott, List:

In all due respect, the fact that Virgilio's UFO group is located in Miami, does not make it a "U.S. Research Center".

This headline most likely was simply to imflate the importance of the story. Judge the contents accordingly.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

Another UFO hobbyist,
The Western Hemisphere Center for UFO Skepticism

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:21:40 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:46:42 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Randles

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Thus, 15 Mar 2001 20:41:11 -0000
>>Subject: Council Proposal
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>evidence that can be examined?

>and

>2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions
>of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>of "the council".

Hi,

I tried to make clear in my posts that I do not favour an elite team created on the basis of experience/or notoriety within ufology - but an elected body into which anyone can aspire, be nominated and voted by their peers. Plus a system whereby all people can offer cases that they believe merit consideration.

I don't believe this can fairly be termed elitist.

As for opinion-mongering, all ufology is really that. But what I am suggesting is that we put some structure behind it by seeking answers to a specific question - if these answers exist. Yes, what emerges will be opinions as to which are the best cases, but the best cases that point in a particular direction - according to criteria that we can mutually agree. So it would not merely be personal preference at work but how well a case argues towards a specific theory.

Like I said in an earlier post this experiment is not suggested to prove the ETH. I agree that the dearth of physical evidence precludes that. But it is to establish which cases in our data base are the ones that point most towards the ETH as a reasonable possibility. Whether you believe that possibility is proven, unproven or nonsense is not the issue. We can at least define which cases are the ones we all agree upon as the kernel of the pro ETH argument used by many ufologists.

That alone is progress and more than simple opinion mongering too.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:57:20 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:49:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 03:24:49 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 12:21:00 -0000

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Serious Research
>>>Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 21:50:41 -0000

>What I mean is that so many in the field of popular ufology seem
>to have no inner standards that would help keep us out of the
>muck we wallow in and help put us on the road to some real truth
>and not make us look like a laughing stock to people trained in
>science or other professional fields in which there are definite
>standards of attempting to proving a claim, which include peer
>review, etc.

Hi,

This is indeed an important - and too little debated - area of
Ufology - in that Ufology simply has no agreed standards - not
even an agreed code of ethics - or an agreement to 'have' a
code!

Some groups have their own codes. In the UK a number came
together 20 years ago and in a year long series of meetings we
defined a code of practice that is now mandatory for several
(notably BUFORA) and was extended by UFOIN when formed in 1999.

But these are still voluntary codes that rely upon the
individuals concerned and the willingness of the groups
themselves to act when any defaults occur.

Some groups train investigators - too - and only allow such
experienced, qualified people to act on their behalf. BUFORA has
a seven month training course that I designed when I was
Director of Investigations a decade ago and I know the current
Director (Gloria Dixon) maintains the standards this attempts to
set for its team of investigators.

But again these things are voluntarily and only as good as the
determination to make them fulfill their aim of raising
standards. The temptation is always to let an unqualified person
act on the basis that there are too few qualified and willing
people to cover everything.

From time to time I have mused about the need within Ufology to
have some kind of semi professional 'guild' of Ufologists -
something to which you could only be elected after proving your
expertise. And I don't mean an elitist - only if you have written
a book, or been around for 20 years or whatever can you join -
type body. That's an old boys club, not a professional body.

I mean provided you can satisfy certain guidelines regarding ethical and investigative competence that perhaps could be universally agreed - then a person can apply to be and perhaps be granted status as a member of this guild.

Something that would send a signal to the world at large that we are trying to raise our own credibility level.

However, this route is fraught with difficulty - who watches the watchers? What happens when a member of the guild cocks up - as is sure to happen? All told there is a risk that it would probably create more problems than it would solve.

But it is an area that deserves some discussion.

>Until the early 1990s I attended UFO conferences. What circuses!
>even most of the ones that were supposed to be more serious
>would have a few legitimate researchers and also many poseurs
>who were just making astounding claims with no real evidence.

This is a problem of Ufology in general and it is easy to see why it happens. UFO groups exist primarily to continue their existence. If they do not attract new members they fold - so conferences feature entertaining speakers to make money by attracting the crowds to join the group that sets them up.

Conferences almost never fulfill a specific purpose - to further research, discuss one case in depth, plan new directions. Those that do such things contribute far more to Ufology (eg the MIT symposium - without question the most important UFO event I have ever been to).

I have always felt that Ufology should organise more conferences on a scientific model - that is as working events that make no effort to attract large audiences and which do not subsidise speakers but split the costs amongst all who want to be there. And that organise themselves up front with very clear agenda in mind - like MIT did.

This is hugely desirable but is blocked by Ufology being a 'bitty' subject where most people congregate into groups and most groups exist really to outdo other groups rather than to further research. In a sense UFO groups are almost counter productive to serious research.

Of course, working conferences - unless they are subsidised by rich enthusiasts as was MIT - will end up being parochial and confined to attendees from single countries or regions - since the cost of attending and travelling to be there will be so great for an almost totally amateur based subject such as ours that it will preclude the sort of international events that science hosts all the time. You just cannot have a working (science emulating) event other than on a local level without some major source of subsidy.

Not that this is an argument against doing it. In my view Ufology needs to carefully reassess its whole policy of conference organising because they are too often (everywhere in the world) just a group of regular lecturers preaching to a floating audience on a level that is at best grade B Ufology. And I include all my own lectures in this, of course.

They only sporadically do much to further serious research and hardly ever start with a goal and by the end of the weekend or whatever have made progress and created new initiatives towards that goal.

In science conferences are one way in which the momentum for research is maintained. In Ufology that happens far too little. They are more social events and like Star Trek conventions than science.

And this is no groups fault. It is an inherent problem of the field itself.

It is another area of Ufology to which we need to give considerable thought.

Best wishes,
Jenny Randles

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:46:05 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:52:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>Date: Thus, 15 Mar 2001 23:06:55 -0000
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:19:38 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>Date: Thus, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

><snip>

>>I would like to propose a very simple concept that will cut
>through a lot of the hassle and red tape in the selection of UFO
>cases to support ETH:

>It seems to me that the kind of case that most impresses people
>as indicative of spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere are
>Daylight Disc cases (DD's - Hynek Classification) involving
>metallic-appearing objects. The cases should be long enough in
>duration (say 1 minute or longer) and large enough in apparent
>size (at least Full Moon or so) so that enough detail can be
>observed to enable competent investigation eliminating IFO's
>etc. Hynek's rule requiring multiple witnesses should be
>included in the screening criteria, and date, time and location
>must be known.

Hi,

I think there is much sense in your idea of defining the kinds of cases up front that we might consider appropriate for debate. I don't think Daylight Discs, per se, are any more or less likely to be misperceptions. I have seen quite a few that turn out to be aircraft or balloons, etc. But they are certainly preferable to LITS - which hardly ever would qualify as credible arguments for an ETH theory (even if some are alien light probes - or whatever - there are way too many other things they could turn out to be - negating most of their value as evidence for even the possibility of the ETH)

But I do agree with the suggestion that we should make a few ground rules and that one of these should be to gun for multiple witness cases (indeed I might even argue multiple, independently located witnesses as this best eliminates the prospect of a hoax). (A group of people together tend to be known to one another / related and are no stronger in terms of ruling out a hoax than single witnesses in many instances)

Even multiple, independent witnesses can be fooled (such as the Buckinghamshire movie film case where there were three sets of witnesses at different locations and movie film of the UFO but it still turned out to be a rather unusual and rare IFO). (See 'The UFOs that Never Were' for details). But this is undoubtedly a good prerequisite of any strong case. So a sensible starting

point.

Indeed if we were to define a simple scoring system to help us describe the kind of case that we seek it could include something like: physical evidence of non terrestrial material (10), physical evidence of an ambiguous nature (8), photographs purporting to show an alien (6), photographs appearing to show a landed UFO / constructed craft (5), multiple independent witness sightings of a constructed craft (3).

There are no doubt other things that could/should be added to this list.

Other factors need to be taken into account as well (maybe, for instance, a score from 1 to 10 on the likelihood of a hoax, and a similar score on the likelihood of a misperception) (with 10 equalling no probability and 1 meaning certainty of hoax or misperception).

In this way the combined score of these three factors (out of the maximum possible of 52) (based on the numbers used above fairly haphazardly) indicates the strength of the ETH viability of any case. And this is an objective measure not a personal assessment if we all agree on the relative figures to ascribe to each element.

In fact, in this way we can quickly get a grip on the ETH viability index (the EVI) of any reported UFO sighting. Already a progression in research terms.

This is very rough and ready guide - and simply a basis for what needs to be a lot more thought and work to refine such a scoring system. But this idea of creating an EVI could be a sensible next step and we could probably quite readily define a method whereby we can define such a rating.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Response to Larry Warren's Questions (Part One)

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 20:29:27 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:54:52 -0500
Subject: Response to Larry Warren's Questions (Part One)

Georgina Bruni's Response to Larry Warren's Questions
Permission to publish providing all the content is intact.

This document is in two parts - Part One

Larry Warren has made a public statement claiming that there are "a staggering 407 problems" with my book "You Can't Tell The People" and has challenged me to respond to the following questions, stating: "Should she choose not to, that will be self evident as well." I am therefore left with no option but to answer these questions in the same manner that they were presented, which is publicly. However, I find it very odd that Larry has put forward only twenty-one questions and only ten of these concern the content of my book, the others have nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged errors.

Here then are Larry's questions and my answers:

Q#1 - Ms Bruni, Why does the fact that you edit an online "Gossip Magazine" entitled "Hot Gossip" not mentioned in the text of your book? Sure, your dust jacket states that you edit an "on-line magazine", but again I ask you, why is the keyword "Gossip" omitted from the jacket text, I mean, it is true right?

Answer: It is no secret that I am editor in chief of Hot Gossip UK. The reason the magazine is not mentioned in the text of my book is because it has nothing whatsoever to do with the content. The dust cover also mentions that I trained as a private investigator but it does not name the agency.

Q#2 - Ms Bruni, Did you read the book, "Left At East Gate"? If so, as a researcher "Trained In Investigation", did you note the on "Record interviews" with other witnesses circa 1984 and published in East Gate, and then compared the statements from that time with the alleged statements given to you during the course of your "Definitive Research" by those same individuals?

Answer: I did read the interviews in your book concerning the witnesses. However, I prefer, whenever possible to talk to the witnesses direct rather than work with second hand (in this instance third hand) information. I consider this to be the professional way to work. There are no "alleged" statements in my book they are all genuine.

Q#3 - Ms Bruni, On page 29, 2nd paragraph of the chapter, you title "American Pie", you write, "Both police squadrons carried weapons such as the M-16, and a weapon capable of shooting down a helicopter" end quote, my question is this, you claim to have interviewed numerous witnesses from 81st SPS cir 1980, myself included. You claim to be a trained investigative journalist as well, that said, in 1980 the 81st Security Police - was in fact made up of two separate disciplines. Law Enforcement Police carried a Colt 38, 6 shot revolver, a nightstick, a Motorola 4 band radio and hand cuffs. L.E. Did not carry an M-16 rifle, as you write in your book. My point is simple - you are claiming in your "Factual Book" that we were armed with "surface to air" weapons - as you now know, this is not true - Whom told you this "fact?" Who told you that L.E. Carried M-16's?

Answer: Actually, you are wrong. There were in fact three police units at RAF Bentwaters. Security Police, Security Police Investigations and Law Enforcement, and in my book I make it clear the duties of all three. I see Kevin Randle has already corrected you on your errors concerning the weapons. I did not write in my book that LE's carried M-16s, I actually wrote: 'Both police squadrons carried weapons _such as_ the M-16 and a weapon capable of shooting down a helicopter or small aircraft. So I did not specify who used what, but mentioned those weapons as an example. I think this is being very picky considering you allege there are so many problems concerning you personally. But I do admit I could have made it clearer that LE's carried hand guns. The fact that a 'weapon capable of shooting down a helicopter or small aircraft' was available, was stated by Colonel Charles I Halt (ret) during a lecture in the UK in 1994. A transcript taken from a recording of the lecture reads as follows:

'...and have on hand immediately available firepower way beyond that [machine gun] ...something large enough to stop a tank or knock a helicopter out of the sky ...'

If there is an error regarding this then I'm sure Halt or another member of the USAF would have corrected it. Obviously you did not have clearance for such a weapon; hence you might not have had access to this information. After all, not including your basic training period, you only served approximately six months in the USAF. It is therefore understandable that you would not have known much about how the military machine worked. It is for this reason that I pay more attention to the facts and to the people who have served in the service much longer than you. Of course Colonel Halt was the deputy base commander at RAF Bentwaters and Woodbridge.

Continuation of Q#3: As an investigative journalist did you do any background research on the security police and the jobs role in Europe circa 1980?

Answer: Yes, I did do background research on the security police, not just their role in Europe either. My book offers as much information as allows room for concerning the security police and their role at that time. You must realise that my book is not about the security police in Europe, but concerns the Rendlesham Forest incident and the people involved. I devoted a whole chapter (A Little Piece of American Pie) to the workings of the USAFE at RAF Bentwaters and Woodbridge and I laid out their role and named the commanders in charge and also interviewed the commanders of the 81st Security Police (something that you did not do for your book). I feel this was more than adequate.

Continuation of Q#3: Did you contact the USAF Security Police Museum in San Antonio, Texas? One would think you would as it was Security Police whom are your primary witnesses to the UFO incident! Or as you like to say, was this information something you were told or something you knew?

Answer: My book is not about the history of the USAF Security Police. I did obtain and read USAF records, as mentioned in my book. As aforementioned, my concern was with the witnesses and those stationed at RAF Bentwaters and Woodbridge and, the people who knew more about that than anybody, were the witnesses and of course their commanders.

Q#4 - Ms Bruni, In the current issue of UFO Magazine (UK), I notice on the top of page 13 - the banner headline "MOD Warned America About UFO Book!" This refers only to the point that the MOD sent a rather bland memo to USAFE Mildenhall, Norfolk (Likely to public affairs) informing USAF to expect queries concerning your book - Of course this happened as far back as 1984 with the book "Skycrash" except at that time, memos of this nature would have gone to Bentwaters Public Affairs, Mildenhall is now the administrative centre for the USAF in Britain. I see nothing strange with this. So I ask you, is the banner headline simply hype and more creative marketing? Or do you really believe that you are the only person to publish a book on the case? And that America was really "warned" about your book? Books on this subject are NOT reviewed by the government before being published in America, as we have freedom of speech and expression.

Answer: Have you seen the memo you refer to? Because it has my name on it I am endeavouring to obtain a copy. The Answer in the Hansard is clearly little more than the standard attempt to downplay this subject. Surely you can see that this is just the MOD spinning the usual party line. I should think it is clear from the bibliography in my book that I am aware of other books on the subject. And who said anything about the American's reviewing my book? This entire question has nothing to do with the content of my book.

Q#5 - Ms Bruni, Is your book available in book stores in America?

Answer: Yes, but what has this to do with the content of my book.

Q#6 - Ms Bruni, of course you have shown the lighthouse theory to be the joke it always was - you are not the first to do so. Why did you not choose to vent some of your spite at the idiots (Like Easton and Ridpath, etc.) Who promote the lighthouse theory, instead of on some of the witnesses to the incident.

Answer: I feel my book does more than other books have done to prove the lighthouse theory is a joke. It offers proper evidence, not just theory. It features actual USAF pictures of the landing site and evidence of ground indentations that could not have been caused by animals. It also features Adrian Bustinza's testimony revealing that he was forced under pressure to say that it was the lighthouse. It also reveals that two other witnesses were not responsible for typing the alleged statements, which the sceptic's claim are proof that the lighthouse was responsible. I do cover the sceptic's theories including Ian Ridpath's, but I refuse to waste precious space on debunkers who have no case. I believe I have been very fair to the witnesses, there have been no complaints from them, in fact it is the opposite, they have congratulated me on my research. You are the only person to make complaints regarding your alleged involvement.

Continuation of Q#6: Did you ever visit the forest at night?

Answer: Yes, see page 270 - 272 in my book "You Can't Tell The People."

Continuation of Q#6: Or for that matter, Did you ever visit Caple Green?

Answer: Yes, I have visited Caple Green (and the farmer's field that you believe is called Caple Green) and, while on this subject I should mention that new evidence has recently come to my attention (thanks to a local researcher who supplied me with this information), which in my opinion questions your claims that the discoloured area in the farmer's field is evidence of a UFO landing in 1980. More information on this will emerge in the near future. As you know Larry, you are the only person who claims the UFO landed at this location.

Continuation of Q#6: As a trained investigator, I'd have thought you would have addressed the debunkers by name and theory and then laid waste to them with your "Definitive Research"? Ignoring them is not balanced research is it?

Answer: I have already answered this question (see Q#5). The debunkers claims are based on wild speculation and theory and with the evidence I have presented for the case, these claims do not stand up. I have devoted a whole chapter to challenging the sceptics and I feel the book is very balanced. But I refuse to give the oxygen of publicity to debunkers who simply re-hash the theories of other sceptics.

Q#7 - Ms Bruni, On page 33 in the New UFO Magazine, we see you have been invited to speak at the 20th Leeds UFO Conference in September - I can tell you that I'm sure you will enjoy it! Baring another petrol strike.

Answer: Thank you, I'm sure I will enjoy it. What kind of question is this?

Continuation of Q#7: I notice that in your brief bio, you are identified as being a "Best Selling Author" Congratulations!!! That's super. Peter and myself were in the British Top 10 Best

Sellers List in the summer of 1997, in fact two lists. (In Britain, one must sell over 5,000 Hard Back copies of ones book without returns, to get there!) Could you let me know on what list your book has qualified as a "Best Seller" or is the claim more hype and creative marketing? It is hard work to get a true best seller (A major book tour can help), but UFO books are not doing well these days and it would be insulting to authors that are Best Selling authors, to have authors who are not, saying that they are! What do you say? (In your defence, John Mack is NOT a "Former" Pulitzer Prize Winner, he is one!)

Answer: I should point out that "Best Selling Author" is not mentioned in my bio. This is something the media has taken to writing. However, my book went into second re-print before publication and a week later it went into third. I understand it is now in its fifth re-print. As of early January 2001 I understand it had sold approximately 6,000 hardback copies and that is not bad considering it is a UFO related book and was only published on 10 November. I do not have the latest figures but no books have been returned and it is still selling very well. For somebody who claims to have identified 407 problems with my book, I am somewhat surprised that this, as with many of your "questions" do not relate to the substance of my book at all. It seems to me that you are trying to score points here and not debate any of the data in my book.

Q#8 - Ms Bruni, In your book you state that I "more than once contemplated suicide" Based on what source do you conclude this? First it is bullshit, second, it is legally actionable, and third, - Did you read East Gate? Had you done so, why did you not report accurately what happened to me 14 years ago and why? Why was it necessary to write this inaccurate and slanderous statement at all? Please don't tell me that I told you that! Because I will then ask you to produce the audio tape of me doing so, OK! So please answer why you tried to create such an inaccurate and unstable picture of Larry Warren? In fact, you put more effort into slandering me then resolving the case, Why?

Answer: There is no need to produce further evidence because I did read your book, but did you? Turn to page 490 (index) in Left at East Gate and read: Warren, suicide attempt, 279. A paragraph on your attempted suicide in 1988, which concludes with, "I couldn't even kill myself properly." Then turn to page 82, referring to the year 1981: "Drinking was a constant in my life and some moments I thought about ending it all." Now turn to page 289, where your co-author Peter Robbins is discussing your problems in 1988 and had learnt that, "...he [Larry] had come pretty close to killing himself the month before."

Q#9 - Ms Bruni, During our 5 or 6 telephone conversations from March 1999 to the late Spring of 2000, you often asked me if I was recording you? You also stated more than once that you NEVER recorded your interviews! In the State Of Vermont, one can record any telephone call without The other party knowing it, for legal purposes and for the record. When we did speak, I was living in Vermont, and I did in fact record all of your phone calls, (For legal purposes) as it was my right to do so. However you eventually told my wife that you reordered all of your conversations and did not admit as much to the people you spoke too. "As A Professional Trained Researcher", Why did not have the professional courtesy to ask for permission to record your "sources" all good researchers do, why not you?

Answer: So if you have recorded our conversations, why are you asking these questions?

Q#10 - Ms Bruni, On Page 71, You state that "Busty Bustinza" cannot recall the names of the men he picked up that night, (3rd UFO Incident) I ask again, have you read his previous interviews by Larry Faucett, Ray Bouche, Chuck Decaro, etc. If so, then why did you not question the man, because he knew whom he had picked up in 1984 when he was first interviewed, What is your agenda?

Answer: I read the interviews to Adrian Bustinza and asked him more than once if he had picked you up that night but he said he could not recall doing so. In these interviews he does not name you as being with the patrol. When Fawcett asked the questions he constantly mentioned your name but not Bustinza. Apart from the officers, he mentioned a Polish man whose name he cannot recall, yet he does not recall you being in the truck. I think I was trying to be kind to you by omitting that information, but

that's the way it was. As you know, Bustinza says it was Colonel Halt not Colonel Williams who was with his patrol, and he states it was Halt in Fawcett's interview that you feature in Left at East Gate too. I had to go with what Bustinza told me and I never led him. I have to ask why you did not interview Bustinza personally, or indeed any of the witnesses for Left at East Gate?

Continued in part two

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Response to Larry Warren's Questions (Part Two)

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 20:29:13 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:57:31 -0500
Subject: Response to Larry Warren's Questions (Part Two)

Georgina Bruni's Response to Larry Warren's Questions
Permission to publish providing all the content is intact.

This document is in two parts - Part Two

Q#11 - Ms Bruni, Did you tell researcher, Brenda Butler that Larry Warren and Peter Robbins "made up" the other witness supportive statements in "Left At East Gate", and that we made up the supportive statements from witnesses that came after our books publication. Ref: P. Robbins lecture at Leeds 1998 Ref: Info that was offered to you by me and Peter that you had no interest in? Brenda said this to more than just myself.

Answer: I was surprised to hear this because I never said any such thing. As you know, when you realised I had discovered certain errors with your story, you wrote to me demanding that I not use any of your material. So it was not as if I did not have any interest. I contacted Brenda about your accusations and she told me that I had been the topic of conversation during your visit to Rendlesham Forest but that at no time did she repeat what you have stated here. From what I gather your statement is distorted and you might be interested to know that Brenda filmed the occasion, so she has it on video.

Q#12 - Ms Bruni, On page 72 of your book, you write "Larry Warren claims to have seen three aeronaut entities communicating with Gordon Williams." Please show me where in the last 20 years - That I have used the term "Aeronaut" to describe the phenomena we observed, I mean you say that I "claim" that. What is your source?

Answer: This was not a direct quote. For your information the word aeronaut means 'one who sails or floats in the air'. 'Floating' is a term that you have used many times when describing the entities.

Continuation of Q#12: On communication with Williams, I've never once said that definite communication took place with Williams, I say it could have - Please explain yourself?

Answer: Please see your book Left at East Gate, page 414, where Peter Robbins states: "Warren is certain that it was Williams who stepped through the circle of airmen and faced off with the life forms". Also see page 47 in Left at East Gate where you quote at the end of the paragraph, " I don't think there was any communication in the traditional sense, but I believe they were communicating." Also see your video interview with Anthony James entitled "The Bentwaters Incident", you state: "Gordon Williams had interaction with another life form."

Continuation of Q#12: Your book clearly places Williams on site, but with so many agendas going on at once, you might have missed it?

Answer: My book does not place Williams at the site (see my chapter on Williams) and according to all witness testimonies and all available evidence, Williams was not on site. You are the only person so far to claim that he was.

Q#13 - Ms Bruni, Why do you write that I saw a "huge machine land"? I've never said that, and it wasn't "huge", I also never saw the machine land! So what is your purpose for attributing that description to me as if you are quoting me?

Answer: This is not a direct quote: On page 45 of your book *Left at East Gate*, you say there was an explosion and then you saw a machine on the ground, it was big and almost the shape of a pyramid. On page 46 you say as you stood in front of the thing, you walked ten paces to the left and ten paces to the right and you could see your shadows in it. Now please turn to page 385 in your book, where you are quoted as saying: "There was a burst of intense bright light. After that, a massive structured object could be seen on the ground where the fog had been." In your video interview (as above) with Anthony James you stated that the object was 30 feet across and rose to 25 feet at a sharp angle. Now, was that big or not, and did you see it land or not?

Continuation of Q#13: Again, I ask did you really read "*Left At East Gate*"?

Answer: Yes, I really did read it but did not necessarily take everything in it at face value. Would you like a list of errors from that book Larry?

Q#14 - Ms Bruni, Have you watched the 3 part CNN broadcast from 1985? If so, why did you mention it only in passing in your book, and on top of this describe it inaccurately. Example, "Capt Mike Verrano doesn't just "claim" to have driven Williams to a jet with film of the UFO," He did!

Answer: I did not just mention it in passing, please re-read my book. Yes, I have seen a copy of that film and Verrano's face is clearly blacked out and his name is not used in that segment. You are wrong about Verrano mentioning Williams, he does not. Only De Caro mentions the "base commander" The base commander was Colonel Ted Conrad, Gordon Williams was the Wing Commander, there is a big difference. Isn't it time you got your facts right!

Continuation Q#14: You also write that Larry Warren was "surprised to recognise Verrano on the show," How do you conclude this? I worked with Chuck Decaro from beginning to end on that program and had spoken to most of the participants before it was broadcast in February 1985. Why the surprise? I was the first person interviewed by CNN in September 1984 as well.

Answer: I did not use the word "surprised". What I wrote on page 72, is as follows:

'In *Left at East Gate* he [Larry] refers to the CNN documentary, stating that although the faces of the witnesses were blacked out he recognised Captain Mike Verrano...'

Now, please turn to page 178 of *Left at East Gate* where it reads as follows: 'Though their faces were obscured and, in one case, a voice disguised, I recognised Master Sergeant Ball, Sergeant Gulas and Captain Verrano'. Who exactly did you speak to? I ask this because according to De Caro, these witnesses were interviewed separately and discretely and did not want to be named. In fact, all their faces are blacked out on the film. Isn't it true that you did not speak to most of the participants? After all, two of them were NCOs and one was a captain. All were still serving in the service and I doubt they would have wanted to talk to you at that time. Besides, De Caro would not even reveal their names 20 years later because he gave them his word.

Q#15 - Ms Bruni, On page 74 you write that I was "upset" and "paranoid" after the UFO incident and that Bustinza tried to "calm me down." You also write that Bustinza remembers walking down the hall while I wonder if cameras were watching us? In reality, Bustinza asked to talk to me! Why did he not paint me as a paranoid in 1984, your information is false.

Answer: My information is not false. Are you questioning Bustinza's testimony? Why did you not interview Bustinza for your book, I wonder.

Continuation Q#15: You also state that Larry Warren was talking to "everyone about the UFO", again, not true! Cookie (Belinda) Vaughn was my girlfriend at that time, as you know, from speaking to her yourself! I never told her about it! You have your facts ass backwards again! And you seem to be hell-bent to create an untrue picture of me. Please explain your research methods of this issue? Check out Cookie's recollection's from that time on your own website, or have you removed it? Because it's another contradiction? Let me add, that Cookie was not a security police woman.

Answer: Bustinza said that in January 1981 you wanted to tell everybody about what happened and that you wanted to write a book about it. When I informed you of the latter, you got very upset, so I omitted that piece from my book, which I should not have done. By calling my information false, you are calling Bustinza's information false. I respect his testimony and I think he has been very kind to you under the circumstances. Cookie was not mentioned in the book because you suggested that this information was not necessary and although I had to agree, I did think of adding it. However, I had to make room for the extra work (the photo saga) that you threw at me late in the day. Cookie was surprised that you had not mentioned the incident to her, but explained that it was something of a fleeting romance. If I recall correctly, she was not your girlfriend at the time of the actual incident, but soon after.

Also, please check your book *Left at East Gate*, chapter 4 entitled, *We Have To Tell Someone!*. Jim Penniston pulled you up for talking about the incident with personnel. You talked to Bustinza and others, you talked to La Plume, you talked about the incident with the guys in the supply office, you talked to Mark Reese, you talked to Battram and called your mother on the base telephone.

Q#16 - Ms Bruni, After two letters and verbal requests for you to return my photographs and documents, you finally did, via your "man servant" Nick pope, at last Septembers Leeds Conference. Thank you, however you seem to have forgotten to enclose that yellow piece paper from Bustinza's girlfriend, Cindy Schultz, telling me that Busty wanted to talk! You must remember that one? It had text from Bentwaters all-ranks club on the reverse and a picture of a mule. As you know, that is the actual note that Busty had slipped under my door that initiated our first discussions about our experiences. You can read the true version in "*Left At East Gate*" if you like. I do have a copy of the note, I sent you the original (Silly Me) and it kind of blows your version of events out of the water that I refer to in question 15. You know you have it, why did you not explore, "if indeed he was accurately quoted by you" this fact with Bustinza. Please explain, and please return the note, sweetie, ta!

Answer: I only ever received one letter demanding that I not use any of the photographs or copies of documents etc and requesting that I return them. I intended to send them back as soon as I had collected them from my publisher. I was about to send them, when Peter Robbins asked Nick Pope if he could pick them up because you would be meeting each other at the Leeds conference. I don't recall that piece of paper, it was not with the other material, however, I will search my files. Regarding the note that you claim Bustinza put under your door which proves your first meeting with him to discuss your experiences. The meeting Bustinza was describing to me was a separate issue and was indeed the first meeting after the incident. The one you are referring to is at a much later date. Please turn to page 73-74 in your book *Left at East Gate*. It is now April and you have found a note under your door from Bustinza, who wanted to talk to you "to have some facts" because you would soon be getting out of the Air force.

Q#17 - Ms Bruni, on page 73 of your book, you write that "I was convinced Gordon Williams communicated with the crew of an "Alien Spaceship"" Again on page 73, you state that "No one else puts Williams at the landing sites" You naughty girl!!! On the first point, (Again) I've never in 20 years described the phenomena we saw as one "Alien" nor have I ever described the machine we saw on Capel Green, as a "Spaceship"! (I mean, how would I know?) If you had read "*Left At East Gate*" you would have noticed that I do not believe the object came from "Space" at all. I believe it was from the future! I also expressed this

opinion to you on the phone as well (Check your "research tapes") on the first point again, I never said that "definite" communication with the "crew" (Another description I've never ever used!) Took place with Williams, I say, Some form of communication could have taken place, with Williams. Once again, please describe your research methods on these points, if any were used?

Answer: Larry please note that these are not direct quotes. Turn to page 490 (index) in Left at East Gate, where it states: Warren, communication with alien entity, page 61-62. Now, am I correct in saying that the alleged alien contact in the underground was connected with the incident that took place earlier? On page 47 of your book you state, "They had large heads with catlike eyes. I could not see other facial features. They were not human at all, but I was not frightened." So, you think that those from the future are not human? Well, if they are not human, then they must be alien! You only ever told me that you thought they were from our future after I told you that other witnesses were of this opinion. You ask how would you know it was a spacecraft. Why don't you turn to page 52 of your book where you say that a Naval officer told you the day after the incident that what you had seen in the forest represented a technology far advanced to our own and that numerous civilisations visit this planet from time to time. And recall you told Anthony James that Williams had interaction with another life form. Anyway, we've already covered the Williams saga.

Continuation Q17: As for others placing Williams on site, you write that "no one else does!" Halt has, the interviews with participants conducted by Ray Bouche confirms that "fact" as well, and was published in a MUFON journal and "Left At East Gate! Your book goes to great lengths to remove Williams from the incident, however your writing, and the mans own actions and words indite him as having been involved.

Answer: Ray did not confirm that fact. During a conversation I had with him, he explained that Halt had told him that Williams had taken the film canister to a waiting aircraft. That does not mean it was that night, in fact the canister was taken to the aircraft a few days later and according to all the people I have interviewed, Williams was not involved. Halt has denied he said that to Ray Bouche and claims there was a misunderstanding. This is confirmed in a tape recorded interview that Peter Robbins did with Halt, which is included in your book and is available on your website at www.leftateastgate.com

Continuation Q#17: PS He was!

Answer: Then why are you the only person to say so?

This is a bit more complex then the previous questions, but do give it the old college try. I will simplify it, why did you ignore established facts? (And Please, No Spin!)

Answer: I did not ignore them, I investigated them and found many of the so-called established facts to be erroneous. This is what has bruised so many egos.

Q#18 - Ms Bruni, In your book you claim the following (false) information. Larry Warren was never cleared to work in the WSA "Did you really and truly read my book?" Did you review my existing military records, (published in the appendix) or did we make these records up as well? Had you done so, you knew before you published your book, that on 11th Dec '80, I was posted to D flight with my security clearance (intact), on the 15th Dec '80, I received my (PRP) which is clearance to work with nuclear weapons, (in the WSA). I did so twice before the UFO incident. I believe that you knew that too!

Answer: According to my military sources and those who actually worked in the weapons storage area, you had to have special clearance to guard nuclear weapons. You claim in your video interview with Anthony James that you had "Secret clearance to work around nuclear weapons", but you had only been on guard duty for approximately one month at Bentwaters, so I am not convinced that you would you have had this clearance. Apart from a couple of TDYs you spent the remainder of your service in the supply hut waiting for your discharge. It stands to reason that a newbie would not be put in charge of guarding nuclear weapons.

I would be very surprised if the Air Force allowed this. The records you produced are standard training procedure. One day training for the WSA does not guarantee that you would have guarded nuclear weapons. You might have been on guard on the perimeter fence but I am not convinced you would have been inside, unless of course you can prove otherwise. Please read page 31 in your own book, as follows: 'I was now assigned to D Flight and spent the first week in the weapons storage area, mainly checking access badges not very exciting work.' The nuclear weapons area was a separate area, I know because I had access to it when I visited the installation after its closure. I also have the DOE map of Bentwaters. You would have only been on the gate checking badges at the entrance to the weapons (not nuclear) area and not inside the gates.

Continuation Q#18 Lady, from where I stand, I don't see a hint of "investigative journalism" skills on your part!" Please explain why you make blanket statements that are clearly false.

Answer: I believe my answers prove otherwise and now you need to prove everything you are claiming because so far I have not had that proof. Therefore as an investigative journalist I have to go by factual information and information supplied by those who are qualified and not by somebody who had only served a short time in the service, and most of that period waiting for a release.

Q#19 - Ms Bruni, On page 77 in your book you tell the "hopefully" true account of a Bruce Tyler, whom describes a similar film to the one we were shown within hours of the UFO incident! You then write that this film was, quote "probably the exact same film that Larry and the other witnesses were shown" end quote. Perhaps it was? Big deal, why in one sentence do you back up events that did happen to me and in the next write falsehoods and slander about me. That is a tactic you seem to use throughout your book, why?

Answer: This is a very strange question. I tried as much as possible to back up your story as my book proves. Whenever, I came upon information that was in your favour I would include it, but it has to work both ways.

Q#20 - Ms Bruni, In a recent issue of UFO Magazine (UK) you know, the one with your interview and the masked howls of hate, i.e. Pain you direct at me. Well in that issue, it was announced that we had sold the option for a film treatment of "Left At East Gate", this may or may not. Pan out, but that's show biz right! (Although things do look good folks) Ms Bruni you claim to have extensive background in public relations (I do) and are now an author right, so please explain your reasons for contacting "Fast Carrier Pictures" President Steve Rubin, (The man who bought the film option on Left At East Gate) (Smart Guy!) And then trying to flog your book to him, (as if the company would drop us) First I suggest that you get your own dramatic literary agent, (you need one, as the movie business does not accept unsolicited material.) As a PR you should have known this! Lastly, stay the hell off my coat tails and be original for once. What is your version of this "fact", because your actions seem rather sleazy, but wait, I would expect that from a gossip writer.

Answer: Your name was never mentioned in my interview with UFO magazine and the so-called "masked howls of hate" is in your imagination. I did not read the piece where it states that you had a film deal with Fast Carrier Pictures. There was no intended malice for me contacting Steve Rubin. In fact, this was a standard e-mail sent to several media companies. It was only when I received a reply from Rubin that I learnt he was interested in your story. I immediately replied, apologising for the intrusion and I also wrote to Peter Robbins explaining the situation. So before making accusations you should be sure to check your information.

Q#21 - A bonus question should you be up for it? (I can't resist) Ms Bruni, In your book you refer to a conversation with researcher Brenda Butler, you write that at some point Brenda offered me false information (Perhaps back in 1983?) "And he (Me) took the bait!" A load of old shit girlfriend. But worse you write that you ask me about the aforementioned crap and then attribute a false quote, by me in response as if I am a stuttering idiot! Look, you know, that I know, that you know, I

never said what you wrote, and further, the inflection and style of speech is not mine. Perhaps yours? If you have it on tape, produce it! Brenda tells me that you misquoted her? So either you or she speaks with forked tongue?

Answer: I did not write, "you took the bait". When I read your chapter to you, you were asked to comment. The comment is a direct quote from you. I spoke to Brenda and she stands by her story and says I did not misquote her.

Larry: Well sweetie, if you do well with these I have another 385 for you!

Answer: Actually that's 395 questions because you only asked 12 that referred to your complaints concerning material in my book that you allege are erroneous.

Larry: Of those we can discuss the "pictures" and many other "fun facts"

Answer: You might think this is fun but I have far better things to do, so if you have any more objections please keep to the content of the book and don't waste my time on trivia.

Larry: To all that have read this, I'm not the sort that likes to put people on the spot, nor do I like to be perceived as a bully. Ms. Bruni has chosen to include information in her book that she knows is false, she also spun statements about me to fit her agenda, never in 20 years has anyone done this, (Not even the debunkers!) I wanted to take legal action but reminded myself that the many thousands of intelligent people the world over, who have read my book, will find the problems that I have with Ms. Bruni's book to be self evident. Read her book by all means, but you won't find anything to be "Definitive" or with regard to Larry Warren, "True" at all.

Answer: I think what you mean Larry, is that in 20 years nobody has dug deep enough with regard to your claims. In fact, when anybody tried to, you had a fall out with them or became very defensive, as you did with me. I know Peter Robbins did his best and I respect his research and it could not have been easy working with you. As I explain in my book, I only worked on a chapter of the Larry Warren story and it completely drained me. I know you liked the attention but there had to be a cut off point because the book concerned the Rendlesham Forest incident and although you were a player, there was much more work to do and more witnesses to interview. I was very thorough when it came to investigating the incident and all those who claim to have been involved. I am confident that my book and indeed these answers show who is telling the truth.

Larry: I hope she answers these questions, as I'm a major focus of her Warren Commission style take on the Bentwaters case. Should she choose not to, that will be self evident as well. It's a lousy position to be in. As I've fought hard for twenty years to get this case into the wider public eye and she has put great effort in confusing it rather than resolving it. You be the judge! A lengthy overview of her book is on the way, and many "issues and facts" in Bruni's book need to be addressed.

Answer: I think what you are trying to say is that you have fought hard for twenty years to get yourself into a wider public eye. Unfortunately, you have not helped this case in recent years and that is regrettable because it really is genuine in my opinion. Rather than confusing the case, "You Can't Tell The People" has blown it open and has uncovered a good deal of myth and nonsense and for the first time in twenty years it has told the truth about what happened that week. Of course there is more to come out and more witnesses to come forward.

It has not been too difficult to answer your questions and although there is other evidence available, it was not necessary to include this because many of the answers can be found in your own book, which is really strange that you did not see this.

With regard to the private e-mail I sent to Peter Robbins in September 1998. At that time I was sure that you were there, but was not sure that you were with the patrol at the site. I have to say that I strongly object to people posting private e-mails in the public domain without permission of the original sender.

It is such bad taste. I find it very difficult to believe that Peter, who I consider a friend, was aware of this and would be shocked to learn otherwise. My message to all researchers and witnesses, please be careful and make sure you use the word CONFIDENTIAL in all your private e-mail.

Despite what you may think Larry, I bear you no ill and you may well have been involved in the incident, but as you know, I do have genuine problems with your various claims.

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 18](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:48:34 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:59:26 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Kaeser

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:45:08 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Handwriting

>Hello, all...

>A recent thread got me to thinking about (moan) Alien Autopsy,
>again. There has always been something about the way AA was shot
>that bothered me and a recent question about analysis of the
>doctors' handwriting suddenly made me realize what it was.

>Here's the problem:

>According to AA proponents, the footage was shot on an old Bell
>and Howell, spring wound Filmo 16mm camera. This camera had a
>limited run time for each wind of the camera and, as I
>understand it, film was in short supply which accounts for the
>type of film used. In addition, the cameraman was wearing
>protective gear (hood, gloves, etc.) which supposedly made
>handling the camera harder than usual.

>So, if film and run time was at a premium and the gear made
>handling the camera difficult, then why in the world is the
>cameraman shooting useless footage of the "doctor" writing stuff
>down? Each roll of film is only going to last about 2.5 minutes
>or so. Why waste film on the doctor writing stuff down when such
>unnecessary footage is only going to mean having to change
>precious film sooner which, in itself, is going to require
>removing the cameraman's gloves, etc. A friend has an old Filmo
>and, try as I may, I cannot load film in the darned thing with
>rubber gloves on. Film waste aside, why even bother shooting
>such a thing in the first place unless only for show? After all,
>AA is supposed to be a documentation of the procedure, not a
>movie of the paper documentation of the procedure.

Roger

Good point. However, I think the argument was that this was filmed on relatively short notice and was designed to simply document the event, and not give a particularly detailed view of the proceeding. Why they would want this form of documentation is a mystery to many of us, as is the question of why one would dissect an "alien" in a matter of a couple of hours, when one would think that scientists would want to take days performing the procedure to analyze the creature in minute detail.

There is much about this story that makes little sense, but while I've seen very strong arguments that would indicate that this is a hoax, I've not seen any "smoking gun" evidence one way or the other.

Philip Mantle has been working on a follow up book that I believe will bring evidence, both for and against its validity, up to date. Unfortunately, there are many books in search of a publisher at this point, and this one is apparently caught up in that.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:01:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:00:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Kaeser

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>Brad, Jenny, Dick, List:

>Whatever Lincoln LaPaz's credentials are, or were, this is
>really not a supportable statement. There is, and was, no such
>acknowledged category. Intense green fireballs, for example,
>can certainly be natural in nature. Richard Haines' book,
>Observing UFOs, provides an explanation for this color, and
>associated color changes, in the chemical functioning of the
>human eye. I don't think that the research Haines cited had been
>done in LaPaz's day.

>He may very well have been a very good investigator. More is
>probably a stretch.

LaPaz's credentials were good enough to cause the military to involve him in the study of a phenomenon that they were becoming very concerned about. While it is acknowledged that green fireballs can be natural events, is there any explanation as to why there was a large increase in such sightings in the late 40's and early 50's, followed by a decline in such sightings? As a natural event, one would think that the number of sightings would be consistent through time.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:08:54 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:02:56 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Tonnies

>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Handwriting
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 15:48:34 -0500

<snip>

>Good point. However, I think the argument was that this was
>filmed on relatively short notice and was designed to simply
>document the event, and not give a particularly detailed view of
>the proceeding. Why they would want this form of documentation
>is a mystery to many of us, as is the question of why one would
>dissect an "alien" in a matter of a couple of hours, when one
>would think that scientists would want to take days performing
>the procedure to analyze the creature in minute detail.

That's an area of concern for me as well. As far as I'm
concerned, if the AA is for real then the footage we all know
and love simply has to be the record of either

a.) a "panic" situation, in which the pathologists are doing it
fast due to some unknown urgency

or

b.) a "routine" operation. ("Looks like we gotta take apart one
of these weird-looking 'aliens' again...")

Both situations are a bit disturbing.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: John Carpenter's Resignation

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:09:21 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by inuendo, not proof and
made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization. A
simple twist of fate. Accomplished nothing. Proved less
than nothing and if the gods exist, should be followed by
the action of going around, coming around. One would
hope.

Jim Mortellaro

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Bowden

From: Dave Bowden <grafikfx@lineone.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:31:41 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:12:48 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Bowden

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:53:26 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:54:29 +0000
>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>>Dear Colleagues,

>>I am happy to announce that Larry Hatch has won the Lost Haven
>>book quiz.

<snip>

>Maybe you should wait for me to examine the prize from the first
>contest, before you send in your nominations for the second prize.

>I once swiped a live tarantula from my dad's science classroom.
>I put this lovely arachnid into a gaily decorated box and left
>it on the doorstep of the only registered democrats on this
>block of Jeter Street, in Redwood City, California.

>That was almost 50 years ago, and I remain virtually unforgiven
>to this very day.

>I'm sure Roy would never stoop to such shenanigans, [even
>though I once did] but I would examine any actual prize for
>hoof-and-mouth or mad-cow disease.

Larry,

As an extra prize I think you should be sent a side of beef
signed by all 300 or so farmers who are currently going through
hell with this foot and mouth thing. I am sure they will
appreciate your razor like wit.

Dave

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledgerd <ledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:30:09 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:14:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:39:31 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

><snip>

>>I think this sums up the attitude of
>>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects _are_ UFOs -
>>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>>but I think it _does_ matter, and in many cases unidentified
>>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>>than UFOs.

>All:

>Hear, hear, hear. All the backbenchers are on their feet, over
>here.

>Bob Young

Hi Bob,

That was snipped from a larger submission. That which you just
posted was about the only thing he was right about.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:53:22 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:18:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 19:30:37 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 09:00:37 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

><snip>

>>Hello John:

>>I must really be missing something here. I have always
>>assumed, presumed, (whatever) that UFO was simply the
>>abbreviation for Unidentified Flying Object, period.

>>This is the first hint I have ever heard in my life that there
>>is any difference whatsoever, except a modest savings in time,
>>ink and bandwidth .. the very purpose of commonly agreed-upon
>>abbreviations like UFO/UFOs.

>>If there is some difference between UFOs and Unidentified Flying
>>Objects (capitalization issues aside) please let me know what it
>>is.

>I quite agree. There is no difference between a UFO and an
>unidentified flying object. But if you re-read the postings by
>David Furlotte and Don Ledger they are clearly implying that to
>'indentify' something as a 'UFO' is an end in itself. Ledger
>says quite clearly that it "doesn't matter a damn" to try to
>find out what a UFO might be. Furlotte says we should take the
>witnesses initial report at face value and should not challenge
>it.

>I certainly don't think all Americans believe this by a long
>way, but I have only ever seen this assumption coming from your
>side of the Atlantic.

What nonsense. Like many others I get reports or read reports
all of the time claiming UFO sightings. I blow most of them off.
I won't even consider lights in the sky anymore unless it
resolves into something much closer and moves over a large area
of the sky and has some definition. There's just too much up
there to misidentify.

But I guess I wasted my time posting what I did as a reply to
your posting I guess John. I think what I was trying to say is
that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Meaning, 'The
Bird In The Hand' was Arnold on the spot with the knowledge,
technical knowhow, experience and the actual sighting, while
we've got 2 birds/debunkers like yourself and Easton sitting in
your armchairs in England 53 years later, second guessing him.
And that's all you are doing is second guessing. Don't try and
dress it up with nonsense about research.

Arnold's sighting hasn't come close to being explained by Easton
or anyone else. So far, Arnold is the one with the credible

experience and on the spot.

Nothing I've seen yet has come close to convincing me that he didn't see what he claimed to see. Give me something credible and I'll buy in - but not before then.

Regards,

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Shedding Secrets

From: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:03:26 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:38:37 -0500
Subject: Shedding Secrets

The following is from the editorial pages of today's NY Times:

"The answer was delivered the other day by Federal Express. It came in the form of two red CD-ROM's adorned with a hammer and sickle. They contain nearly 20,000 pages of what were once some of Washington's most secret documents, the CIA's assessment of the Soviet Union from 1947 to 1991. The reports were recently declassified by the CIA and were the subject of a conference earlier this month at Princeton University attended by many former agency analysts. Here, at my fingertips, was the best intelligence that hundreds of billions of dollars in spy hardware and manpower had bought for the United States."

FWIW

Dennis Stacy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Gulf Breeze Books?

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <thiagolt@opengate.com.br>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:21:27 -0300
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:41:14 -0500
Subject: Gulf Breeze Books?

I`m looking for books about the Gulf Breeze Sightings, especially those by Ed walters, but at amazon.com and b&n.com they are out of print.

I would like to know if someone of you have one to sell or indicate a place that I can find them.

Thanks and regards to all.

Thiago Luiz Ticchetti
Entidade Brasileira de Estudos Extraterrestres(Brasília/Brasil)
(EBE-ET VICE PRESIDENT)

www.ebe-et.com.br
ICQ 35119615

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: John Carpenter Resigns - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:29:23 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:43:58 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter Resigns - Gates

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

The question now becomes is the MUFON board going to do anything at this point, (perhaps release results of the investigation) or just let it go and not worry about it?

One suspects it will fade into the sunset, to be forgotten and not discussed any futher.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 18:43:03 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:46:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:42:55 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 01:09:19 -0400
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

><snip>

>>Is it your idea that Arnold decided to fly to Yakima and just
>>sort of flew that-a-way hoping he would bump into it? No he
>>would use charts, land marks, checking his speed against ground
>>checkpoints and a line on a 1/500k chart, marked off in 10 mile
>>increments. He'd measure off his progress with an accurate
>>stopwatch and his instrument panel clock to get his ground
>>speed. Check point after checkpoint he made his way through the
>>mountains in a timely fashion so that he would know whether he
>>was in a tail wind, cross wind, or a head wind. The last two
>>force you to use up more fuel which is always in limited supply.

>>Apparently there was none that day because Arnold mentioned it
>>was one of those days that it was a joy to fly. Thick cold
>>stable air. The kind that does not produce updrafts, thermals
>>and temperature inversion. If you check you will see that
>>temperature inversions are created at low altitudes and not over
>>mountains so there go your "mirages".

>All very good points Don, especially about how a pilot such as
>Arnold would be carefully measuring distances, etc., not just
>"estimating." One small point: I think there was about a 10
>mph tail wind. If that is the case (I think McDonald, an
>atmospheric physicist-meteorologist, checked the weather
>records), then it argues against a temperature inversion which
>requires calm stable air masses, with essentially no wind.

>>Arnold flew this area all of the time and as an experienced
>>pilot he would know the type of birds that fly in an area he was
>>used to flying. When he first started to fly there he would have
>>asked questions about what he was likely to encounter in the
>>mountain areas and would have learned about the habits and types
>>of birds flying there.

>>All of us VFR pilots do that.

><snip>

>>If a flight of birds [pelicans] flew across my line of flight at
>>say 3,500 feet in front of me between two points fifty miles
>>apart they would be getting tangled up in my prop and coming
>>through the windshield before they could make it across the
>>distance. I'd be on them in 20 seconds at a cruise of 115 mph.
>>Arnold cruised at 105-110 mph.

><snip>

>Your data on bird visibility from an aircraft highlights the

>fact if birds were too far away they wouldn't be visible, if too
>close they'd be recognized as birds and overrun by Arnold's much
>faster aircraft. On a flight path at right angles to Arnold, the
>birds' speed becomes essentially irrelevant or zero relative to
>Arnold, and would only change the direction at which Arnold
>would intercept their path.

This is true. The 10 mph tailwind [I'm assuming from the west] would have been a bit of a bonus for him-always nice when you are going east. So much for stable air over or around the mountains. You must have warm stable air [which is unusual] over cold stable air [great stuff for pilots] in order to get a temperature inversion. Then of course your line of sight relative to the layer created is limited to a very shallow angle under the layer.

None of this means anything in the scheme of things anyway Brad because we are North Americans. To us all UFOs are real.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 18:53:07 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:49:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Ledger

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:06:39 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>>This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynek strenuously
>>objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do"
>>chapter 12 in The UFO Experience, 1972). Hynek objected that
>>Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness
>>could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter
>>definition of a case in which a scientifically competent
>>investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms.
>>Condon's definition swamps the core UFO cases in masses of less
>>important or time-wasting IFO cases. The Condon Committee could
>>have made a valuable study of IFO's, something like what Allan
>>Hendry did in his UFO Handbook, so that we would have a control
>>study against which to compare the UFO's among other things, but
>>didn't.

>I won't repeat the whole thing, but simply wanted to say that
>this is an excellent commentary on witness testimony,
>definitions, and attitudes. I commend it to the attention of all
>sceptics, doubters, debunkers.

Hi Dick and Brad,

I suppose we will never know what Condon's motives were during
the progress of the study for which he was responsible. It
wasn't until I read UFOs Yes by Saunders that I came to know
what a brilliant scientist and courageous person he was. And yet
he chose to play the fool. Shoots down the study scarcely 2
weeks into the program while speaking at Corning.

Him and Menzel. There's a field of study right there.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 22:54:00 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:08:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:07:32 -0500
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Hi Richard,

>So far I love the list of names you have suggested. I'd also
>like to nominate Greg Sandow for consideration as a 'moderator'
>if you will. I not only liked Greg's suggestion, I think -he-
>should be the one to do the job. Please give it some serious
>consideration. My great love and admiration of Greg aside, the
>man is (literally) the most intelligent, fair, and even handed
>human being I have ever met.

>I hope that this whole idea makes it past the 'talk' stage. It
>is one of the better ones to manifest on this list in many
>years.

John,

I totally agree with you about Greg Sandow, but didn't want to
give him the "kiss of death."

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Randle

From: **Kevin Randle** <KRandle993@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 18:30:07 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:12:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Randle

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:07:32 -0500
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000

<snip>

>>If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
>>oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
>>examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
>>U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
>>Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
>>the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

>Hi Richard,

>So far I love the list of names you have suggested. I'd also
>like to nominate Greg Sandow for consideration as a 'moderator'
>if you will. I not only liked Greg's suggestion, I think -he-
>should be the one to do the job. Please give it some serious
>consideration. My great love and admiration of Greg aside, the
>man is (literally) the most intelligent, fair, and even handed
>human being I have ever met.

Richard, John, all -

John Velez and I agree on very little, but I would like to
second his nomination of Greg Sandow. He certainly is everything
that John suggested and probably more.

KRandle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:37:10 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:14:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Council Proposal - Evans
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:48:47 -0500

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 17:43:47 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:16:20 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal

>Previously, Richard wrote:

>>>>In any event, I am willing to participate because I do agree
>>>>that any serious discussion of cases is better than endless
>>>>opinion-mongering.

>I replied:

>>>For the record, I do believe in the existence of ET life and ET
>>>visitations to our not so humble planet. That said, however, I
>>>find a problem with the above statement on two points:

>>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>>evidence that can be examined?

>Richard replied:

>>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

>>So, in essence, I am correct after all. By your own admission
>>there is no physical evidence that can be examined, which was my
>>original point. All that's left is a collection of opinions
>>about something that is as elusive as smoke; worse, we are left
>>with opinions about other people's opinions.

Roger,

I have no idea "where you are coming from" with this line of argument, but how you can conclude that I said there is no evidence that can be examined makes me doubt that you heard what I said. Radar sightings, physical trace evidence, and strong testimonial evidence of recurring patterns does not amount to "a collection of opinions..." If you seriously believe that, we have nothing further to discuss.

>Regarding such, I had written:

>>>2) In light of point number one, just what elevates the actions
>>>of the proposed council above more "opinion-mongering"?

>>>I don't see how anyone can have a better opinion than someone
>>>else about something that has never been proven to exist, at
>>>all. Seems rather presumptuous and a bit elitist, to me; like
>>>the opinions of all else are somehow unenlightened if not part
>>>of "the council".

>Richard replied:

>>If the council were to include experienced, scientifically
>>oriented investigators and researchers such as (just for
>>examples) myself, Ray Fowler, Walter Webb, Jennie Zeidman in the
>>U.S.; Jenny Randles and others in the UK; Bill Chalker and Keith
>>Basterfield in Australia, then you have information input from
>>the most experienced and knowledgeable "ufologists" in the world.

>>I see nothing "elitist" about valuing their recommendations
>>higher than those of John or Jane Doe. I definitely do not agree
>>that just anyone's opinion in the UFO field is equally valid
>>with everyone else's, and I have argued that point strongly over
>>the years. Do you think every self-styled financial adviser or
>>medical expert's opinion is equally valid? I don't. Some are
>>quacks or incompetents. People with demonstrated standards and
>>principles are needed, as Josh G. observed.

>Oh, I agree that we need as many experts in the field of UFOs as
>can be mustered. I simply take issue with the notion that any
>exist. Financial advisers, self-styled or otherwise, are at
>least operating within a field where the subject in question,
>money, has been proven to exist. Therefore, results of their
>expertise are quite measurable.

By this I take it that until UFOs have been "proven to exist"
(by whom and under what standards?) no one's opinion is anymore
valuable than anyone else's. Investigative experience,
educational attainments, and demonstrated knowledge do not count
for anything? Sorry. I couldn't disagree more.

>On the other hand, the existence of ET craft has yet to be
>proven. In the end, it would seem, anyone claiming to be an
>expert would be as "self-styled" as the financial advisers you
>allude to above. While I am all for some intelligent thought on
>the matter of ET life, sometimes the common sense of John or
>Jane Doe can be not only welcome, but invaluable in sorting out
>what may or may not be the truth about ET life. After all, we
>don't seem to see thousands of sightings by the "experts"
>themselves. In that sense, what elevates the councils' views
>over that of the common folk that seem to experience sightings
>more often than anyone?

You keep insisting that the reality or "existence" of something
must be "proven" before qualifications to discuss it
intelligently matter. Also, you totally ignore the fact that I
have been a strong defender of the basic accuracy of testimony
from "the common folk."

>I'll take the word of a bad painter that has actually handled a
>brush over one that's only speculated what it must be like to
>paint.

Well, I'm a bad painter who has actually handled a brush, both
literally and figuratively. And, more relevant to the point, I
have been deeply involved in UFO investigations for most of my
adult life. And I still don't understand "where you are coming
from." Let me hear your blueprint for establishing the "truth"
about UFOs and how it differs from mine.

- Dick Hall

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:46:46 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:18:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:26:33 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

>With no dis-respect to our neighbours to the south, I do trust
>that you mean North American when you use the "American" term in
>such a cavalier fashion. Us Canadians get a little touchy about
>being called American.

I would not wish to offend follow subjects of Her Majesty.
However as this list seems to be dominated by people from south
of the border, it was they I was primarily referring to!

>I did not say that we should stop
>investigation when something is determined to be a UFO.

So let's see some real investigation into what Arnold actually
did see. The only person I am aware of who has done this is
Eastman, and see where that got him

>I said
>that we have to stop the Pelican story. Why? Because it cannot
>be proven that what Mr. Arnold saw were Pelicans. In other words,
>stop beating a dead horse, please.

>>Also
>>we are back with the myth of the expert witness: as a pilot
>>Arnold was familiar with most things that flew in the sky. Hmm..
>>do we know that he was familiar with American White Pelicans?
>>Have we seen his membership card for the Audubon Society? Was he
>>familiar with fragmenting meteors seen in daylight? Was he
>>familiar with rare mirage phenomena?

>My apologies for assuming that a pilot might be a little more
>familiar with observing flying objects whilst in flight. If
>anything, he would be watching carefully to make sure he didn't
>fly into anything else that might be up in the sky with him

<snip>

>I also used the word "most" which means
>that there might be the occasional item that he might not be
>able to identify.

Such as, for example a fragmenting meteor? Let's run with this
one for a bit, and let those poor old pelicans carry on fishing!

>>It is this attitude, which seems prevalent on this List, which
>>makes me doubt if an 'Academy' such as Jenny Randles suggests,
>>is feasible in current circumstances. If a re-investigation of
>>the Lakenheath case provokes such hostility in some quarters,
>>can any other case - particularly an American one - be re-opened
>>without similar attempts to stifle any analysis which attempts a
>>mundane explanation.

>No, actually, the Academy that Jenny Randles suggests would
>examine the Pelican 'theory' and place it into one of several
>possible explanations for the Kenneth Arnold incident. They
>would not and should not jump on any one theory and turn it into
>some kind of crusade. We've heard the pelican theory, let's
>move on.

Agreed. So long as we don't know just say "that's enough
pelicans" and put Arnold back into the folder that say
"Mysterious and Unexplained".

>>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>>inconclusively.

>>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of
>>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>>than UFOs.

>You're correct, the proper usage should be conclusive, as the
>evidence should be. However, you're incorrect, when a UFO
>sighting is proven conclusively to be something else, it no
>longer is a UFO, it then becomes an IFO, an Identified Flying
>Object.

But haven't we all just agreed (with the possible exception of
Mr Easton) that we haven't turned Arnold's sighting into an
IFO? So what are we (by whom I mean you Americans, Canadians and
citizens of St. Pierre et Miquelon, as you're nearer to it)
going to do about it?

>Cheers,

>Dave (Furry) Furlotte

L'Chaim

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:31:34 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:22:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>>Gentlemen,

>>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>>they would be UFOs.

>>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

>You seem to be referring to "investigation or analysis" only in
>the sense of eliminating IFO's and other conventional
>explanations (I will use "IFO" as shorthand for all conventional
>explanations). Hynek would say that once the IFO-type screening
>was done that was when the investigation began, scientific
>investigation to learn more about the UFO phenomenon.

I quite agree, so where can we see the serious scientific investigation which is trying to work out what Arnold **really** saw? If it wasn't pelicans (and even a Pelicanist like me admits that it's a very slim chance) what was it? Who's on the case? No-one, because everyone's happy just to leave it that Arnold saw a UFO - end of story. The bunkers don't want to find an answer, because they think they already know it. No matter how much they tiptoe round it they do really think he saw extraterrestrial spaceships. Some one, a reply or two, back suggested he might have seen US secret aircraft. Possibly so, I don't know enough about aviation history to comment, but is someone checking that out?

>>Also
>>we are back with the myth of the expert witness:

>This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynek strenuously
>objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do"
>chapter 12 in The UFO Experience, 1972). Hynek objected that
>Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness
>could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter
>definition of a case in which a scientifically competent
>investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms.

But hang on a minute, isn't this just what we are being told to
do? Like here in Mr Furlotte's words:

>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with _most_
>things that flew up in the sky _with_ him. When he sees
>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>they would be UFOs.

Arnold is an "expert witness", he was "the man on the spot"; I
see that you at least, disagree that expert witnesses are
infallible:

>Again, Hynek would object that the witness is not supposed to
>serve as the scientist on his own case. What is most relevant
>and useful are Arnold's sighting data. True, some of it is
>conflicting but not all of it and the conflicts can be
>rationally discussed. Arnold's experience in having flown more
>than 4,000 hours as a mountain pilot as of June 1947 _does_
>count for something, it's not completely worthless nor is it
>completely probative. It's a factor to be given some weight and
>to be rationally discussed.

Yes, given some weight, but not probative. Hendry found that
avation personel did not have a significantly better rate of
UFO/IFO misidentifications than 'civilian' witnesses.

>As a matter of fact, Arnold almost certainly was familiar with
>American White Pelicans as he overflew the SE Washington/N
>Oregon lake habitats of the AWP's many times in his plane,
>including on his return flight from his famous sighting in June
>1947. He would have had no reason to comment upon it any more
>than he would have had to do so for the many other species of
>birds in the area -- until Easton splashed the Pelican Brief all
>over the Internet in 1999. Of course Arnold was deceased fifteen
>years by then.

I'm not particularly pushing the pelican explanation. In fact it
seems the bunkers are more concerned with pelicans (perhaps the
fact that they are quite funny looking creatures makes it easier
to use them as a term of abuse) than the debunkers. While I
respect the effort that Easton has put into it, I don't actually
notice many other sceptics cheerleading for him. But he has at
least come up with a proposed explanation which can be
rationally debated, and I don't see many people on the other
side of the argument doing that. Oh, of course, I forgot,
Arnold's unidentified flying objects have already been
identified... as UFOs, so no further investigation is required.

>I do have concerns about the response to the re-opening of the
>Arnold case -- but not as to the pelican theory which
>contradicts almost every measurement and observational detail,
>but as to the daytime meteor fireball explanation which merits
>serious consideration.

Then perhaps we could start having some consideration. But I'd
hazard a guess that if you or others started to come up with any
rational theory involving meteor fragments (and that's the one
I'd put a limited amount of money on) the heat will be turned
off the Pelicanists, and some people will start going for the
jugular of the 'Meteorists'. You'd still be demystifying
something which, for many people, must remain a mystery.

>>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>>inconclusively.

>>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of

>>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>>than UFOs.

>I agree but I think it should also be pointed out that by the
>same token many IFO cases can be proven to be UFO's. It is not a
>one-way street that inexorably leads only to the explanation of
>UFO's as conventional phenomena. McDonald salvaged many
>improperly dismissed IFO cases out of the Blue Book files.

And did he then go on to investigate what they really were, or
did he just prove to his own satisfaction that they had suddenly
become mysterious again, and left it at that?

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:56:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:25:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Dung Rains From The Skies - Hatch

>From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dung Rains From The Skies
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:55:39 -0800

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 10:12:19 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Dung Rains from the Skies

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 20:24:33 EST
>>>Subject: Dung Rains from the Skies
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Ladies & Gents:

>>>Please see the following article from The Salt Lake Tribune
>>>regarding an alleged incident in Sevier County, Utah, this week:

>>><http://www.sltrib.com/2001/mar/03152001/utah/79732.htm>

>>>Evidence of OI/NHI?

>>I enjoyed the article. So, its raining terdlets in Utah. I'm
>>hardly surprised. Did you know there are only two or three
>>liquor stores in the entire south end of that very arid desert
>>state? I looked all that up once, just in case.

>>Odd as it may sound, I wonder if they don't have twisters in
>>Utah sometimes. Not your full blown Kansas tornado mind you, but
>>something greater than a dust devil.

>>I have a case listed here of a dirt-sucking tube-tornado which
>>came down from some UFO (supposedly) which was pulling up all
>>sorts of dust, sand and what have you.

>>Sevier County is about as close to the geographical center of
>>Utah as one might get .. maybe Sanpete County takes that prize.
>>My tube-tornado-UFO was near Pelican Lake in Unitah County
>>however, maybe 125 miles NE of the Richland,UT terdlet affair ..
>>and 33 years earlier.

>>If they do have mini-tornados, one might have passed over a cow
>>pasture or sheep range. That's my armchair theory for various
>>frog falls, fish from heaven and similar forteana. I'm sure no
>>twister ever wrecked a brewery in Utah, not that it would much
>>matter.

>>The last time I was in Utah 1996, to be exact I was working a
>>fire near Cedar City, about 20 mi out in the direction of
>>Richfield. Utah seems, in my experience, as a former Aerial fire
>>fighter, to have some of the nastiest Thunderstorms around, and
>>as I can attest, Tornado activity along with them- one touched
>>down just as we were entering the pattern at Cedar, (naturally
>>we were low on fuel) but it did tear up a Barn and attendant
>>feedlot! Larry's theory is probably right about the dunglets.
>>Tornadoes are not uncommon in that area, in fact one tore up
>>Temple Square in Salt Lake City in Early summer of 99'.

>The Fire Crews all had the Liquor store located as that was
>where you could by what passed for Real Beer-as opposed to the
>stuff that was marginally better than tap water in the local
>stores. (Why am I thinking of a Monty Python routine?)

>I am not enamored of the lifestyle that the southern part (or
>any part) of Utah affords, When we'd go to the local wine bar
>(the strongest stuff available at the hotel) they'd cut everyone
>off at the second glass, and you couldn't switch to Beer! They
>threw our mechanics out because they were too loud!(none were
>drunk) as far as I know there were no "private clubs" there.
>Fortune smiled on us,as the next day it snowed and the Fat Lady
>sung, and we escaped from the Bosom of the LDS Church, or some
>such body part!

>So, when I fly or drive I try to make it all the way through
>Utah if I can.

Hello GT:

So there are tornados in Utah! (They are very rare in
California.) Then maybe my armchair flying dunglet theory wasn't
so off-the-wall after all.

I browsed up an official Utah web page showing the convenient
locations of their state liquor stores:

http://www.alcbev.state.ut.us/Stores/locate_store.html

If it were not for one in Moab,UT, on the very banks of the
Colorado river, there would be none at all South or East of the
Colorado river. I see all of three (3) outlets south of the 39th
parallel, an area comprising perhaps 37% of the entire desert
state.

Somebody in Blanding or Monticello, in the dry dry SE corner of
Utah could drive 100 miles or more to find some nice merlot to
go with the fried rattlesnake. With the state of Colorado just
to the East, I wonder if some folks don't simply drive there by
mistake.

(Wines are more economical, since they aren't slapped with the
minimum 61% mark-up required by state law. 750 ml of Dewars
White Label scotch costs \$23.45)

Simply flying over Utah solves that problem of course, but I
prefer to drive. I learned my lesson and keep some anti-freeze
in the trunk of my car just in case.

There are links you can click on from the web-page above, and
learn more about Utah liquor laws and procedures.

Utah is far, far away from Britain or France. Utah makes
Oklahoma look normal, well almost.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 20:32:08 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:31:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Young

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:22:38 -0800

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 13:43:02 -0000

<snip>

>This process must be as open and transparent as possible.

Dear Serge, Dick, Roger, All:

This is the best approach.

>It would not be wise to put 50 years of ufology in the hands of
>the few. This would not be realistic and I believe that any
>process afraid of its people is doomed to failure.

<snip>

>As such, we need a judiciary structure, which selects members
>who apply the rules of a system. This structure would ideally
>become a self-sustained recurrent mechanism that would guaranty
>it's efficiency while using a maximum of available human
>resources.

Is this how scientific disciplines hand publishing and peer review?

<snip>

>An alternative approach might look like this:

>Make a list of the strong cases, and don't be shy about
>trimming. My heart goes to airline pilots cases, radar
>confirmation (not a necessity) and multi-witness military cases.

>Show as much material as possible on a web site.

>Have people take a crack at it.

This sounds like peer review of things to be put on the web
site, followed by wide open debate. I think it might be a sound
approach.

Is anybody here familiar with how a peer-reviewed web journal
works in a scientific discipline?

It seems to me that this would not be a once and done thing.

I think it might help put things in perspective.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 16:58:14 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Mortellaro

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM
>>"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

>>*'OF INTEREST*'

>>REED HOAX RETURNS

>>For those of you already familiar with this hoax, Jonathan Reed
>>is set to appear once again on Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell
>>tonight.

>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and
>>they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's
>>tall tale

>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

>>Among having some bogus alien and UFO photos, Reed has lied
>>about having a conversation with Peter Davenport regarding his
>>'alien in the freezer' story...Why Art Bell claims to support
>>Ufology and then stabs it in the back with a fraud like Reed
>>defies logic...

>I wrote a recent paper regarding a justification for general
>conspiracy based on the for profit actions of the stealth
>psychopath.

><http://www.worldwiderenaissance.org/psycho.html>

>Perhaps a knife in the back of Ufology is not the illogic it
>appears. There are all sorts of profit. There are all sorts of
>reasons to have an apparent red herring on a syndicated radio
>show, neither of which is at the root and are peripheral issues.
>A mainstream look at the monstrous amount of data pervading the
>honest record is regarded with reflexive enmity by that
>mainstream.

>Why is that?!

>The reasons for mainstream dismissal of the ufological are not
>validated by lack of data (there's plenty), the disrespected
>interest of a, so called, New Age community (People want
>explanation, and it's a new age after all), or a regretted
>retreat from traditional scientific 'values' (which only serve
>selected interests). A preponderance of evidence that is
>historic, photographic, physical, anecdotal, and personal
>dictates a wide aperture ufological interest that demands
>intensive mainstream investigation which is not forthcoming.

>Again -- Daniel Sheehan seems to have a solid plan for providing
>an impetus regarding the mechanism for a quality mainstream
>investigation into these perplexing ufological matters. These
>are matters critical to the sociological, psychological, and
>physiological health of every living thing on this planet. Mr.
>Sheehan has had some success in the struggle with assorted
>Goliaths. I suggest he's tailor made, and has the correct
>approach for gainful employment in this area. I suggest further,
>and again, that a measure of his likely success in lancing this
>ufological boil is how his proposal was so chillingly ignored by
>the ufological "principals". There are MORE than enough
>effectual individuals to provide for and fund the class-action
>legal mechanism Sheehan suggests. I remind the reader that
>Ufology is second in importance only to sex vis a vis habitual
>users of the internet. This suggests a huge interested base. I
>think it's worth investigation. There is none.

>Regarding UFOWATCHDOG... seems to me that you are, so far,
>trying to take a balanced alien view on the subject and provide
>for an energetically evenhanded effort to provide a little more
>clarity. Thrashing around in the sociopathic's china shop is
>just what the Doctor ordered, and after my own heart. Just don't
>be too selective in the sociopaths that you confront and you
>will have provided a service that has been, and continues to be,
>very much needed. The stealth sociopath is ubiquitous,
>_everywhere_, and on both sides of the ufological fence.

Dear Alfred, bListeners, Researchers and EBK,

Indeed, all too true for the intellectually depraved to
comprehend; even they. And alas, all too true for the mainstream
scientist as well.

Last evening there was a play on PBS TV for money. Their semi-
annual demand for the bucks they so richly deserve. And as part
of the pitch, was a replay of the best Dr. Sagan's wonderful
series, one which even I admired and I am not a Sagan fan.

I admired Sagan's astronomy and was indeed exposed to it via my
employment at Gremlin Airtrash, on the OAO program. I was
terribly impressed. But then he changed horses in midstream as
quickly as some of the researchers here on UpDates have done in
past, just to sell a book. In Sagan's case, just to sell a
career. Pelican poop.

I digress.

Sagan did a program on one of the most celebrated UFO abduction
stories ever, The Betty and Barney Hill abduction. I remember so
well being extremely angry the first time this show ran, later
in the series. But this time I was exceedingly angry, because
I've experienced much more in the years following Sagan's
adventures in television broadcasting. And what pissed me off
was Sagan's tossing off of all of the anecdotal evidence and
some of the semi hard evidence of what he termed as dreams. Yah,
identical dreams. But again, I digress.

His main speech in that program was (which has become the guidon
of many of you out there) "Extraordinary Claims require
Extraordinary Evidence."

Alfred, the problem with mainstream science, Sagan and the
skeptidopeys out there in the void, is that ANY evidence which
is not hard and contains no hard evidence, extraordinary
evidence, is discounted. Which is why these folks are out there,
in the VOID.

No tickie, no shirtie. No Saucer on the lawn, then you got no
Mott's. You got Nuttin, Honey. And right there, in your face, is
the problem. They refuse to acknowledge ANY evidence.

Now the question, Alfred, is why!? And my answer, (mine alone)
is short and sweet. To me at least. They are afraid. Broken
paradigms mean new knowledge and new knowledge means starting
all over again. They are scared little weenies. Without
portfolio. Never will have what it takes to engage in,
participate in and contribute to, the Renaissance of this
planet. The New Renaissance! They who remain standing still
will fall far behind faster than those who walk only more

slowly.

See y'all when we come back as people who know enough to boldly go where these folks only fear and debunk. There.

Nya, Nya.

Dr. Morty,

President and Prince of the abductees... I am getting my portfolio too....

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:39:49 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:25:07 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Gates

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:45:08 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Handwriting

>Hello, all...

>A recent thread got me to thinking about (moan) Alien Autopsy,
>again. There has always been something about the way AA was shot
>that bothered me and a recent question about analysis of the
>doctors' handwriting suddenly made me realize what it was.

>Here's the problem:

>According to AA proponents, the footage was shot on an old Bell
>and Howell, spring wound Filmo 16mm camera. This camera had a
>limited run time for each wind of the camera and, as I
>understand it, film was in short supply which accounts for the
>type of film used. In addition, the cameraman was wearing
>protective gear (hood, gloves, etc.) which supposedly made
>handling the camera harder than usual.

>So, if film and run time was at a premium and the gear made
>handling the camera difficult, then why in the world is the
>cameraman shooting useless footage of the "doctor" writing stuff
>down? Each roll of film is only going to last about 2.5 minutes
>or so. Why waste film on the doctor writing stuff down when such

Roger,

Naturally one presumes that the AA supporters will now give us
all the reasons and storys as to why this event lends to
authenticity. The point is well taken, why waste resources on a
doctor writing something on a clip board unless one can make out
the writing in the film and somehow, somehow the note was of
some incredible historical value. Nah, not likely.

Perhaps the note actually :) read:

"Dear President Truman,

We are going to disembowl the alien carcass, so if your stomach
is not feeling well after watching everything thus far, you
should leave the room so as not to barf in front of the cameraman
recording all this for history...

Thanks,

Dr. X

>unnecessary footage is only going to mean having to change
>precious film sooner which, in itself, is going to require
>removing the cameraman's gloves, etc. A friend has an old Filmo
>and, try as I may, I cannot load film in the darned thing with
>rubber gloves on. Film waste aside, why even bother shooting
>such a thing in the first place unless only for show? After all,
>AA is supposed to be a documentation of the procedure, not a
>movie of the paper documentation of the procedure.

Don't worry, somehow, someday the AA supporters will turn this into how it conclusively proves the film is real because if it was hoaxed, they wouldn't have wasted the time with the Dr writing on the clipboard. Kind of like Woods arguments with the purported MJ-12 documents. How various and many typing errors in the documents actually prove that they are real blah blah.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: **Bruce Maccabee** <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:48:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:27:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>>mathematician-meteoriticist Lincoln LaPaz whose
>>observational and investigative skills put him in a class by
>>itself and well above the vast majority of the best UFO cases,
>>in effect having the world's best visual observer/investigator
>>as a UFO witness.

>Brad, Jenny, Dick, List:

>Whatever Lincoln LaPaz's credentials are, or were, this is
>really not a supportable statement. There is, and was, no such
>acknowledged category. Intense green fireballs, for example,
>can certainly be natural in nature. Richard Haines' book,
>Observing UFOs, provides an explanation for this color, and
>associated color changes, in the chemical functioning of the >
>human eye. I don't think that the research Haines cited had been
>done in LaPaz's day.

>He may very well have been a very good investigator. More is
>probably a stretch.

Regarding "intense green fireballs":

La Paz argued that the fireballs sighted in the 1948-49-50 time frame were unusual, but color was only one reason. Of more importance were the flat trajectories reported by numerous witnesses including security guards and La Paz himself and the concentration of the events in the southwestern USA.

You can find quite a bit about the fireball mystery in The UFO FBI Connection because the FBI was made aware of the events and of La Paz's suggestion that if they weren't a US secret project then they might be... he suggested they were (and Hoover echoed this through Walter Winchell) --- Soviet missiles "zeroing-in" on the nuclear weapon sites in the USA.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 00:01:19 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:29:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rudiak

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>Fwd Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 18:09:18 -0500
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>I do have concerns about the response to the re-opening of the
>Arnold case -- but not as to the pelican theory which
>contradicts almost every measurement and observational detail,
>but as to the daytime meteor fireball explanation which merits
>serious consideration.

Brad, I expect statements like this coming from scientific illiterate debunkers (you know who you are) and maybe even some literate ones (someone like Menzel leaps to mind), but I'm rather surprised to hear it coming from you. The only reason to seriously consider the meteor theory is to quickly note the impossibility of it and then toss it in the skepti-bunker garbage heap along with the rest of the Dumb and Dumber explanations for the Arnold sighting.

The meteor fireball theory would have to be rejected for the exact same reason you rationally reject the pelican theory - it contradicts almost every measurement and observational detail provided by Kenneth Arnold. Furthermore, as you yourself have noted, conventional explanations for UFO sightings should surely obey conventional physics. Meteors as the Arnold objects most certainly do not.

Consider:

1. The elevation angle reported by Arnold (slightly below his visual horizon) would have placed the objects at a very low altitude of no more than a few miles. No fireball travelling at meteoric speeds (tens of thousands of miles per hour) at such low altitudes could last for more than a few seconds. Arnold's sighting was for at least 2 minutes. In fact, I don't know of any documented meteor fireball sighting in history that lasted for more than a minute, much less 2+ minutes. (They burn out, "skip out," explode, or hit the ground long before then.)
2. Meteor fireballs do not fly horizontally at low altitudes, pass in front of mountains 25 miles away, and at speeds of less than 2000 mph. (more details of Arnold's sighting)
3. Meteor fireballs at lower altitudes (less than 30 miles) do not fly silently but leave an explosive sonic boom.
4. Meteor fireballs leave trails. Arnold's objects did not.
5. Meteor fireballs of the size Arnold described would not be almost blindingly bright in broad daylight. They would not suddenly turn off and appear to be almost invisible dark lines backlit by snowfields, then suddenly flair up and become brilliantly bright again.
6. Meteors don't play "follow-the-leader" and maneuver like the "tail of a Chinese kite."

Long-lived fireballs are generally visible over tens of

thousands of square miles and usually attract a lot of attention. This is because of their higher altitudes, lengthy paths, smoky trails, and noise they generate. We should have expected a lot of reports of such fireballs from places hundreds of miles east of Arnold's position (where the fireballs would have to be located to ever have a chance of being meteor fireballs travelling horizontally at meteor speeds). But there are no such reports.

Instead, there are maybe 2 or 3 known corroborating reports from Arnold's immediate area. The latter situation is consistent with a more localized event taking place silently at low altitude in a sparsely populated, rugged, heavily wooded wilderness area. High-speed objects whizzing overhead in such conditions could easily have gone unnoticed by the few people in the area since they would generally be in view for only a few seconds from ground level.

In addition, meteors hundreds of miles away would have their intensity greatly diminished by atmospheric absorption (think of how we can actually look briefly at the sun at sunset when it is near the horizon). Arnold would never have reported such meteors as appearing as bright as an electric arc or nearly blinding him with their glare.

Worse yet for the meteor theory, for the meteors to have had any chance of flying horizontally for any length of time, they would have had to be skimming the upper fringes of our atmosphere at speeds of at least orbital velocity. This would place them approximately 70 or 80 miles up at speeds of at least 17,000+ mph (darn low by meteor standards). At this lower limit for the velocity and at the needed altitude, the meteors would have been at least 250 miles away and elevated in altitude by nearly 20 degrees above Arnold. But Arnold's observation placed them at an elevation where they appeared to be skimming the tops of the southern Cascade mountains, approximately 2 degrees below his visual horizon. (When I do the math, this works out to an altitude of only 2 miles - time to get out the umbrella.)

Honestly, I can't think of a single thing supportive of the meteor theory other than they could outfly Arnold's plane, quite unlike those ridiculous pelicans.

David Rudiak

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 00:03:06 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:32:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Young

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:28:32 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 08:33:39 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>I'm leaning toward Phil Klass's fireball meteor explanation, see
>>points #1, 3 & 4, above.

<snip>

>Well, anyway, I wouldn't lean very far, if I were you. You might
>find a tilted stance to be highly unstable, especially if you
>accept Arnold's claim that the sighting lasted perhaps 2.5
>minutes, but certainly more than the 103 seconds Arnold reported
>as the time to travel from Rainier to Mt. Adams. A meteor would
>over that distance in 1/10 of the time.

Unless it was in the far distance, and actually a great deal
further away. Meteors glow above 20 kms or so. A meteor
photographed in the early 1970s had a horizon to distance time
of 110 seconds.

>And meteors in a
>nominally level trajectory at an altitude less than 2 miles is
>"unheard of." (They would slo down,. cool down and not glow
>anymore... and furthermore, would fall to earth.)

That's true, unless they were at a great distance.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 01:58:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:51:23 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez

>From: Stephen G. Bassett <SGBList2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:23:41 EST
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:25:43 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

<snip>

>>If people have certain doubts about abduction matters, you might
>>at least credit the likes of Leir and Sims for clouding matters
>>beyond recognition.

>Gentlemen,

>An article was just forwarded to UpDates regarding an incident
>of feces dropping from the sky in Sevier County, UT. I think we
>now know whence the dung comes.

I believe it was the sky Steven. I haven't flown in awhile so I
cannot be held culpable. ;)

>Neither one of you have foggiest idea as to merit of Roger
>Leir's work, the implant removals, what they may or may not have
>demonstrated, and what he has gone through because he dared to
>stick his neck out and address a known and reported aspect of
>the experienter/abductee phenomena.

That's not true Steven. EBK will bear witness that back in 1995
I was one of the few that were supporting Dr. Lier's efforts to
recover some of these 'alleged' implants. I had developed a
friendship with two of the people who were the first candidates
to undergo the surgical procedure. I was closer to the issue
than you give me credit for. I don't know if you were involved
at the time, but there was fierce opposition and ridicule being
aimed at Dr. Lier and anyone who supported their efforts. I
fought hammer and tongs over the issue right here on this List.
(and with some heavyweight people too. There were a lot more
well known ufologists and sceptics active on the List back
then.)

I have earned the right to express an opinion about Dr.Lier.
He promised that the recovered objects would be analyzed
by an independent lab and that the results would be published
in peer review journals. That my friend, is what I was in
support of.

*And not out of idle curiosity either. Myself, my wife, and my
children are involved in this. 'Things' don't touch any closer
to home, or inspire a stronger sense of urgency in me than that.

You know me awhile Steven, I'm not out here promoting myself,
selling books, pitching belief systems, or playing word games
as 'some' do. This isn't a personality or a popularity contest

for me.

I do not bring any psychological or emotional baggage ("needs") to be fulfilled here on the List. (again, unlike some others, I have a very rich and deeply rewarding family and social life away from this dreaded arena.)

I am a sound, experienced, and "Whole" person. A 'serious' 52 year old man who is only here to -work- and to -contribute- in any meaningful way that I can.

A few who take up bandwidth here on the List cannot honestly say that about themselves. "They" are usually the ones that get 'back of the hand' treatment from me. I have said it countless times, I have little patience for fools and fakers. I'm here to work not play. I'm as thoughtful, real, and "straight-arrow" about my contributions and my involvement as I can be.

I'm not 'coming down' on Dr. Lier (or anybody else for that matter) for any frivolous reasons. I have good reason for it in Dr. Liers case.

I can justify it.

That goes for any of the few others I have 'trimmed at the ankles' on this List.

Steven,

Because I like you, I'm going to sit here and hammer this out on the keyboard one more time. For you, and any Listerions who weren't members in July/August,1995 when all this first transpired.

You tell me if I'm being unreasonable, Steven. I'll listen to what you have to say. You have earned that much respect from me.

I backed Lier because I thought he was going to do all the things he promised he would. (Independent analysis, publication of results in peer review journals, and that it would all be handled and executed according to very strict scientific standards, etc. etc. etc.) For a brief time, I thought the sun shone out of Dr.Lier's a**. What a sorry disappointment he turned out to be.

Instead of what was 'advertised' on the front end, what he 'delivered' was:

1. Gross mishandling of the materials. (chain of custody) It was handled so incompetently in fact that he almost literally invalidated the results before he had them in hand.

One of the people I have communicated with over the years was a police detective for 25 years. He was so outraged at how the materials were handled, that he was moved to write me a long letter outlining what he called, "evidence procedures that an academy rookie would know." He was so outraged that he speculated that Lier had to have done it on purpose, (intentionally invalidate the evidence by not maintaining a clear chain of custody.) That's strong stuff coming from an experienced pro! Not being as experienced myself, I give a lot of weight to such 'educated opinions.'

His handling of the foreign objects left way too many holes for serious scientists to do pirouettes through, and to call into question the integrity of both the materials, and the data.

2. Instead of at a 'neutral' and independent laboratory, hospital or academic institution, the 'foreign objects' ended up at NIDS!

Enter Bob Bigelow -again! - Bob Bigelow's NIDS is not I repeat, not a "neutral, or academically accredited" laboratory or research institution. It is Mr. Bigelow's private lab (guys with his kind of \$ can afford to have bigger and better toys than the rest of us. In Bigelows case he bought himself a whole GD lab and a staff.)

The only legitimate lab that Dr. Lier claims to have used, denies any knowledge of the business, (vehemently!) And the scientist whose name he mentioned in connection to the "meteorite content" of the "implants", has become exasperated trying to explain what he 'really meant,' and how he rues the day he ever got involved with Sims and Lier.

Those two pained denials are the sum total of Dr. Liers academic 'credentials' for his findings.

3. The only "publication" where any "results" have been published is guess where? That's right! Dr. Lier's book! Not the Journal of Medicine, or any other peer review journals, but in a privately written book that profits, guess who again... that's right, the good doctor!

4. After three years had passed (1998) and still neither Leir or Sims had published anything. Although both of them had been working the lecture circuit to death the whole time. Oh, and guess what the subject of the lectures was,...that's right, "Recovered Alien Implants.") I offered Dr. Lier a 'possibility' to have his 'foreign objects' studied by some doctors at Columbia University Hospital here in New York. One of the finest institutions in the world with an impeccable reputation in the medical and the academic community. He didn't respond. The conversation between us just dropped suddenly. I wrote him two more times offering to try to get the Columbia people to look at them. No response. Then, or since.

Tell you what Steven, if the day ever comes when the good doctor lives up to his (original promises,) I'll back him 100%. It's not going to happen though. Know why? It's already been six years since the first surgery and he hasn't lived up to his word yet. I don't expect him to change colors overnight. As you are well aware, Johnny can be as powerful an advocate as he can be a thorn in the side. ;)

>Anyone who enters the fray, particularly those whose careers
>require any type of certification are easy targets for the
>debunkers and "offended" mainstreamers scared silly by what the
>research is unfolding. Nothing works better to knock someone
>out of the game like taking away a person's livelihood short of
>taking away their life.

Steven, I'm expressing honest and informed opinions about Dr. Lier and how he conducts his business. It's just an expression of opinion though. I'm not trying to steal the bread out of any man's mouth. Much less 'kill' anyone. ;)

>John, over the years I have developed a growing appreciation for
>the contribution you have brought to the table. You have a
>fierceness and determination which is activist in style, and you
>refuse to back down. If something doesn't work out, you try
>something else.

Combination of being a "cause activist" all of my adult life, and way too many years of playing chess to win! <LOL >Steven, I worked for ten+ years with drug addicts on the street, and in the prisons. I protested the war at Columbia back in the 60's, I have attended every anti-nuke rally ever staged in the New York area. It's a Habit bro. Been doing it all my life with things I believe in.

My abduction experiences are no different. ;)

>But for some reason, you are unable to lose your tendency to
>piss on others who are trying to find the answers to this
>complex new reality within a context that has been subverted and
>propagandized by their own government.

Please refer to above. (regarding 'who' and 'why' I will "piss" on someone.) It is not a tool I pull from the bag often or easily. But I'm not afraid to use it either. As my Canadian buddies taught me, "some people need to be slapped upside-down their head!" <LOL>

Only when I really think it's the kind of response that the person deserves (or has earned from me) will you see me 'doing that.' I do it for a reason not out of a 'need' or 'lack of control.'

Also, I'm a New Yorker Steven. I'm not kidding man, I grew up on some tough streets in uptown Manhattan. I learned both to defend myself, and not to take sh*t from anybody at very tender age. There's some of that mixed in there too I'm afraid. I can't help that. It's a part of 'who' I am. Many find the frankness and directness of New Yorkers to be pushy or offensive. It isn't. It's just cut to the chase, no nonsense, straight from the hip, shooting. ;)

I'm not a "bad guy." ;)

>When you launch yourself into the mode represented by the above
>exchange, you engage in hubris.

It's not, Steven, honest. I'm speaking the truth and expressing my disappointment and frustration a an abductee who has waited for some 'hard evidence' to materialize in support of our claims. That, is where I'm coming from amigo, I swear to that.

>Some thrive on that kind of
>indulgence, but you are better than that and the people you
>occasionally target deserve better than that. Many of those same
>people would unhesitatingly rise to defend you, if circumstance

Oh, I 'think' I know 'who' you heard that from. He tells that to all the boys Steven! ;)

Sometimes my friend, what some people 'say' is not necessarily what they actually 'do.' ;) Don't believe everything you read!
<LOL>

Warm regards,

John Velez, Used to was 'long haired', Pinko, hippie freak. ;)

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:00:27 +0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:53:20 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Morris

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:45:08 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Handwriting

>Hello, all...

>A recent thread got me to thinking about (moan) Alien Autopsy,
>again. There has always been something about the way AA was shot
>that bothered me and a recent question about analysis of the
>doctors' handwriting suddenly made me realize what it was.

>Here's the problem:

>>According to AA proponents, the footage was shot on an old Bell
>and Howell, spring wound Filmo 16mm camera. This camera had a
>limited run time for each wind of the camera and, as I
>understand it, film was in short supply which accounts for the
>type of film used. In addition, the cameraman was wearing
>protective gear (hood, gloves, etc.) which supposedly made
>handling the camera harder than usual.

<snip>

Roger,

Nope, no one said film in general was in short supply,
military cameramen from that time frame have reported that
colour footage was difficult to get hold of. Neil.

```
--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0
Manchester. 1
M13.9PL. UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/
```

Radio Callsign G8KQO
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

* * * * *

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 05:19:58 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:56:36 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers

>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 11:31:56 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01

>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Previously, Royce posted:

>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and
>>they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's
>>tall tale

>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

>Hi, Royce!

>If you look at the photos of the black ship, you will notice
>that the shadows are on the opposite side than the trees in the
>background. There's a tree to the far right of the picture as
>well as one to the far left. If you look closely, you will see
>that the shadows are on the right side of both trees while the
>shadow side of the black ship is on the left. Amateur stuff. The
>guy is a joke.

Reed is one of the biggest hoaxers I have seen - almost as bad
as Sean David Morton. The other interesting thing about Reed's
bogus photos is that you can see holes in the ship which reveal
the background of the forest. Now Bob Shell is reported to have
verified the negatives are genuine, but hasn't verified that
what's in the photos are real:

<http://www.aliendestiny.com/Page%20NegativeAuthentication/Page%20NegativeAuthentication.htm>

Shell's report only states that the negatives are normally
exposed negatives and does not go into any real in-depth
analysis. I could take a picture of anything and have anyone
verify that the negatives were normally exposed. This doesn't
prove anything and Reed won't step up with any credible evidence
because he doesn't have any.

I am in the process of burying this shameless ruse once and for
all. As soon as my investigation is complete, the results will
be posted at my website for all to view. If anyone in the
Seattle area has any information about the individuals shown in
any of the photos below, please contact me:

PHOTOS:

<http://www.aliendestiny.com/Page%20Reed%20Pictures/Page%20Reed%20Pictures.htm>

PHOTOS:

<http://www.aliendestiny.com/Page%20Reed%20Music/Page%20Reed%20Music.htm>

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III

UFOWATCHDOG.COM

"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind...or silly photos of rubber alien heads and ludicrous claims of alien contact you've made up in an attempt to dip into someone's wallet..."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 09:47:18 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 22:58:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:41:58 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 23:02:58 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:53:08 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

<snip>

>>>Hello Gary,

>>>You wrote:

>>>>Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses
>>>>absorb published material and regurgitate it in their
>>>>stories or hypnosis.

>>>Geez, is this what this is all about for you? To revert
>>>back to expressions of my youth, "What a bring down and a
>>>stone cold bummer man!"

>>Chris wrote:

>>Hi John,

>>Actually, it was me who wrote that.

>><snip>

>>In fact, you inspired me to write it when you said

>>"I have tried(to no avail)to keep myself as "unpolluted"
>>by the reports of others as I could. Because of the
>>nature of my involvement that has been impossible."
>>(March 14th)

John wrote:

>You conveniently twist the meaning/context of my statement
>and call it "inspiration."

Hi John,

Sorry you think I was deliberately twisting your meaning. I did not distort your words (except in my silly rendering of your silly phrase at the end)and I don't think there was any clear context from which to take anything. We could say I misinterpreted what you said, which is different.

>"Imagination" is more like it. And if you are attempting
>to paint any of my own (conscious) recollections as
>"polluted" or the result of "contamination" boy did you
>dial a wrong number.

I don't judge your case, John, and what's more I confess to never having read up on it. My only point was that abductees are known to have based parts of their testimonies on those of others, knowingly or not. You can't seriously deny this, surely?

>Just to 'clarify' my statement for you, (that you have so
>tortuously twisted) I meant after I began to investigate
>my own experiences. Budd was the first (and only)
>investigator I have ever contacted and he was very careful
>to keep me isolated from other abductees for about three
>months or more.

If this is so, then both you and Budd are obviously aware that the risk of contamination exists. I rest my case, and really don't want to carry on with this conversation.

>That is what I was referring to. Not what you twisted
>it into. John Velez, I have had my words twisted more than
>Dorothy's braids in the Wizard of Oz. ;)

To return to the main thread of our correspondence, lack of 3-3s in pre-Strieber reports is suspicious, and that is true whether the 'nine beeps' can be proved real or not. The same is true about the Greys. Where are the pre-1980s reports of Greys? They are few and far between, despite descriptions of similar entities (but not identical ones) in the UFO literature of that period and far more ancient descriptions in folklore etc.

I do not reject 'abduction reality' per se but as a rational observer I cannot find anything to dispell every one of my doubts.

Chris Aubeck

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Best Case Standards - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 12:42:02 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:05:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Best Case Standards - Randles

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Best Case Standards
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 14:12:23 -0000

>Owing to the skepticism about alleged "elitism" in ufology (I've
>heard this before many times), I wish to elaborate my ideas
>about what constitutes a "strong case." First, everyone should
>be able to agree that we should try to present the cream of the
>crop to science, and that scoffers or sceptics should desire to
>have us make our strongest case.

>The following are among the more important elements that should
>be factored into the selection process (not that all the
>elements should necessarily be present in every case):

>(1) Multiple independent witnesses; elementary (at least)
>character information about them, and evidence of their
>observing skills.

Hi,

I think this is one area where we agree completely. And the word
'independent' is crucial. Just by seeking out multiple
independently located witnesses to an event we are making an
immediate and important distinction in the calibre of cases.

>(2) Proximity information based on angular size, environmental
>effects, and/or observed passage in front of known landmarks.

This is going to be more tricky as witness perceptions of
height, size, distance etc are notoriously misleading. I am not
sure how we can be sure enough of these factors based on witness
testimony alone. But perhaps backed by other kinds of data (eg
video or photography or radar to confirm proximity) we might be
able to do something.

For instance, the famous Belgian wave from 1990 features a lot
of sightings reputed to show football field sized objects at
very low height. If we base our judgement purely on that factor
alone it would fit this criterion.

But the wave has much in common with similar cases that occurred
in the UK in the preceding months and years and that had
identical witness descriptions. In those cases (and I think by
reasonable inference we might argue in some of those from
Belgium later) what the witnesses were truly observing was a
large formation of aircraft involved in a military refuelling
exercise as a secret practice for imminent Middle East bombing
raids.

The witnesses observed a dozen aircraft at great height moving
in a well lit formation and the 'slow' speed was an optical
illusion due to the great height at which this formation was
flying. The 'object' seemed to be very large (due to the great
area of sky covered by what were in reality many different - but
interconnected - 'objects' that got mis-perceived as part of one
object).

In these cases the witnesses invariably made the assumption that they were seeing lights on just one object of what they naturally took to be aircraft like size which was thus perceived as very low down (owing to its huge apparent size) and as moving very slowly (because it did move relatively slowly across their field of view).

In reality these aircraft were covering an area much greater than that of one plane and moving at normal aircraft like speeds that simply appeared a lot slower due to the underestimate in actual height made subconsciously by the witnesses - an effect that amounted to a factor of about 30.

So witness testimony about size and proximity can be seriously misleading in my experience. And this needs to be guarded against. The precaution you suggest of a UFO moving in front of an object at known distance is a wise one.

>(3) Geometrical shape and/or structure visible; body lights;
>protrusions; "portholes"; light beams; etc.

Perhaps, but again serious caveats apply. The re-entry of the Cosmos 1068 booster in December 1978 brought numerous sightings of a rocket like object with windows or portholes in the UK. Based on a consistency of multiple independently located witnesses we would have seemed justified in arguing that this must have been what was really out there - viz some kind of alien craft.

But it wasn't. The cigar shape with windows/portholes was an optical illusion created by the mind 'joining the dots' (as often happens in UFO cases) and connecting what was merely a trail of debris spread far apart as it burned up in the atmosphere - turning this into a line of windows on a single dark bodied object. The mind filled in the rest in a powerfully convincing illusion.

Here we had certain knowledge of the Russian rocket burn up and film taken by one witness showing exactly what all these people had mis-perceived. That proved the key that unlocked the mis-perception.

But if we had not had the fortune of either of those things then relying on multiple witness perception of a structured craft with portholes would in this case (and surely in others as yet unidentified) have proven seriously misleading.

>(4) One or more forms of physical evidence (radar, ground
>traces, E-M effects, heat...)

Physiological and physical evidence - whilst still, of course, open to other interpretations, is certainly in my view a better place to look for evidence of something interesting going on. Although the big problem is that these forces infer only the presence of a physical energy. In of itself this does nothing to point towards the viability of the ETH as there are many other kinds of phenomena (eg forms of naturally occurring UAP) that might not be recognised by science as yet but could trigger such effects.

So in a sense we need more than simply 'a tingling sensation' or 'car stop effect' within a case to point towards any clear hint of the ETH.

For instance, witness A described a big purple blob that creates major physical effects (burns his skin, effects his motorbike engine, etc). If verified this is an impressive case of a UAP. But why assume it is an alien craft that glows like a purple blob and not some kind of atmospheric phenomenon that generates a purple blob as a side effect - such as via ionization ?

On the other hand, the sequence of cases involving car stop effects in New Mexico and Texas in November 1957, tied to the truly remarkable 'simultaneous' UFO sightings over the bunkers in the US where the first atom bomb was exploded and the most recent atomic test site (at Maralinga in Australia) - all during the very short period that this planet puts our first two craft into space and our first terrestrial life form goes up in sputnik - now that is a hugely interesting combination of events that

does - in my eyes - argue beyond a series of UAP towards the prospect of an intelligent pattern that we might define as suggestive of the ETH.

So - I think - we need to look beyond just physical effects to cases that offer that little something extra, as here.

>(5) On site investigation and reconstruction; thorough witness
>interrogations; thorough investigation of any possible mundane
>explanations.

Absolutely. Indeed, to go further, I don't think any case should be considered that has not had at least two independently conducted investigations by different investigators/groups that have reached broadly similar conclusions as to its credibility.

But these seem a good place to work from.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - McGonagle

From: Joe McGonagle <joem_cgonagle@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:11:17 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:07:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - McGonagle

>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:01:32 -0500

<snip>

>a natural event, one would think that the number of sightings
>would be consistent through time.

Hello, Steve,

Perhaps the phenomenon is consistent through time, but the cycle of activity hasn't been discovered yet?

It may be that a large asteroid or comet, with say, a high copper content disintegrated a long time ago, and the remains were spread over quite a large area, but still maintain a more or less orbital path. This path may only intersect with Earth's orbit every 300? years or so.

Regards,

Joe

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:36:42 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:09:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 12:16:59 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:27:40 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>Yes, a colloquium was held at the Smithsonian Institution in
>>>Washington, D.C., with both advocates and sceptics/debunkers
>>>participating.

>>September 1980, I believe.

>Thanks. What was the title of this session? Are there
>proceedings available? This might be something good to have
>around.

The only title I recall is "Smithsonian UFO Debate" and there
were no proceedings.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:49:27 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:11:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Mortellaro

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 17:53:22 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

Snip

>What nonsense. Like many others I get reports or read reports
>all of the time claiming UFO sightings. I blow most of them off.
>I won't even consider lights in the sky anymore unless it
>resolves into something much closer and moves over a large area
>of the sky and has some definition. There's just too much up
>there to misidentify.

>But I guess I wasted my time posting what I did as a reply to
>your posting I guess John. I think what I was trying to say is
>that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Meaning, 'The
>Bird In The Hand' was Arnold on the spot with the knowledge,
>technical knowhow, experience and the actual sighting, while
>we've got 2 birds/debunkers like yourself and Easton sitting in
>your armchairs in England 53 years later, second guessing him.
>And that's all you are doing is second guessing. Don't try and
>dress it up with nonsense about research.

>Arnold's sighting hasn't come close to being explained by Easton
>or anyone else. So far, Arnold is the one with the credible
>experience and on the spot.

>
>Nothing I've seen yet has come close to convincing me that he
>didn't see what he claimed to see. Give me something credible
>and I'll buy in - but not before then.

Dear Don,

What a co-inky-dink! My uncle, who is also my Godfadda, is a
Don.

I must admit to not being a researcher. In this I am blessed, as
I would not make a good one. I am too enamored with truth,
justice and the American Way. The latter of which is to say that
I love guns, drive-by shootings, gangsta rap and don't believe
that them ugly critters what gave me fibersigmoidascopes before
they invented fiber sigs.

Where was I?

Oh, yes. How about them Mets? No, I meant to write that I
appreciate your words. In the face of cleaning my new (talkin
about Sigs) Sig Sauer four hundred magnum, four hundred calibre
nug (I'm dyslexic), I wanted to write this to yous.

The real message I wished to convey is this, why the hell
don't you people do what that crazy Gesundt did. Go and
interview some Pelicans. They'll ALWAYS tell you the truth.
It is a very well known fact that pelicans don't lie, unlike the
rest of us... to themselves.

Jessy Mortellaro,

President and Prince.... I got my portfolio and I am now
looking at the thrown, throan... the big chair.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:50:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:27:45 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Kaeser

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

>Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
>A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by inuendo, not proof and
>made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization. A
>simple twist of fate. Accomplished nothing. Proved less
>than nothing and if the gods exist, should be followed by
>the action of going around, coming around. One would
>hope.

>Jim Mortellaro

While Carpenter has not been convicted of wrongdoing, his actions in transferring files for money (even if it is only one file) causes concerns that have not yet been addressed. That transfer has never been denied, and while this matter may have been handled in what all parties believe to have been a proper manner, it apparently caught a number of his research subjects (or "Clients" in the eyes of some) by surprise.

Carpenter may have become a scapegoat, but IMO the MUFON organization was becoming tainted by its silence in this matter and something needed to be done to clear the air. I will add that it has become very difficult to work with most of the abduction researchers in trying to develop research projects, and I believe that is due in part to the issues raised by this transfer of data.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Gulf Breeze Books?

From: Tom Benson <sparkle@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 11:58:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:30:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Gulf Breeze Books?

>From: Thiago Ticchetti <thiagolt@opengate.com.br>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Gulf Breeze Books?
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:21:27 -0300

>I`m looking for books about the Gulf Breeze Sightings,
>especially those by Ed walters, but at amazon.com and
>b&n.com they are out of print.

>I would like to know if someone of you have one to sell or
>indicate a place that I can find them.

>Thanks and regards to all.

>Thiago Luiz Ticchetti
>Entidade Brasileira de Estudos Extraterrestres(Brasília/Brasil)
>(EBE-ET VICE PRESIDENT)

>Hi Thiago and List:

I am a long time UFO researcher and an internet dealer on
"Advanced Book Exchange". I have a few hardback and softback
books (out of print):on Gulf Breeze sightings.

Tom Benson

sparkle@earthlink.net

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 12:21:07 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:35:06 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

>Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
>A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by innuendo, not proof and
>made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization.

Politically inspired? Sacrificial lamb? Innuendo? No proof?
Where have you been all this time? Mars? Moon?

>A simple twist of fate. Accomplished nothing. Proved less
>than nothing and if the gods exist, should be followed by
>the action of going around, coming around. One would
>hope.

I'm the one that brought all this up to begin with. I'm the guy
on the other end of your wish for all this nasty business to
"come around" as you say. But then I'm not the one who's out
there selling the files of witnesses for cash to private
citizens.

You are the only person who has been (consistently) 'out of
touch' with what this Carpenter issue is really all about.
It's just _you!_ ;)

Most sincerely,

John Velez (Speaking strictly for myself)
"Better to remain silent and be thought of as a fool,
than to open ones mouth and remove all doubt."

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 13:20:45 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:38:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:01:32 -0500

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>is there any explanation as to
>why there was a large increase in such sightings in the late
>40's and early 50's, followed by a decline in such sightings? As
>a natural event, one would think that the number of sightings

There may be three prosaic possibilities, and another related to TRUFOS:

- 1) An actual increase during that time of green fireballs.
- 2) An increase of brighter fireballs, which because of their intense brightness, appeared green.
- 3) An increase during that time of interest in the green color of fireballs.
- 4) Something about the ET craft at that time caused them to be green, or they were much more intensely bright.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 13:39:12 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:41:34 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:01:32 -0500

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>>Brad, Jenny, Dick, List:

>>Whatever Lincoln LaPaz's credentials are, or were, this is
>>really not a supportable statement. There is, and was, no such
>>acknowledged category. Intense green fireballs, for example,
>>can certainly be natural in nature. Richard Haines' book,
>>Observing UFOs, provides an explanation for this color, and
>>associated color changes, in the chemical functioning of the
>>human eye. I don't think that the research Haines cited had been
>>done in LaPaz's day.

>>He may very well have been a very good investigator. More is
>>probably a stretch.

>LaPaz's credentials were good enough to cause the military to
>involve him in the study of a phenomenon that they were becoming
>very concerned about. While it is acknowledged that green
>fireballs can be natural events, is there any explanation as to
>why there was a large increase in such sightings in the late
>40's and early 50's, followed by a decline in such sightings? As
>a natural event, one would think that the number of sightings
>would be consistent through time.

Hi Steve, Bob and List,

Thank you for your excellent points Steve, though the issue of
green fireballs is off the topic at hand and I don't know why
Bob brought it up.

My point was simply that there are UFO sightings - in this case
not green fireballs - by scientists and aeronautical engineers
of such caliber that they belong in a class of their own.

Kelly Johnson who headed the Lockheed "Skunk Works" and designed
and built the U-2, SR-71 and many other cutting edged advanced
aircraft, is one example.

Lincoln LaPaz is another. Having been a successful meteorite
tracker for decades, experienced in interviewing witnesses to
get accurate angular data - if you didn't you couldn't find the
fallen meteorite - by the 40's and 50's, LaPaz was hands down
the number one scientist UFO/aerial phenomena investigator in
the world. To have him make his own Daylight Disc UFO
observation with multiple witnesses is simply extraordinary and
all I was saying was that this is something that needs

recognition.

A Clyde Tombaugh, the astronomer who discovered Pluto, is simply not in the same league as a dimwit who watches the setting moon and thinks it's a UFO. Do you really think that Tombaugh would confuse the moon or a star for a UFO?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 19](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 03/19/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 13:43:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:43:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 03/19/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 19, 2001

**PFIAB DOCUMENTS RELEASED BY CLINTON
**REVISITING THE BAY OF PIGS
**ANOTHER VIEW OF VENONA

PFIAB DOCUMENTS RELEASED BY CLINTON

In a last-minute good deed that has gone entirely unnoted, President Clinton on January 19 rejected an appeal by the secretive President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) and directed that hundreds of pages of historical PFIAB records loosely related to the assassination of President Kennedy be released to the National Archives.

Several years ago, the JFK Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB) had identified excerpts of 17 PFIAB documents dating from 1961 to 1963 as "assassination records" that were subject to a 1992 law requiring their release to the fullest extent possible.

Despite the clear language of the statutory requirement, however, the PFIAB objected to the ARRB action. PFIAB chairman Sen. Warren Rudman challenged the ARRB's authority to designate its records as assassination records or to dictate their release. The PFIAB waited until late 1998 when the ARRB was about to be disbanded and then filed an appeal to the President seeking to block disclosure of the designated PFIAB records. Due to the lateness of the appeal, the Review Board was unable to reply.

But in an unprecedented repudiation of the PFIAB's habitual secrecy, President Clinton rejected the appeal the day before his term ended. The decision was disclosed last Friday by Clinton's chief of staff John Podesta, who spoke at a Freedom of Information Day conference at the Freedom Forum in Arlington, VA. The President also turned down an appeal by the US Secret Service to withhold assassination records, Mr. Podesta revealed.

The newly released records relate to U.S. and Cuban exile operations against Cuba between the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis, said Prof. Anna Nelson, a historian at American University and a member of the JFK Assassination Records Review Board. "These are records that will give you new insight into that period," she said.

"What is unique [about the records] is PFIAB's take on the world and how they presented it to the President," said Steven Tilley, a specialist at the National Archives who reviewed each of the several hundred pages of newly accessioned PFIAB documents, which are now open to researchers at the JFK assassination records collection at Archives II in College Park, Maryland.

As a larger consequence of President Clinton's action, it may now become easier to win public access to other historical records of the PFIAB, whose arrogance is remarkable even by prevailing intelligence community standards.

The PFIAB, possibly confusing the United States with some other country, has contended that it "owns" its records and that they are beyond the reach of the law.

In a December 2000 report to the Secretary of State, the State Department's Historical Advisory Committee warned it was "gravely concerned about the efforts of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) to block access to and to delay declassification of its documents. PFIAB seeks a permanent exemption of its records from the declassification statute on the dubious grounds that it provides personal and private information to the President." The PFIAB claim conflicts with the State Department's legal obligation to publish a thorough, accurate and complete record of U.S. foreign policy.

A PFIAB spokesman was not immediately available for comment.

Information about the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection at the National Archives is available here:

<http://www.nara.gov/research/jfk/index.html>

REVISITING THE BAY OF PIGS

Former CIA covert operations officials, Kennedy White House aides, and members of the 2506 Brigade force that invaded Cuba in April 1961 will travel to Havana this week to participate in a historic conference on the U.S.-backed Bay of Pigs invasion.

This extraordinary event is co-sponsored by the National Security Archive at George Washington University, together with the University of Havana and several Cuban government agencies.

The Castro government has announced that it will present declassified Cuban records on the invasion at the conference.

See the National Security Archive press release here:

<http://www.nsarchive.org/bayofpigs>

ANOTHER VIEW OF VENONA

Most scholarly discussion of Venona -- the program to decrypt nearly 3000 Soviet cable messages that were intercepted from 1942-45 -- has centered on Soviet espionage during World War II and the theft of US secrets, nuclear and otherwise. But in a rather startling dispatch in *The Nation*, journalist Stephen Schwartz stresses the insights that Venona offers into Soviet efforts to assassinate leading figures of the non-Stalinist left.

Schwartz (who is not to be confused with Stephen I. Schwartz, the worthy publisher of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, or others of the same name) wrote in the letters column of the April 2 issue of *The Nation*, replying to critics of a book review he wrote in January.

Dismissing questions about the guilt of Alger Hiss, Lauchlin Currie, and Harry Dexter White, Schwartz writes: "I am much less interested in the fates of these three bourgeois careerists than I am in those of such dissident revolutionists as Ignacy Porecki-Reiss, Andreu Nin and Leon Trotsky."

"I have never understood the moral compass of certain U.S. intellectuals who consider the sufferings of White and Hiss, or of the heirs of Currie, to be more compellingly tragic than the assassination of Reiss, the death by torture of Nin or the smashing of Trotsky's brain by an ice ax" by Soviet agents, writes Schwartz.

He goes on to note how Venona records corroborate and complement other information about Soviet actions against dissident leftists and others. This exchange is not available online, but further information about *The Nation* may be found here:

<http://www.thenation.com>

Schwartz, one of what must be a very small group of writers whose work appears in both the leftish Nation and the conservative National Review, developed his case further in his recent book "Intellectuals and Assassins" (Anthem Press, London, 2000).

"It is certainly clear from Venona that the hunting down and liquidation of Trotskyists was a goal of the N.K.V.D. [the Soviet intelligence service, predecessor of the KGB] that far exceeded many others in importance," he wrote there.

And in a particularly noteworthy conclusion, he asserts: "The success of the American military codebreakers, along with the vigilance of the F.B.I., may have had a completely unanticipated, unknown, and, to many, inconceivable outcome: the protection of American radicals from the N.K.V.D."

Schwartz's work is erudite, passionate, and quite original, but also openly polemical. Nor is he beyond error. He proposes, in the course of a linguistic analysis of Venona terms, that the Yiddish word "landsman" (meaning compatriot) is equivalent to the Hebrew term "am haaretz" (which usually means ignoramus). Secrecy News is prepared to bet money that isn't so.

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe
secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:06:59 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:07:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:46:05 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>>Date: Thus, 15 Mar 2001 23:06:55 -0000
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:19:38 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>>Date: Thus, 15 Mar 2001 10:52:02 -0500
>>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>><snip>

>>>I would like to propose a very simple concept that will cut
>>through a lot of the hassle and red tape in the selection of UFO
>>cases to support ETH:

>>It seems to me that the kind of case that most impresses people
>>as indicative of spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere are
>>Daylight Disc cases (DD's - Hynek Classification) involving
>>metallic-appearing objects. The cases should be long enough in
>>duration (say 1 minute or longer) and large enough in apparent
>>size (at least Full Moon or so) so that enough detail can be
>>observed to enable competent investigation eliminating IFO's
>>etc. Hynek's rule requiring multiple witnesses should be
>>included in the screening criteria, and date, time and location
>>must be known.

>Hi,

>I think there is much sense in your idea of defining the kinds
>of cases up front that we might consider appropriate for debate.
>I don't think Daylight Discs, per se, are any more or less likely
>to be misperceptions.

Hi,

Remember, we're trying to find cases that suggest ETH and as you
so rightly pointed out earlier, this goes beyond just finding
cases that are simply Unexplained and not misperceptions. We
don't want to lose the focus on ETH evidence. My point about
metallic-appearing Daylight Discs is not that they are less
likely to be misperceptions/IFO's etc., but that they are far
more suggestive of alien spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere
than any others, except daylight CE's of landed spacecraft. But
in terms of numbers of likely cases my impression is there are
far more DD's than daytime CE's, so I made the general point
with respect to DD's (whereas technically I should have included
daytime CE's as well).

>I have seen quite a few that turn out to
>be aircraft or balloons, etc.

The screening criteria I suggested -- angular size Full Moon or larger, duration 1-minute+, multiple witnesses, date-time-location known -- are intended to screen the _stronger_ UFO cases from the _weaker_ UFO cases, not to weed out IFO's from UFO's -- as you yourself mention further down about how such prerequisites will help distinguish the "strong case." Though these criteria can be helpful guidelines in that sort of preliminary IFO/UFO investigation they don't automatically generate lists of UFO cases from raw sighting reports without even having to investigate. Investigation is still necessary. But these screening criteria would IMO shift the percentages into a much higher framework so that instead of, say, 95% of all sightings reported turning out to be IFO's (numbers for illustration only), which I challenge anyway, maybe only 10-30% of such _screened_ sightings would turn out to be IFO's (here as everywhere I include all conventional explanations within the term "IFO"). In any event, that is not the point I was trying to make, I digress here just for sake of completeness.

>But they are certainly preferable
>to LITS - which hardly ever would qualify as credible arguments
>for an ETH theory (even if some are alien light probes - or
>whatever - there are way too many other things they could turn
>out to be - negating most of their value as evidence for even
>the possibility of the ETH)

Agreed. Again, I would say that I propose these screening rules not as absolutes, but that exceptions would need to be argued. The idea is to try to prevent endless bickering over marginal cases right at the outset by cutting out most of them.

>But I do agree with the suggestion that we should make a few
>ground rules and that one of these should be to gun for multiple
>witness cases (indeed I might even argue multiple, independently
>located witnesses as this best eliminates the prospect of a
>hoax). (A group of people together tend to be known to one
>another / related and are no stronger in terms of ruling out a
>hoax than single witnesses in many instances)

Hoaxes are extremely rare, a few percentage points. Hynek articulated the multiple witness criterion in order to get more data for calibration of the witnesses, not to try to rule out hoaxes, though it would certainly help in that respect. A group of people who know each other can also be a good resource for uncovering any hoax because many people tend to blab or spill secrets, so the larger the number the more likely a hoax will be uncovered. Unfortunately there is one other countervailing tendency about larger groups and that is that it increases the chances of _false charges_ of hoax or whatever from unstable individuals.

>Even multiple, independent witnesses can be fooled (such as the
>Buckinghamshire movie film case where there were three sets of
>witnesses at different locations and movie film of the UFO but
>it still turned out to be a rather unusual and rare IFO). (See
>'The UFOs that Never Were' for details). But this is undoubtedly
>a good prerequisite of any strong case. So a sensible starting
>point.

See above on why multiple independent witnesses is not necessary, and it may be too stringent a requirement. It leaves in the gray zone what to do about multiple witnesses who are in independent locations but are in radio or electronic communication with each other, e.g., air defense nets involved in a UFO interception.

I don't have your book but assume the movie film case wouldn't pass the screening criteria I suggested. Was a saucer or disc reported?

>Indeed if we were to define a simple scoring system to help us
>describe the kind of case that we seek it could include
>something like: physical evidence of non terrestrial material

>(10), physical evidence of an ambiguous nature (8), photographs
>purporting to show an alien (6), photographs appearing to show a
>landed UFO / constructed craft (5), multiple independent witness
>sightings of a constructed craft (3).

This is really a scoring of the relative strength of the case as an Unexplained phenomenon rather than of its strength in indicating ETH, and we may start losing sight of the goal, which is ETH evidence. If we extract the weight of evidence of unexplainability there are really only three items of ETH indication here: Crashed spacecraft. Alien. Functioning spacecraft. Everything else goes to the weight of the evidence and mode of observation rather than the strength of ETH indication. A sighting of a structured craft and a photo of a structured craft still points to a structured craft, only the level and reliability of detail is different. If we don't clearly segregate these measures we may find ourselves getting bogged down in arguments over the strength of unexplainability rather than of extraterrestriality.

As a scoring system it is a good start but needs fine tuning as I'm sure you anticipated. Actually, why bother listing items we know don't exist in our possession or cannot indisputably be proved to exist somewhere, such as the 10 points for physical evidence of unambiguously ET material? If we really had the "goods" in that way we wouldn't have to be going through this exercise in the first place. Likewise with photos of aliens. Why not list Landing on White House Lawn or Alien Nuclear War if we're going to go that far?

Ambiguous physical evidence shouldn't rank higher than good photos of structured craft. Where would instrumentation data fit into this, such as radar, astronomical instruments, electronic intelligence gear, etc.? It may be that this scoring system will get too complicated to get common agreement on the scoring values.

And as I say I fear that this scale tends to emphasize a scoring of the strength of the UFO case as an Unexplained phenomenon, not the ET origin indication. There should be a separate scale for reliability and strength of evidence as evidence.

>There are no doubt other things that could/should be added to
>this list.

>Other factors need to be taken into account as well (maybe, for
>instance, a score from 1 to 10 on the likelihood of a hoax, and
>a similar score on the likelihood of a misperception) (with 10
>equalling no probability and 1 meaning certainty of hoax or
>misperception).

If there is "certainty" of hoax or misperception then the case should go to zero. These numbers should be multiplied against the previous evidence ranking and "certainty" of hoax/IFO should be a 0 which when multiplied would result in a total score of 0.

>In this way the combined score of these three factors (out of
>the maximum possible of 52) (based on the numbers used above
>fairly haphazardly) indicates the strength of the ETH viability
>of any case. And this is an objective measure not a personal
>assessment if we all agree on the relative figures to ascribe to
>each element.

Well, we're going to have to agree on the relative scaling and I see problems ahead. See above. This may not be workable.

>In fact, in this way we can quickly get a grip on the ETH
>viability index (the EVI) of any reported UFO sighting. Already
>a progression in research terms.

>This is very rough and ready guide - and simply a basis for what
>needs to be a lot more thought and work to refine such a scoring
>system. But this idea of creating an EVI could be a sensible
>next step and we could probably quite readily define a method
>whereby we can define such a rating.

It does need some more work as I indicated above.

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Green Fireballs [was: Serious Research]

From: Greg Salyards <d-choma@att.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:32:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:16:04 -0500
Subject: Green Fireballs [was: Serious Research]

>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 04:20:11 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Regarding "intense green fireballs":

>La Paz argued that the fireballs sighted in the 1948-49-50 time
>frame were unusual, but color was only one reason. Of more
>importance were the flat trajectories reported by numerous
>witnesses including security guards and La Paz himself and the
>concentration of th events in the southwestern USA.

>You can find quite a bit about the fireball mystery in The UFO
>FBI Connection because the FBI was made aware of the events and
>of La Paz's suggestion that if they weren't a US secret project
>then they might be... he suggested they were (and Hoover echoed
>this through Walter Winchell) --- Soviet missiles "zeroing-in"
>on the nuclear weapon sites in the USA.

Bruce,

I am a 1962 graduate of the US Naval Academy. I am also a
retired federal employee (Naval Sea Systems Command).

I am in the midst of reading your 1998 update of your earlier
presentation to MUFON. I have just reached the point of where
you mentioned a UFO-FBI CONNECTION report relating to Green
Fireballs (GFBs). I would appreciate it if you would please
forward me a copy.

Your name is familiar to me from you frequent media exposure and
I have taken note in the past of your employment at White Oak.
That facility has been under the control of NAVSEA 06. That is
where I worked at headquarters so we both have worked for the
same boss.

I was previously unaware of your interest in GFBs. In fact,
except for a specific personal experience, I did not know there
were GFB phenomena until I saw it referenced on a web page about
two years ago.

I will recount my experience. It is probably not unique from any
other sightings but there was an interesting piece of
information that emerged when I attempted to report my sighting.

After graduating in June of 1962 I purchased a BMW motorcycle in
New England. I used this bike to get to my first ship which was
homeported in San Diego. I camped out along the way and I took

the route through Seattle so that I could visit the 1962 World Fair.

This same route put me in Calgary during the annual Calgary Stampede. The evening I was there was the same evening that Chuckwagon Race competition was conducted. That is the best I can do for a date. After the competition I stayed up all night and took advantage of the "dancing in the streets" with a young lady I met. We split up shortly before sunrise and I left town heading west toward Banff and Lake Louise.

Just a few miles west of Calgary I climbed a small elevation into an open valley just as the sun was coming up. I observed a silent green fireball crossing my path for a period of from 2 to 4 seconds (as best I remember). It caused me to stop my motorcycle, dismount, and to try to observe all the important directions so that I could report what I had seen. By the way, I hadn't had anything alcoholic to drink that evening.

Later that day when I arrived at Banff I sought out a "mountie" from the RCMP. When I told him what I had observed he seemed only the slightly interested and certainly not surprised. But what he said was interesting. He said, "Oh yeah, the Department of Commerce (or was it the Department of Transportation) has a trailer set up just to look for them." Apparently in the summer of 1962 the Canadian government was actively looking for objects in the atmosphere.

I kept that as "my" UFO story but I did not attach much significance to it. In later years when they were searching in northwestern Canada for a nuclear reactor that had re-entered from space I decided that maybe that where I was is just on the reentry trajectory from some Soviet launch complex. Could this be an explanation for GFBS?

What do you think?

Greg Salyards

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Nazi Technology - New Book

From: **Jean-Luc Rivera** <JLRIV1@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:35:55 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:19:58 -0500
Subject: Nazi Technology - New Book

Hi List members,

I just found today a book called "Blue Fires, The Lost Secrets Of Nazi Technology" by Gary Hyland, Headline, London, 2001, ISBN 0 7472 7146 1.

A quick glance through the bibliography shows very unreliable source materials.

Has anybody on the list read the book yet? I would appreciate any feedback.

Does anybody know who the author is? He wrote another book called 'Last Talons of the Eagle', Headline, London, 1998, on nazi secret weapons.

Thanks for the answers.

Jean-Luc Rivera

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:55:19 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:21:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:06:39 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>>This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynek strenuously
>>objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do"
>>chapter 12 in The UFO Experience, 1972). Hynek objected that
>>Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness
>>could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter
>>definition of a case in which a scientifically competent
>>investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms.
>>Condon's definition swamps the core UFO cases in masses of less
>>important or time-wasting IFO cases. The Condon Committee could
>>have made a valuable study of IFO's, something like what Allan
>>Hendry did in his UFO Handbook, so that we would have a control
>>study against which to compare the UFO's among other things, but
>>didn't.

>Brad,

>I won't repeat the whole thing, but simply wanted to say that
>this is an excellent commentary on witness testimony,
>definitions, and attitudes. I commend it to the attention of all
>sceptics, doubters, debunkers.

> - Dick

Dick,

Thank you for the kind remarks. Here is the URL to the posting:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m17-026.shtml>

I would add to what is excerpted above that I do not want to appear to endorse the UFO Handbook as the definitive study of IFO's, as it certainly is not, since it is riddled with mammoth flaws in methodology and execution including some astounding errors of astronomy that should have been caught by two close Ph.D. astronomers but weren't. I simply wanted to contrast what the Condon Committee didn't do with what was at least attempted in the work leading to the UFO Handbook, i.e., conduct a control study of IFO's.

The point of that was a digression from my main point about witnesses as experts, that it was Condon who majorly contributed to the problem of making witnesses out to be experts by misdefining UFO reports as whatever the _witness_ determines instead of what the scientists or investigators determine, thus swamping the core UFO cases in loads of IFO's. And if IFO's were deemed so important then Condon as a scientist should have made a proper study of IFO's, but didn't -- I gave an example, however flawed, of what such a study might begin to look like. Another example would be the massive statistical study by Battelle Memorial Institute, Blue Book Special Report 14. Battelle compared IFO's with UFO's in several categories of appearance and flight characteristics and grudgingly found little overlap or similarity. But Battelle didn't specifically analyze IFO's to help Blue Book investigators identify them and weed them out, as was required in the original plans for the study. So Battelle didn't really study IFO's as it should have done.

I hope the work on the Council Proposal will lead to some real progress in the field and that some true skeptics will be able to participate in a constructive critical fashion.

Brad

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 16:06:43 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:23:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

Council Profile

Hello List,

It is important to avoid sentimental choices in selecting the Council.

This would be a mistake.

My vote goes to PhDs or individuals with proper credentials in pertinent disciplines in regard to the cases studied.

The means must fit the goal.

Bob Young mentioned "peer review". I do not think this can be achieved without due credentials.

This is not a popularity contest, this is a Scientific Panel.

Let's be careful not to lose sight of the meaning of this project.

Regards,

Serge Salvaille

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:12:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:26:08 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Hart

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

>Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
>A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by inuendo, not proof and
>made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization. A
>simple twist of fate. Accomplished nothing. Proved less
>than nothing and if the gods exist, should be followed by
>the action of going around, coming around. One would
>hope.

Sorry, Jim: You have no idea what you are talking about. There were no politics except the politics to keep him on the board no matter what the evidence. This state of affairs is not acceptable in a public organization. Period.

The people within the MUFON structure that needed to see my most recent evidence have seen it. The battle moves to another venue. If you want to see pieces of evidence yourself, I could share some few pertinent pieces with you privately. Ask me directly.

In the message I received that first declared John had resigned, he was quoted as saying he did so as a result of the Internet bashing of his reputation. John is in full denial of the real reason he had to be removed from office: his behavior, his conduct. He tries to blame-shift the guilt to his detractors. In fact, I was able to solidly prove every allegation I have made here. This is to my constant amazement. All that I had heard was provably true. It just took a long time to do it.

I will post the results of legal actions as they become available.

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall

From: "Richard Hall" <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 21:20:27 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:28:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers":;
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:22:00 -0500

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:31:34 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>I quite agree, so where can we see the serious scientific
>investigation which is trying to work out what Arnold *really*
>saw? If it wasn't pelicans (and even a Pelicanist like me admits
>that it's a very slim chance) what was it? Who's on the case?
>No-one, because everyone's happy just to leave it that Arnold
>saw a UFO - end of story. The bunkers don't want to find an
>answer, because they think they already know it. No matter how
>much they tiptoe round it they do really think he saw
>extraterrestrial spaceships. Some one, a reply or two, back
>suggested he might have seen US secret aircraft. Possibly so, I
>don't know enough about aviation history to comment, but is
>someone checking that out?

John,

U.S. aviation history is well known, and that explanation won't
hack it. In fact, others are re-investigating that possibility.
But aircraft that fly on an undulating path at the calculated
speed still are not in our inventory.

You seem to be operating under two (at least) misapprehensions:
(1) that if you look long and hard enough, you will find out
exactly what each and every UFO was (past tense; i.e., a mundane
explanation); (2) that no one has ever investigated these
classic cases adequately before. "What was it?" in each case.
Well, hell, maybe it was an interplanetary spaceship, who knows?

You are entitled to believe (1) if you wish, but it is (2) that
we veterans tend to find annoying. I can't quite say that I was
present at the Creation, but in my time I have been deeply and
personally involved in investigation, in fact spearheading
investigations, of many important and classic cases. My mentor,
Donald Keyhoe, the U.S. Air Force, and others also were.

Arnold's sighting was old history even when I became involved,
but Bruce Maccabee and others have investigated it intensively,
as did people contemporaneously. Anyway, along come newcomers,
many from the UK, trying to re-invent the wheel and apparently
unaware of what has gone before in regard to investigations.

I have no objection at all to re-investigation, but ignorance of
what has gone before leads to a huge waste of time. In fact, I
recently supplied some information to a person who is
re-investigating the 1957 Levelland, Texas, electrically charged
pelicans (just kidding). But the new investigators all too often
appear to be playing a game of "Pin a label on the Donkey."

It had to have been (a) pelicans, (b) ice crystals blowing in
the wind, (c) American test aircraft, or (d) at least "other."

Now a "fragmenting meteor!" I find that very amusing and will be extremely interested to hear the case made for that one. Fireball meteors is (are) something I have studied and catalogued for decades.

To paraphrase one of the whopper case explanations in the Condon Report, "it must have been a meteor of a type that had never been seen before and has never been seen since." In any event, the Arnold case is more important historically than evidentially. I would not rate it as one of the stronger cases suggestive of the ETH.

Jenny's Council could serve a good purpose, but it would be highly desirable to have Debunkers and Doubters participate in evaluating various explanations for the selected cases in a serious way. I hope you will participate.

Dick Hall,
Bunker 1st Class

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Wright

From: **Bruce Lanier Wright** <magnus@io.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:20:00 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:29:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Wright

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:46:46 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>So let's see some real investigation into what Arnold actually
>did see. The only person I am aware of who has done this is
>Eastman, and see where that got him

Yes, it got him a fairly detailed critique from Bruce Maccabee that Easton has made little effort to address so far. As for verbal abuse, your little collection of Colonel Blimps seems to get taken to the woodshed for that rather more often than the poor colonials.

Bruce W.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:40:43 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:32:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Evans

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:37:10 -0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

Previously, I had written:

>>>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>>>evidence that can be examined?

Richard replied:

>>>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>>>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>>>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>>>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>>>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

To which I responded:

>>So, in essence, I am correct after all. By your own admission
>>there is no physical evidence that can be examined, which was my
>>original point. All that's left is a collection of opinions
>>about something that is as elusive as smoke; worse, we are left
>>with opinions about other people's opinions.

Richard now writes:

>I have no idea "where you are coming from" with this line of
>argument, but how you can conclude that I said there is no
>evidence that can be examined makes me doubt that you heard what
>I said. Radar sightings, physical trace evidence, and strong
>testimonial evidence of recurring patterns does not amount to "a
>collection of opinions..." If you seriously believe that, we
>have nothing further to discuss.

Hi, Richard!

To use your words, "I have no idea "where you are coming from"
with this line of argument." If you read what I wrote, I said
that you had no physical evidence at your disposal, something
that you agreed with when you wrote: "No, I can't give you a
crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory." Only later did you
add the idea of physical trace evidence. If you felt there was
physical trace evidence to begin with, then why not say so in
your first response? Besides, you and I both know that physical
trace evidence is not the same thing as examination of an object
of claimed ET origin. This is just a dodge of the real issue at
hand: lack of physical evidence, i.e. objects of ET origin. Not
mysterious burned grass at a supposed landing site or the like.

Beyond that, if any other evidence at the disposal of the
council had real scientific value, it would have already been
examined. Therefore, the bottom line is that all the council has
left are opinions about the "likelihood" of a given case;
nothing can be proven one way or the other, no matter how long
the council studies a given case.

Regarding such, you wrote:

>You keep insisting that the reality or "existence" of something
>must be "proven" before qualifications to discuss it
>intelligently matter.

<snip>

>And, more relevant to the point, I
>have been deeply involved in UFO investigations for most of my
>adult life. And I still don't understand "where you are coming
>from." Let me hear your blueprint for establishing the "truth"
>about UFOs and how it differs from mine.

I never claimed to have one, Richard. Is it your contention that the council does?

After all, it has already been discussed that one of the first acts of the council is to "weed through" the UFO reports to determine which are more likely to be valid than the others. Let's say, for the sake of argument, that some valid ones don't get left behind. Just what happens after the council appraises the cream of the crop? How much further will the discussion of UFOs be advanced after the smoke clears? Will there be a "Eureka moment" when the council proclaims a UFO report as "valid" and, as a result, ET craft will be validated?

I understand the good intentions, however, without real physical evidence I don't see how much will be accomplished beyond the very opinion mongering that you previously showed such disdain for. It would seem that the only difference is whether it is the opinion of "the council" or the opinion of the average UFO enthusiast. In either case, it's still only an opinion. Nothing will be proven one way or the other, I'm afraid. I hope I am wrong. Perhaps there's a speck of evidence that hasn't been seen that will turn the tide, but I doubt it.

Good luck, guys! I would like nothing better than for the existence of ET life to be proven, no matter who does it.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:52:58 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:34:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl - Hart

>Date: 16 Mar 2001 11:08:16 -0800
>To: Bill Hamilton <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: skywatcher22@space.com
>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strange Lights Over Popocatepetl

>>One still picture came from a friend in AZ and looks like a
>>glowing window in the air. Another picture looks like a stick on
>>fire. Nothing was seen at the time.

>Question: Was the picture taken by Linda Bradshaw on the
>Bradshaw ranch?
>
>-Bill Hamilton

Bill,

Yes. I have other pictures from other places that have far more of a proper background: imaging details, etc. so I can, in her case, attest only to the unusual nature of what she claimed and have no proof other than what is limited to my own pictures taken there.

You also went there. What was you take on what was happening? My efforts determined some of her other claims were errors of observation.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 19 Mar 2001 14:28:51 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:36:31 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600

>>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM
>>>"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
>>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

>>>*'OF INTEREST*'

>>>REED HOAX RETURNS

>>>For those of you already familiar with this hoax, Jonathan Reed
>>>is set to appear once again on Coast to Coast AM with Art Bell
>>>tonight.

>>>UFOWATCHDOG.COM has investigated aspects of Reed's claims and
>>>they are false. Read a small amount of what's wrong with Reed's
>>>tall tale

>>><http://www.ufowatchdog.com/reed2.html>

>>>Among having some bogus alien and UFO photos, Reed has lied
>>>about having a conversation with Peter Davenport regarding his
>>>'alien in the freezer' story...Why Art Bell claims to support
>>>Ufology and then stabs it in the back with a fraud like Reed
>>>defies logic...

<snip>

Dr. Jonathon Reed's Washington University email address is
validated. His photos validated by Bob Shell...

see website: <http://www.aliendestiny.com>

Does this mean that some will reconsider this case or is it just
pelican droppings?

Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 05:50:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:00:11 -0500
Subject: Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:16:40 EST
>Subject: Re: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on Chupacabras
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 06:17:58 -0500
>>Subject: U.S. Research Center Discloses Information on Chupacabras
>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>

>>SOURCE: La Estrella del Loa (newspaper)
>>DATE: Saturday, March 17, 2001.

>>U.S. RESEARCH CENTER DISCLOSES INFORMATION ON CHUPACABRAS

><snip>

>>but from the president
>>and director of the Miami UFO Center, Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo,
>>who wrote the Estrella del Loa from the U.S. to recount the
>>latest information regarding the alleged creature's
>>manifestations in Chile.

>Scott, List:

>In all due respect, the fact that Virgilio's UFO group is
>located in Miami, does not make it a "U.S. Research Center".

>This headline most likely was simply to imflate the importance
>of the story. Judge the contents accordingly.

Dear Bob,

Thanks for your comments. Unfortunately, if the newspaper calls it a duck I'm not going to call it a swan to please other people's sensibilities. A research center is a research center is a research center (with apologies to Gertrude Stein).

Scott Corrales

"You must do what you feel is right, of course.."
---Obi-Wan Kenobi to Luke Skywalker, SW:ANH (1977)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 18:21:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:01:14 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Mortellaro

>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600

Previously, Jimmy wrote:

>Alfred, the problem with mainstream science, Sagan and the
>skeptidopeys out there in the void, is that ANY evidence which
>is not hard and contains no hard evidence, extraordinary
>evidence, is discounted.

>Now the question, Alfred, is why!?! And my answer, (mine alone)
>is short and sweet. To me at least. They are afraid. Broken
>paradigms mean new knowledge and new knowledge means starting
>all over again. They are scared little weenies. Without
>portfolio. Never will have what it takes to engage in,
>participate in and contribute to, the Renaissance of this
>planet. The New Renaissance! They who remain standing still
>will fall far behind faster than those who walk only more
>slowly.

Hi, Jim!

What about AA? Or Dr. Reed and company? Or Billy Meier? Or the
Mexico City sighting? Or how about crop circles? Are these not
evidence, as well? Or does your common sense tell you that some
things just don't pass the smell test? Regardless, there are
those that will swear on a stack of Bibles that these are all
real and that you are the skeptic!

As a healthy skeptic, I can assure you that I am not afraid. On
the contrary, I can't wait for the day that ET life is proven.
In the mean time, I grow tired of the false profits... er, I
mean prophets...that come along and muddy the waters.

Ya' can call me "jaded" but ya' don't have to call me "sir".
(for all you old timers out there)

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Arnold's Fleet - A Question

From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:02:29 -0500
Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question, re the Arnold sighting.

Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar formation of any kind?

I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings. Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend credence to the overall phenom.

I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings may have been unique.

Curious Purrrrrs....

Wendy Christensen

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:04:02 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

Here's another nagging question. This one I address to Mr. Velez.

You've said several times now that you have "a lifetime of conscious memories" to support your claim to be an abductee. This intrigues me, not the least because you have never (so far as I recall) gone into any further detail. Are your experiences described in a book I can read?

If you're planning to write a book and "saving" the story for that, I shall inquire no further and await your book.

But can we have a hint or two? Are your "conscious memories" actually of abductions? Being hauled physically through windows (or walls, or whatever)? Close up (rivet-counting-close) saucer sightings? Both? I want details! (I am the curious-by-nature type.)

I am not trying to be disrespectful or doubt your word. However, you are SO openly and publically vociferous about being an abductee that I can't imagine you would object to a query for details. I realize that this might be a deeply painful or personal subject for you. But you have said many, many times that your aim is to get to the bottom of this, to find out what's happening. Would not telling your own story, in as much detail as possible, to as many people as possible, do much towards possibly accomplishing this worthy goal?

If all this has indeed happened to you, and you have "conscious memories" of it, and you aren't writing a book --- Why Not??

A "lifetime of conscious memories" of the type you say you have, with the attendant clear details, might well make your case one worthy of examination by the scientific study team currently under discussion on this list.

I'm not picking on you -- really. I would pick on Mr. Mortellaro, too, but as I recall, he's in the process of writing a book about his own experiences, which I eagerly await.

Extremely Curious Purrrrrrs...

Wendy Christensen

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 21:37:06 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:32:25 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Gates

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Jim wrote:

>Sagan did a program on one of the most celebrated UFO abduction
>stories ever, The Betty and Barney Hill abduction. I remember so
>well being extremely angry the first time this show ran, later
>in the series. But this time I was exceedingly angry, because
>I've experienced much more in the years following Sagan's
>adventures in television broadcasting. And what pissed me off
>was Sagan's tossing off of all of the anecdotal evidence and
>some of the semi hard evidence of what he termed as dreams. Yah,
>identical dreams. But again, I digress.

>His main speech in that program was (which has become the guidon
>of many of you out there) "Extraordinary Claims require
>Extraordinary Evidence."

Jim,

Sagan's claim about "Extraordinary claims require extraordinary
evidence" always gives me a semi chuckle, especially when you
consider the hyprocricy of some in so called science.

For example we have been told since the 30s' that the Universe
is/was 4-6 billion years old. All based on the scientific study,
all available evidence and so on. Hubble space telescope comes
along and snaps photographs.

In some of these photographs so called scientists and
astronomers tell us that there are pockets of matter that are 15
billion years old i.e. older then the big bang shockwave.

Based upon that we are now told that the universe is at least 15
billion years old. Essentially 75 years of scientific theory and
pronouncements was changed on the basis of a photographs and
interpretation of photographs.

Now, if a person came up with a photograph of a UFO, these same
so called scientists and people would instantly start telling us
why it is a hoax, why it is not to be believed, why it is
absolutely impossible for any kind of alien space ships to be
real etc etc. All based upon the photograph and "their"
interpretation of said photo.

Interesting isn't it.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Spy Agency NIMA Examines Surface Of Mars!

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 21:50:54 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:33:45 -0500
Subject: Spy Agency NIMA Examines Surface Of Mars!

Hi everyone.

----- Forwarded message -----

SPACE.com Bulletin -- Monday, March 19, 2001 --
<http://www.space.com/>

-----BREAKING NEWS-----

EXCLUSIVE: Spy Agency May Have Located Mars Polar Lander
http://www.space.com/news/mpl_found_010319.html

The National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) has been quietly scanning Mars pictures, looking for the Mars Polar Lander since early December 1999. According to a source close to the NIMA effort, photographic specialists at NIMA think they've spotted something.

<snip>

If NIMA could locate something as tiny as the Mars Polar Lander, I wonder if they could also have a look at the Martian bushes; tunnels or wormlike structures and even the recently imaged but missing half of the Face on Mars (assuming that they haven't done so already) and tell us what they see.

Nick Balaskas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:43:39 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:44:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Sparks

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:31:34 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 22:10:33 +0000
>>>Fwd Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 21:14:14 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Rimmer

>>>>From: David Furlotte <furry@nobelmed.com>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 15:22:46 -0500

>>>>Mr. Easton, Mr. Maccabee et AL,

>>>>Gentlemen,

>>>>This Pelican story has got to come to an end!

>>>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with most
>>>>things that flew up in the sky with him. When he sees
>>>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>>>they would be UFOs.

>>>>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>>>>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>>>>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>>>>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>>>>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>>>>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

>>You seem to be referring to "investigation or analysis" only in
>>the sense of eliminating IFO's and other conventional
>>explanations (I will use "IFO" as shorthand for all conventional
>>explanations). Hynek would say that once the IFO-type screening
>>was done that was when the investigation began, scientific
>>investigation to learn more about the UFO phenomenon.

>I quite agree, so where can we see the serious scientific
>investigation which is trying to work out what Arnold *really*
>saw? If it wasn't pelicans (and even a Pelicanist like me admits
>that it's a very slim chance) what was it? Who's on the case?
>No-one, because everyone's happy just to leave it that Arnold
>saw a UFO - end of story.

Not so. See my refutation of Corso in SI back in 1998 where it
is mentioned that I am working on the Arnold case. Also see Keay

Davidson's bio of Sagan where my work is mentioned along with Keay's and Phil Klass'. I would probably have had something published by now except that the sheer volume of postings responding to the pelican issues and other questions has totally swamped me. I don't know exactly when I can sort this out.

>The bunkers don't want to find an
>answer, because they think they already know it. No matter how
>much they tiptoe round it they do really think he saw
>extraterrestrial spaceships. Some one, a reply or two, back
>suggested he might have seen US secret aircraft. Possibly so, I
>don't know enough about aviation history to comment, but is
>someone checking that out?

Actually I have seen quite a lot posted on aviation history with respect to the Arnold case by Joel Carpenter and many others, much of it on Easton's list prior to the outbreak of pelicanism.

>>>Also
>>>we are back with the myth of the expert witness:

>>This is a "myth" that Condon perpetuated and Hynes strenuously
>>objected to (see "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do"
>>chapter 12 in The UFO Experience, 1972). Hynes objected that
>>Condon defined a UFO or UFO report as one in which the witness
>>could not identify the stimulus, rather than a much smarter
>>definition of a case in which a scientifically competent
>>investigation cannot explain the UFO in conventional terms.

>But hang on a minute, isn't this just what we are being told to
>do? Like here in Mr Furlotte's words:

>>I tend to see things pretty cut and dried in a lot of ways and
>>Mr. Arnold got it right when he reported that the things he saw
>>were UFOs. Why? Because that is exactly what he saw,
>>Unidentified Flying Objects. The gentleman was a pilot and as
>>such it would be safe to assume that he was familiar with _most_
>>things that flew up in the sky _with_ him. When he sees
>>something that he cannot identify, it is only safe to assume
>>they would be UFOs.

>Arnold is an "expert witness", he was "the man on the spot"; I
>see that you at least, disagree that expert witnesses are
>infallible:

>>Again, Hynes would object that the witness is not supposed to
>>serve as the scientist on his own case. What is most relevant
>>and useful are Arnold's sighting data. True, some of it is
>>conflicting but not all of it and the conflicts can be
>>rationaly discussed. Arnold's experience in having flown more
>>than 4,000 hours as a mountain pilot as of June 1947 _does_
>>count for something, it's not completely worthless nor is it
>>completely probative. It's a factor to be given some weight and
>>to be rationaly discussed.

>Yes, given some weight, but not probative. Hendry found that
>aviation personel did not have a significantly better rate of
>UFO/IFO misidentifications than 'civilian' witnesses.

I have serious doubts about Hendry's work and would rather see a more comprehensive study that includes UFO flaps in the database. I gave the example of his UFO Handbook as a contrast to what Condon should have done but didn't do, but I should have qualified that by saying the work is badly flawed. Maybe I shouldn't have mentioned it at all.

My impression is that professional scientists at the Ph.D. level have a very low rate of IFO misidentifications compared to average witnesses. In fact I cannot think of a single instance of Ph.D. scientists misidentifying IFO's as UFO's except possibly the Texas Tech scientists involved with the Lubbock Lights, and even then we're still not sure the IFO's were birds or moths -- a big difference. In any case their sightings would not pass my screening criteria for best ETH evidence proposed on another current thread on UFO Updates (angular size Full Moon or larger, duration 1 minute+, multiple witnesses, date-time-location known, Daylight Disc metallic-appearing cases). For best Unexplained UFO evidence I would drop the DD-metallic criteria.

In the Arnold case, he was not the "expert witness" on the

scene, IMO, because of his "mountain pilot" title, but because of his demonstrated expertise unlike virtually any other witness in UFO history. His skill in observation should not be imputed to him by virtue of a "pilot" label but because of the attention to detail and on-the-spot thought processes he used to refine and measure what he was seeing, however imperfectly he may have done it. How many of us would ever have been able to do what Arnold did when caught totally off-guard by an unprecedented and extraordinary phenomenon of brief duration? Would we think to measure the angular size? Geez, I doubt most on this List even know what angular size means let alone how to measure it! Would we think to clock the phenomenon?

Arnold demonstrated more presence of mind in his real-time measurements of the UFO's angular size, timing, number count, window reflection test, and immediate post-sighting measurement of formation length, than most pilots on record. So I wouldn't use the run-of-the-mill pilot stats to denigrate his testimony. Despite the conflicts in some of his testimony most of it still holds up. Skeptics give lip service to the fact that witnesses are expected to have less-than-perfect observations but when it comes to the actual details of a case that are discrepant in some way, suddenly all that lip service is forgotten and now the entire case is to be discredited based on the discrepancies. I think there is no choice but to accept Arnold's accounts as largely accurate with much of the discrepancies resolvable by resort to his other consistent observational details and what is physiologically possible or impossible to observe. Thus, some parts of his testimony can be used to "correct" other parts. That seems to be a fair and reasonable procedure, even though no doubt some will disagree with the concept and some with the outcome. It is also experimentally testable in many ways.

For example, as a matter of physiological optics I contend that Arnold could not possibly have seen all the detail he claims to have seen of the objects' structure -- that his mind filled in the details -- because the angular size was too small even at closest approach (1/13 of Full Moon max. width), and that the objects must have actually disappeared for seconds at a time, except when they intensely "flashed," according to my analysis of other portions of his testimony.

This is easily testable. Take a one-foot diameter Frisbee toy, spray paint it reflective mirror silver, and have someone hold it and toss it from 1/2 mile away crosswise to your line of sight and up into a clear blue sky background -- see if you can even see the Frisbee. That is the angular size of Arnold's objects from 50 miles away. Do it from 1/4 mile away and that will represent the object's appearance at Arnold's estimated 23-mile minimum distance at closest approach, but that will not improve the resolution by much. Have your associate toss a Frisbee alongside a car travelling at 30 mph to see if he can match the speed -- as that represents the objects' maximum angular velocity from Arnold's "clocking" when translated to the Frisbee's size and distance framework (at 1/4 mile). Other possibilities include altering the Frisbee to look like Arnold's drawings of shape perhaps by painting out the rest in blue or black or white to blend in with background leaving only the silver portion as Arnold drew it. It will have to be held in the air because spinning will blur the painted shape, so the motion part of the simulation will not be feasible this way.

>>As a matter of fact, Arnold almost certainly was familiar with
>>American White Pelicans as he overflew the SE Washington/N
>>Oregon lake habitats of the AWP's many times in his plane,
>>including on his return flight from his famous sighting in June
>>1947. He would have had no reason to comment upon it any more
>>than he would have had to do so for the many other species of
>>birds in the area -- until Easton splashed the Pelican Brief all
>>over the Internet in 1999. Of course Arnold was deceased fifteen
>>years by then.

>I'm not particularly pushing the pelican explanation.

I realize you might not be.

>In fact it
>seems the bunkers are more concerned with pelicans (perhaps the
>fact that they are quite funny looking creatures makes it easier
>to use them as a term of abuse) than the debunkers. While I
>respect the effort that Easton has put into it, I don't actually

>notice many other sceptics cheerleading for him. But he has at
>least come up with a proposed explanation which can be
>rationaly debated, and I don't see many people on the other
>side of the argument doing that.

There are literally hundreds of postings on "the other side of the argument" here and on Easton's old list, including an exhaustive analysis of the optics by Bruce Maccabee with some corrections and contributions by me. See for example:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m15-006.shtml>
<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/apr/m09-006.shtml>
<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/apr/m09-023.shtml>
<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2000/apr/m12-002.shtml>
<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/jul/m17-002.shtml>

>Oh, of course, I forgot,
>Arnold's unidentified flying objects have already been
>identified... as UFOs, so no further investigation is required.

I still get the feeling that the kind of investigation you mean by this is only investigation that will turn up conventional explanations, as I note that when I suggest consideration of a conventional meteor explanation (below) you suddenly light up. Had I suggested an investigation of high performance boundary layer properties of the Arnold object's configuration I wonder what your reaction would have been.

>>I do have concerns about the response to the re-opening of the
>>Arnold case -- but not as to the pelican theory which
>>contradicts almost every measurement and observational detail,
>>but as to the daytime meteor fireball explanation which merits
>>serious consideration.

>Then perhaps we could start having some consideration. But I'd
>hazard a guess that if you or others started to come up with any
>rational theory involving meteor fragments (and that's the one
>I'd put a limited amount of money on) the heat will be turned
>off the Pelicanists, and some people will start going for the
>jugular of the 'Meteorists'. You'd still be demystifying
>something which, for many people, must remain a mystery.

Maybe so.

>>>>No, actually, whether it was Pelicans or Extra-terrestrials
>>>>doesn't matter a damn because neither can be proven
>>>>inconclusively.

>>>[sic], as Jerome Clark would say. I presume the word should be
>>>'conclusively'. Given that, I think this sums up the attitude of
>>>too many ufologists: unidentified flying objects are UFOs -
>>>that is all you know and all you need to know. Well, I'm sorry,
>>>but I think it does matter, and in many cases unidentified
>>>flying objects can be proven conclusively to be something other
>>>than UFOs.

>>I agree but I think it should also be pointed out that by the
>>same token many IFO cases can be proven to be UFO's. It is not a
>>one-way street that inexorably leads only to the explanation of
>>UFO's as conventional phenomena. McDonald salvaged many
>>improperly dismissed IFO cases out of the Blue Book files.

>And did he then go on to investigate what they really were, or
>did he just prove to his own satisfaction that they had suddenly
>become mysterious again, and left it at that?

McDonald continued investigating UFO cases after they were classed as such but as you know his efforts were tragically cut short. (I should also add that Fran Ridge has posted a list on the C-E List of more than a dozen IFO cases in the Condon Report that McDonald also recovered to UFO status.) Others have gone on from there, e.g., Hynek, McCampbell, Rutledge, Persinger, et al., with varied results.

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 00:51:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:47:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 09:47:18 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>> Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:41:58 -0500
>> To: updates@sympatico.ca
>> From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>> Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>John wrote:

>>You conveniently twist the meaning/context of my statement
>>and call it "inspiration."

>Hi John,

>Sorry you think I was deliberately twisting your meaning. I did
>not distort your words (except in my silly rendering of your
>silly phrase at the end)and I don't think there was any clear
>context from which to take anything. We could say I
>misinterpreted what you said, which is different.

>>"Imagination" is more like it. And if you are attempting
>>to paint any of my own (conscious) recollections as
>>"polluted" or the result of "contamination" boy did you
>>dial a wrong number.

>I don't judge your case, John, and what's more I confess to
>never having read up on it. My only point was that abductees
are >known to have based parts of their testimonies on those of
>others, knowingly or not. You can't seriously deny this,
surely?

I can only speak for my self but yes, I can "seriously deny it."
I have told you that when I first contacted Budd that I was
unfamiliar/unaware of the details being reported by abductees
and I meant what I said.

Now please tell me 'where' it is "known" that "abductees have
based part of their testimony on those of others, knowingly or
not"? Which study are you referring to? And then tell me how I
(or anybody else for that matter) can "parrot" the testimony of
others without having any foreknowledge of the testimony?

>>Just to 'clarify' my statement for you, (that you have so
>>tortuously twisted) I meant after I began to investigate
>>my own experiences. Budd was the first (and only)
>>investigator I have ever contacted and he was very careful
>>to keep me isolated from other abductees for about three
>>months or more.

>If this is so, then both you and Budd are obviously aware that
>the risk of contamination exists. I rest my case, and really
>don't want to carry on with this conversation.

Cut and run eh? Sorry Bud, it doesn't work that way. Yes Budd is
"aware of contamination" and, he made me aware of it. I think
he was being intelligent and responsible. You choose to put a

'negative spin' on it. You're entitled to your point of view. Budd may not be a "scientist" but he is an extraordinarily intelligent, decent, and thoughtful man. It really rubs my fur the wrong way when anybody who does not know the man, arbitrarily assigns low motives and guile to him. Two things that anybody who knows him will tell you that he is incapable of. It's just another case of one man's treasure being another man's trash.

Now that I have had an opportunity to respond, the "conversation" is over! ;)

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.spacelab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 00:43:56 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:49:36 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Evans

>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:00:27 +0000
>Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Morris
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 23:45:08 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: AA Handwriting

Previously, I had written:

>>>According to AA proponents, the footage was shot on an old Bell
>>and Howell, spring wound Filmo 16mm camera. This camera had a
>>limited run time for each wind of the camera and, as I
>>understand it, film was in short supply which accounts for the
>>type of film used. In addition, the cameraman was wearing
>>protective gear (hood, gloves, etc.) which supposedly made
>>handling the camera harder than usual.

><snip>

Neil replied:

>Nope, no one said film in general was in short supply,
>military cameramen from that time frame have reported that
>colour footage was difficult to get hold of. Neil.

Hi, Neil!

As Jerry would say, "Whatever..."

The real point is the one that you snipped and haven't
addressed: Why did the cameraman waste valuable footage of the
doctor writing on a piece of paper? He knows that he has only
2.5 minutes of film per reel before having to remove containment
gear to reload. I mean, there's an alien corpse just one foot
away and the guy shoots footage of the doc scribbling? Come on!

Roger

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 01:47:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:52:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:31:34 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 03:20:39 EST
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>>This is as clear a statement as I have ever seen, of what
>>>appears to be the American belief that unidentified flying
>>>objects can be identified as UFOs. That no further investigation
>>>or analysis is needed once it has been determined that the
>>>witness saw a UFO. To do so is only to draw charges of
>>>'debunker', 'pelicanist', 'noisy negativist', and so forth.

>>You seem to be referring to "investigation or analysis" only in
>>the sense of eliminating IFO's and other conventional
>>explanations (I will use "IFO" as shorthand for all conventional
>>explanations). Hynek would say that once the IFO-type screening
>>was done that was when the investigation began, scientific
>>investigation to learn more about the UFO phenomenon.>

>I quite agree, so where can we see the serious scientific
>investigation which is trying to work out what Arnold *really*
>saw? If it wasn't pelicans (and even a Pelicanist like me admits
t>hat it's a very slim chance) what was it? Who's on the case?
>No-one, because everyone's happy just to leave it that Arnold
>saw a UFO - end of story. The bunkers don't want to find an
>answer, because they think they already know it. No matter how
>much they tiptoe round it they do really think he saw
>extraterrestrial spaceships. Some one, a reply or two, back
>suggested he might have seen US secret aircraft. Possibly so, I
>don't know enough about aviation history to comment, but is
>someone checking that out?

I use the term TRUFO to refer to an object/phenomenon that
remains unidentified AFTER investigation. The term UFO can then
be used in the Condon sense (unidentified by the witness).

In the above you ask "where can we see the serious scientific
investigation which is trying to work out what Arnold "really"
saw?

Right here... in front of your nose...but you are (a) not
sufficiently familiar with the case (haven't read all the
available discussion) or (b) don't understand that the FIRST
portion of the scientific endeavor to determine whether or not a
sighting is of a TRUFO is to carefully study all possible
explanations and to determine whether any one of them fits the
sighting data. This requires that the validity of the sighting
data be evaluated as well as the "reasonableness" of the
explanation. I call the proposed explanations "Candidate
Explanatory Hypotheses" (CEP). For any particular sighting there
would be one or more CEP. Most CEPs will be unconvincing (for

example, CEP = HOAX for the Arnold case; no reason to believe his sighting was a hoax.... although the strict skeptic would probably argue that you can't assign $P = 0$ --- probability = 0 --- to the hoax suggestion.) Some CEPs might appear convincing at first and then upon analysis they are determined to be unconvincing ($P =$ low number; for example in the Arnold case, CEP = "motes in the eye" was suggested; likely that $P =$ very small number or zero) or just plain wrong ($P = 0$; for example in the Arnold case if the CEP is ball lightning, one can reasonably assign $P = 0$; and note that no one has suggested ball lightning.)

You wrote:

>If it wasn't pelicans (and even a Pelicanist like me admits
>t>hat it's a very slim chance) what was it? Who's on the case?
>>No-one, because everyones's happy just to leave it that Arnold
>>saw a UFO - end of story.

There are about a dozen CEPs that have been suggested for the Arnold sighting including relatively nearby military aircraft (Hynek; $P =$ very low number), water drops on the windshield (Menzel; $P = 0$... cause Arnold looked through the open window at the object...he said... unless you believe he was lying, in which case $P > 0$) , mountain top mirages ($P = 0$ because they don't occur under the conditions of the sighting; unless you believe Arnold was lying or seriously mistaken in his sighting, in which case $P =$ a very low number).

The science in this comes in two parts: 1) determine whether or not a sighting can be reasonably explained by a CEP involving known, if rare, phenomena. (2) if it can be so explained, say so and go on to something else; if it can't be convincingly explained, then begin theorizing about what unusual/unrecognized or unknown phenomenon (such as ET) might explain the sighting.

Many skeptics end up chasing their tails in a circular argument:, always looking for mundane explanations , without ever realizing that SOME sightings cannot be explained in a mundane manner and therefore something new... something "out of the box" must be suggested as a CEP.

Bak to the Arnold Case: Want to be scientific? Fine. Propose an explanation and then be prepared to defend it using reasoning that is convincing. You like meteors? Prove that meteors could probably explain the Arnold sighting. If you are unable to prove same, then leave the discussion to others.

So far as I am concerned, no one has come up with a convincing argument that proves Arnold's sighting can be explained as a known phenomenon. Do I defend this position by appealing to the ETH or some other "belief" in OI/NHI? Resoundingly, NO!!!

I defend this position by demonstrating that not one of the CEP thus far proposed, involving known phenomena, provides a convincing explanation.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 03:20:51 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:54:52 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez

>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:50:15 -0500

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
>>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:32:29 -0600
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: Gary Hart geehart@frontiernet.net
>>>Subject: John Carpenter Resigns

>>>John Carpenter has resigned from the MUFON board.

>>Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
>>A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by inuendo, not proof and
>>made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization. A
>>simple twist of fate. Accomplished nothing. Proved less
>>than nothing and if the gods exist, should be followed by
>>the action of going around, coming around. One would
>>hope.

>>Jim Mortellaro

>While Carpenter has not been convicted of wrongdoing, his
>actions in transferring files for money (even if it is only one
>file) causes concerns that have not yet been addressed. That
>transfer has never been denied, and while this matter may have
>been handled in what all parties believe to have been a proper
>manner, it apparently caught a number of his research subjects
>(or "Clients" in the eyes of some) by surprise.

Hi Steve,

Just for the record, John Carpenter openly admitted to "wrong
doing" (in regard to the sale of files) on this List. This was
never about "John Carpenter" per se from the beginning. At least
not for me. As far as I'm concerned the one and only real issue
has to do with the rights of witnesses to be consulted/informed
when their files/testimony is being sold (or transferred) to a
third party. Assurances need to be provided to those who may
have anonymity concerns that all files are properly sanitized of
any 'identifying' information.

No "crazy" or "wild" demands. Just a call for simple respect for
peoples rights, and to insure the execution of accepted ethical
standards by all researchers involved. "Some" have tried to
twist that (repeatedly) into a "witch hunt" or "headhunting" for
John Carpenter personally. Actually, it just happened to be him
that got busted. I didn't "pick" him. ;)

>Carpenter may have become a scapegoat, but IMO the MUFON
>organization was becoming tainted by its silence in this matter
>and something needed to be done to clear the air. I will add
>that it has become very difficult to work with most of the

>abduction researchers in trying to develop research projects,
>and I believe that is due in part to the issues raised by this
>transfer of data.

MUFON has an opportunity to win a lot of public respect by 'doing the right thing' and conducting an internal investigation into the whole affair, and then publishing the results in a timely manner. It would go a long way towards establishing in the minds of the members and the general public that they do care about the expressed (and legitimate) concerns that have manifested.

Rights of witnesses/abductees and ethical behavior. That's what this is all about. Period. As for Mr.Carpenter, I left him to the Lords of Karma months ago.

As you can see, when you dance, you must pay the piper! ;)

Regards,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - McCartney

From: Pat McCartney <ElPatricio@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 04:15:40 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 07:56:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - McCartney

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 09:47:18 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>To return to the main thread of our correspondence, lack of
>3-3s in pre-Strieber reports is suspicious, and that is true
>whether the 'nine beeps' can be proved real or not. The same
>is true about the Greys. Where are the pre-1980s reports of
>Greys? They are few and far between, despite descriptions
>of similar entities (but not identical ones) in the UFO literature
>of that period and far more ancient descriptions in folklore etc.

Chris,

I've also wondered about the shift in witness descriptions over time and across cultures. Just as grays are now more often reported, the description of UFOs has changed over the years too. (Although flying discs have a very long pedigree.) Wasn't it common in the late 19th century, for instance, for witnesses to report the occupants of flying machines using an anchor or some other, distinctly Victorian equipment?

Of course, some of those descriptions may have been tall tales rather than real reports.

But maybe, also, the descriptions reflected cultural limits to a witness' ability to describe things outside their larger society's experience. For instance, I've always wondered why medieval artists couldn't draw cats, dogs or wild animals as accurately as artists later than, say, the late 18th century. Could it have been an inherent inability to see the animal for what it was? Or a cultural reason?

I think the cultural component is related to the escalation of hypothesis many UFO witnesses have described they've gone through. The first, sensible response when confronted with something that's very different is to describe it in familiar terms. In that regard, Kenneth Arnold's initial consideration of a flight of geese in his 1947 sighting was a classic response to seeing a group of objects flying in the sky. And as a further comment about Arnold's subsequent sighting of "copper colored," duck-like objects, his having earlier seen something he ultimately found inexplicable UFO! UFO!_, changed his expectation that he could see something similar, even if it later proved to be mundane.

So, what I'm saying is that I think descriptions of alien or UFO encounters taken at face value as raw data_ may reflect a greater ability by humans to recognize something that is completely_ outside our experience.

I mean, look at that gawdawful original Star Trek set decoration! Was that the best humans could do to imagine 23rd century technology? How about the latest Star Trek Voyager? Could either television show's set designers really imagine what a hundredth-, thousandth- or millionth-century technology might look like? I doubt it.

I still don't understand how those medieval artists made cats look like dogs.

Pat McCartney

Like Velez, a 52-year-old ex-hippie and current troublemaker

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 03:59:30 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 08:01:32 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Myers

>Date: 19 Mar 2001 14:28:51 -0800
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600

>>>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 19:52:24 -0500
>>>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

><snip>

>Dr. Jonathon Reed's Washington University email address is
>validated. His photos validated by Bob Shell...

>see website: <http://www.aliendestiny.com>

>Does this mean that some will reconsider this case or is it just
>pelican droppings?

Reed's e-mail has not been verified. The spelling of the first name is incorrect and Reed is attempting to capitalize on this by now saying he spells his name both ways. This is not the same Jonathan Reed and I now have reason to believe that this is not his real name. I am now in the process of UW officials checking that out and should have an answer today.

As for Reed's negatives, they have only been verified as being normally exposed negatives, nothing more. Shell did not conclude that the images on the negatives were authentic. This proves nothing and Reed is only trying to build momentum for his bogus case. By the way, someone at the IUFOC in Laughlin saw Reed's bogus alien video and commented that when Reed turned the head that the entire head and neck moved in unison. Its a prop...

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III
UFOWATHCDOG.COM

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Serious Research - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 13:08:33 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 14:55:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Easton

Forwarded. For your information.

To: "UFO Skeptics" <debunk@listbot.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 10:57:26 +0000
From: "James Easton" <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Subject: 'UFO' Thesis

List members might be interested in the following publication
I've come across:

UFOCRITIQUE

UFOs, Social Intelligence, and the Condon Committee

Diana Palmer Hoyt

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Science and
Technology Studies

20 April 2000

[END]

It's available in Adobe Acrobat format at:

<http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05082000-09580026/unrestricted/UFOCRITIQUE.pdf>

At the time of publication, Diana was the "Director, Policy
Development-National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
Office of Policy and Plans".

From what I've read of Diana's thesis so far, it seems well
researched and an objective perspective on the issues addressed.

In her summary conclusions, Diana writes:

"In the case of UFOs, the evidence is circumstantial and
originates in personal testimony and eyewitness accounts, which
are not considered sufficient proof, or even credible evidence
in the scientific community. There is no conclusive direct
evidence that would settle the matter, one way or the other. The
eyewitness functions as the instrument of discovery. In ufology,
the principal investigators are amateurs; thus the evidence is
ambiguous and colored by the perspective and frame of reference
of the individual investigator. Thus a great deal of time and
effort is understandably spent calibrating the instrumentation-
which means determining the credibility of the UFO witnesses
themselves (as instruments of measurement) and the integrity of
the data they produce. While this is understandable, it is not
useful in the analysis of the UFO phenomenon. In addition, the
use of human instrumentation is not precise enough or reliable
enough for science. Because of the nature of the problem and the
question of the status of the evidence, UFO investigators fail

to publish their findings in standard scientific peer reviewed journals.

From all perspectives, the study of UFOs does not meet the standards of science. That which does not meet the standards of science, yet engages in science controversies claiming discoveries, impedes science in the eyes of the scientific community. Unlike science, in the UFO research arena, there is no guild for investigators; since there are no socially stabilized norms, there are no identified rewards and punishments readily available to the amateur investigator. In a field where notoriety helps, for the less than scrupulous amateur, there is no reason not to attempt hoaxes. Most UFO investigators do not have credentials in astronomy or astrophysics and are considered to be charlatans by the pedigreed scientific community. In fact, the entire field of ufology is tainted by the lack of credentials of the UFO hunters".

James Easton.
E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Arnold - What He Did Or Didn't See

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 06:01:59 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 14:59:43 -0500
Subject: Arnold - What He Did Or Didn't See

Hello, All.

I start with a quote from Alexander De Seversky, in part, to show the nature of thought at that time, and also to demonstrate Arnold's "Airman's mind".

"The Roman Empire at the apex of it's glory, flourished in the era of land power. Every Roman was a soldier. The British Empire, flourished in an era of sea power. Every Briton though he might never go to sea, was a sailor in his emotions and loyalties. Even thus, in our own United States, in the new epoch of air power, will flourish on the Base of matchless air power, thus, every man, woman, child-must be an airman in their hearts." From the Book "Victory Through Airpower", by Seversky.

This was at a time when the U.S. was at war :1942 when the Book was published. But, even before the war, the American (I don't write Chauvinistically just illustrating what the mood was like in the prewar U.S. about aviation) public at large was enthralled with aviation. Names like Turner (Roscoe, one of my heroes, hope you like Lions!), Hazlip, Doolittle, and Seversky's Test Pilot Jackie Cochran, Founder of the WASP'S were as popular as sports and movie stars of today.

Except. Leonardo De Caprio doesn't have oh, a 3 to 1 one chance of coming out of a film alive. Sometimes it was 50/50.

Now to Arnold, just an ordinary guy, flying his small airplane (Call Air A-2) and looking for a crashed transport. When something very unusual happened. He saw something . He had the experience and , well prescience of mind to think about what he saw. He was, like a lot of people that were my mentors, "Air Minded".(meaning he knew how to stay alive, for one thing)

As in my earlier post about Pelicans, and Snow Geese, How can they even be there? Cruising over the high Cascade Mountains at meaningful Mach? this a few months before the sound barrier was broken by one Chuck Yeager in the Bell X-1 (sometimes referred as the XS-1.) on October 14, 1947.

This was kept from public knowledge at the time. I even had collage professor tell me the Brits had broken the sound barrier -in 1950. The DeHavilland 108, did eventually break the sound barrier, but not after losing both the prototype and Geoffery DeHavilland in 1948.

We didn't understand the nature of "Mach tuck" or the fact that as the sonic wave traveled back along the wing and tail of aircraft, it changed the way the Aircraft behaved, usually resulting in a nose down, and quite often unrecoverable dive. The X-1 solved the problem by having what would be called an "all flying tail" or a combination of both elevator and stabilizer. By the changing of the angle of the leading edge of the tail to prevent the diving of the aircraft, the X-1, a "brute force," as opposed to the DH 108 "finesse" aircraft, broke the sound barrier-at 760.5 mph.

The first aircraft to go as fast as Arnolds objects was the

Douglas D558-11 Skyrocket, on August 15, 1951. The speed was : 1,238 mph.

The D558-1 was a straight winged jet unable (as much as they tried) to break the sound barrier back in 1946-7 (the thing would run out of fuel before it could go fast enough). It was called (among other less printable names) Skystreak.

This discussion now calls for an analysis of the era's technology of propulsion. Steam still ruled the rails and seas, internal combustion ruled the land and sky. Gas Turbines were the "new thing" Rockets were the power of choice to go high and fast (for short periods.) but, in June of 1947, there was nothing and I mean nothing that went faster than sound, except captured V-2 rockets that didn't have the ability to fly over the cascade mountains horizontally.

Much consideration has been given to the Horten flying wing fighters as the objects that Arnold saw. The Hortens, however, didn't have anything on John Northup and his various wings

The first rocket powered, made in the USA aircraft, Northrop flew in 1944 (and without "captured Nazi technology") called the MX-324 and it was Publicly revealed in -1947.

The Hornets were never produced in such abundant numbers as to be found in a "secret squadron" and over the high cascades. The Northup fighter/interceptor went nowhere, as the limitations of rocket power were all too apparent: no endurance and more than a little dangerous. The Me-163 rocket fighter was dangerous on landing due to the residual fuel being highly explosive.

The early jets were not good either. The German's axial flow turbojets gave better thrust ratios than the British

Centrifugal flow, but were not reliable having a tendency to , ah, blow up, if ran too hard (like combat, for instance)

The Whittle type engine or centrifugal flow type Jet, was much more reliable, but had high fuel consumption and comparatively low thrust potential, 1200 lbs.. being a really good thrust value (like the early Bell P-58 needed two engines just to get off the ground.) this disparity changed, however.

Finally, by 1947, some progress was being made a high thrust engine was something like the Westinghouse J-34 which was an axial flow engine first developed in 1944 (independent of German Technology). The J-34 put out a whopping 3000 lbs., 4000+ with afterburners. The Allison J-33 Centrifugal flow was also comparable. and really, really big jets like the 6000 +lbs.. Rolls Royce Nene with attendant metallurgical problems. In other word, the Technology powerplant wise wasn't there to power a 1200 mph. anything, even a Titanium Pelican.

Eventually, The German swept wing Technology did change high speed flight forever (look at the superlative Boeing B-47-it still looks modern,) 1947 was still a pioneering era and there was not one aircraft captured or homegrown in the USA that could do what the objects that Arnold saw.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Green Fireballs - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 08:57:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:02:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Green Fireballs - Maccabee

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:32:27 -0500
>From: Greg Salyards <d-choma@att.net>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Green Fireballs [was: Serious Research]

>>Regarding "intense green fireballs":

>>La Paz argued that the fireballs sighted in the 1948-49-50 time
>>frame were unusual, but color was only one reason. Of more
>>importance were the flat trajectories reported by numerous
>>witnesses including security guards and La Paz himself and the
>>concentration of th events in the southwestern USA.

>>You can find quite a bit about the fireball mystery in The UFO
>>FBI Connection because the FBI was made aware of the events and
>>of La Paz's suggestion that if they weren't a US secret project
>>then they might be... he suggested they were (and Hoover echoed
>>this through Walter Winchell) --- Soviet missiles "zeroing-in"
>>on the nuclear weapon sites in the USA.

>Bruce,

>I am a 1962 graduate of the US Naval Academy. I am also a
>retired federal employee (Naval Sea Systems Command).>

>I am in the midst of reading your 1998 update of your earlier
>presentation to MUFON. I have just reached the point of where
>you mentioned a UFO-FBI CONNECTION report relating to Green
>Fireballs (GFBS). I would appreciate it if you would please
>forward me a copy.

Thanks for sending your interesting report. I was referring to a
book, THE UFO-FBI CONNECTION, published by Llewellyn Pub.
published last year. You can get it at a bookstore or Amazon.com
etc.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:01:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:50:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:40:43 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Richard now writes:

>>I have no idea "where you are coming from" with this line of
>>argument, but how you can conclude that I said there is no
>>evidence that can be examined makes me doubt that you heard what
>>I said. Radar sightings, physical trace evidence, and strong
>>testimonial evidence of recurring patterns does not amount to "a
>>collection of opinions..." If you seriously believe that, we
>>have nothing further to discuss.

>Hi, Richard!

>To use your words, "I have no idea "where you are coming from"
>with this line of argument." If you read what I wrote, I said
>that you had no physical evidence at your disposal, something
>that you agreed with when you wrote: "No, I can't give you a
>crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory." Only later did you
>add the idea of physical trace evidence. If you felt there was
>physical trace evidence to begin with, then why not say so in
>your first response? Besides, you and I both know that physical
>trace evidence is not the same thing as examination of an object
>of claimed ET origin. This is just a dodge of the real issue at
>hand: lack of physical evidence, i.e. objects of ET origin. Not
>mysterious burned grass at a supposed landing site or the like.

Roger,

I'm tempted to say "over and out!" Your definition of "physical
evidence" clearly is an ET spaceship. Otherwise, nothing to you
constitutes "physical evidence." If we had a spaceship, there
wouldn't be any further debate, would there?

>Beyond that, if any other evidence at the disposal of the
>council had real scientific value, it would have already been
>examined. Therefore, the bottom line is that all the council has
>left are opinions about the "likelihood" of a given case;
>nothing can be proven one way or the other, no matter how long
>the council studies a given case.

Nice circular reasoning. All other evidence "would have already
been examined" leaving only opinions. Wow! There are lots of
physical trace, EM, and radar cases that have been thoroughly
studied, partially studied, or not studied at all. Lots of
potentially important evidence there, even if it doesn't meet
your "all or nothing at all" criterion.

>>And, more relevant to the point, I
>>have been deeply involved in UFO investigations for most of my
>>adult life. And I still don't understand "where you are coming
>>from." Let me hear your blueprint for establishing the "truth"
>>about UFOs and how it differs from mine.

>I never claimed to have one, Richard. Is it your contention that
>the council does?

The Council does not yet exist, but the people advocating it clearly are trying to work out a blueprint for progress. They are not sitting around waiting for a spaceship to crash!

>After all, it has already been discussed that one of the first
>acts of the council is to "weed through" the UFO reports to
>determine which are more likely to be valid than the others.
>Let's say, for the sake of argument, that some valid ones don't
>get left behind. Just what happens after the council appraises
>the cream of the crop? How much further will the discussion of
>UFOs be advanced after the smoke clears? Will there be a "Eureka
>moment" when the council proclaims a UFO report as "valid" and,
>as a result, ET craft will be validated?

You seem to have missed the central rationale for trying to do this in the first place. It clearly was not to try to prove that UFOs are ET craft, but to try to demonstrate on the basis of the best available evidence that the ETH is a reasonable hypothesis. It certainly would be of considerable importance if the scientific community and government supporters thereof were persuaded to use some real scientific resources to study UFOs.

>I understand the good intentions, however, without real physical
>evidence I don't see how much will be accomplished beyond the
>very opinion mongering that you previously showed such disdain
>for. It would seem that the only difference is whether it is the
>opinion of "the council" or the opinion of the average UFO
>enthusiast. In either case, it's still only an opinion. Nothing
>will be proven one way or the other, I'm afraid. I hope I am
>wrong. Perhaps there's a speck of evidence that hasn't been seen
>that will turn the tide, but I doubt it.

We've already been around this block. I have a hard time understanding why, if you really believe what you are saying, you waste any time on this subject at all. Anyway, even if it did all come down to simply a battle of opinions, I still would rather have the opinions of people who have bothered to conduct the most careful and thorough investigations possible, sifted and sorted, and tried to study the data scientifically than the opinions of armchair theorists.

- Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:08:31 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:51:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hall

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>re the Arnold sighting.

>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>formation of any kind?

>I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be
>grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad
>similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings.
>Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of
>similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend
>credence to the overall phenom.

>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>may have been unique.

Wendy,

A very good and appropriate question. I only know part of the answer. As I report in my new book, there are numerous cases of winglike or boomerang-shaped UFOs on record. Off-hand I don't know of any that were more-or-less inline formation cases.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Sandow

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 10:13:06 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:53:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Sandow

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 18:30:07 EST
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

I'm very deeply flattered by the following.

>>Hi Richard,

>>So far I love the list of names you have suggested. I'd also
>>like to nominate Greg Sandow for consideration as a 'moderator'
>>if you will. I not only liked Greg's suggestion, I think -he-
>>should be the one to do the job. Please give it some serious
>>consideration. My great love and admiration of Greg aside, the
>>man is (literally) the most intelligent, fair, and even handed
>>human being I have ever met.

>Richard, John, all -

>John Velez and I agree on very little, but I would like to
>second his nomination of Greg Sandow. He certainly is
>everything that John suggested and probably more.

I'm especially grateful to see this from Kevin, for reasons
he'll understand. Thanks, Kevin.

Though I do feel I'm too identified with the "pro-UFO" side of
the discussion to really be suitable for the job. Ideally you'd
find someone with no public position on any of this. Marcello
Truzzi comes to mind as one possibility -- very sharp skeptical
mind, in the best sense of "skeptical." He was one of the
founders of what's now CSICOP, but then broke with them, after a
very complex series of events, not much to the credit of the
organization. One issue was that he felt they should be more
skeptical of their own views. What I've seen of his work since
then gives equal time to both sides of the debates we're having.
In addition, two essays of his I've read help to clarify some of
the intellectual issues involved when you challenge orthodox
science.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: AA Handwriting - Morris

From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:22:44 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:58:51 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Morris

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 00:43:56 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: AA Handwriting

>>From: Neil Morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 10:00:27 +0000
>>Subject: Re: AA Handwriting - Morris
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>Hi, Neil!

>As Jerry would say, "Whatever..."

>The real point is the one that you snipped and haven't
>addressed: Why did the cameraman waste valuable footage of the
>doctor writing on a piece of paper? He knows that he has only
>2.5 minutes of film per reel before having to remove containment
>gear to reload. I mean, there's an alien corpse just one foot
>away and the guy shoots footage of the doc scribbling? Come on!

Roger,

But why shouldn't he film it if he's documenting all the
procedures?. Form filling might seem mundane but we don't know
what he's writing so how can you or I judge it's worth?.

Neil

--
* * * * *
Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1 1
Univ of Manchester 0 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0 0
Manchester. 1 1
M13.9PL. UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/

Radio Callsign G8KOQ
E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk
Public PGP Key available at www.keyserve.net

* * * * *

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 20 Mar 2001 07:34:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:03:12 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Hamilton

>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 03:59:30 -0800

>>Date: 19 Mar 2001 14:28:51 -0800
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>

>>Dr. Jonathon Reed's Washington University email address is
>>validated. His photos validated by Bob Shell...

>>see website: <http://www.aliendestiny.com>

>>Does this mean that some will reconsider this case or is it just
>>pelican droppings?

>Reed's e-mail _has not_ been verified. The spelling of the first
>name is incorrect and Reed is attempting to capitalize on this
>by now saying he spells his name both ways. This is not the same
>Jonathan Reed and I now have reason to believe that this is not
>his real name. I am now in the process of UW officials checking
>that out and should have an answer today.

>As for Reed's negatives, they have only been verified as being
>normally exposed negatives, nothing more. Shell did not conclude
>that the images on the negatives were authentic. This proves
>nothing and Reed is only trying to build momentum for his bogus
>case. By the way, someone at the IUFOC in Laughlin saw Reed's
>bogus alien video and commented that when Reed turned the head
>that the entire head and neck moved in unison. Its a prop...

This is what we need, refutation backed by real research.

Thanks.

Bill H.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: John Carpetner Resigns - Mortellaro

From: **Jim Mortellaro** <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 10:47:27 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:05:24 -0500
Subject: Re: John Carpetner Resigns - Mortellaro

>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 12:21:07 -0500
>Fwd Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 23:35:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation - Velez

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:18:48 EST
>>Subject: Re: John Carpenter's Resignation
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Was politically inspired. Something which had to be done.
>>A sacrificial lamb, slaughtered by innuendo, not proof and
>>made into a scapegoat for the rest of the organization.

>Politically inspired? Sacrificial lamb? Innuendo? No proof?
>Where have you been all this time? Mars? Moon?

>Snip

>John Velez (Speaking strictly for myself)
>"Better to remain silent and be thought of as a fool,
>than to open ones mouth and remove all doubt."

Dear John, bListers, EBK;

Thank you so much for your thoughts on the issue of JC. I must admit that your personalization of those comments are incorrect.

Regarding John Carpenter... my opinions shall be changed when I see proof. Thus far, I've seen none which allow an apology on my part, for being wrong. As this List knows, when I am wrong, I admit to it. And the apology is to me and to me alone, in spite of my making it public.

I acknowledge those who have provided me with additional information. These will be responded to offlist.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 14:08:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:07:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 22:54:00 -0000

>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 02:07:32 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Hi Richard,

>>So far I love the list of names you have suggested. I'd also
>>like to nominate Greg Sandow for consideration as a 'moderator'
>>if you will. I not only liked Greg's suggestion, I think -he-
>>should be the one to do the job. Please give it some serious
>>consideration. My great love and admiration of Greg aside, the
>>man is (literally) the most intelligent, fair, and even handed
>>human being I have ever met.

>>I hope that this whole idea makes it past the 'talk' stage. It
>>is one of the better ones to manifest on this list in many
>>years.

>John,

>I totally agree with you about Greg Sandow, but didn't want to
>give him the "kiss of death."

"El beso de la Muerte!" <LMAO!>

What should we call you, Don Dick? <LOL>Listen man, if you can
get me and Kevin Randle to agree on anything, you've made the
oceans rise, and the skies fall! ;)

Greg would be a 'score' for that position. See what the
consensus is, and then ask him.

Warmest regards,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 14:11:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:16:56 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

>Here's another nagging question. This one I address to Mr.
>Velez.

Nagging? <LOL>

>You've said several times now that you have "a lifetime of
>conscious memories" to support your claim to be an abductee.
>This intrigues me, not the least because you have never (so far
>as I recall) gone into any further detail.

Wendy, I have done nothing but "go into detail" about my experiences since I joined this List. I have related many of them in great detail exclusively on UFO UpDates. If you would take the time to go to the UpDates archives at Ufomind you will find detailed accounts of specific events, (UFO sightings, abduction memories, associated phenomena) sprinkled throughout my posts of 5 years. All of the long-standing members of this List will verify what I have just told you.

If it's something that is "nagging" at you, then you'll just have to do a little leg work and homework on your own. I'm under no obligation to regurgitate my personal memories 'on demand'.

>Are your experiences described in a book I can read?

No. I'm not here (or in public) because I'm trying to peddle a book or books. Although I have been asked to write on many occasions. I recently had an article published (my first!) in the Winter 2001 issue of Razor Magazine. (Canada)

<http://www.razormagazine.com/>

In it I recount the details of a (conscious) up-close UFO encounter and subsequent abduction. You might want to pick up a copy. It'll scratch that "nagging" itch for you. <VBG>

>If you're planning to write a book and "saving" the story for
>that, I shall inquire no further and await your book.

What's with you and "books?" Writing a book does not 'legitimize' anybody or anybody's claims. No, I do not have a book, I am not writing a book, nor do I plan to write a book. I'm not a writer or a journalist Wendy. Maybe I should write, if some folks on the List who tell me they think I'm so intelligent knew I was a drop-out and completely self-taught, they'd really be impressed with me!

Wendy, this isn't about fame, or being well known, or having a 'book' on the market, and working the lecture circuit. You miss the whole point. You also miss the real value in having access to somebody like me via this List. You are always 'confrontational' in tone and in the way you phrase questions to me. Like you're "challenging me" rather than simply asking a question or two.

What's up with that?

>But can we have a hint or two? Are your "conscious memories"
>actually of abductions? Being hauled physically through windows
>(or walls, or whatever)? Close up (rivet-counting-close) saucer
>sightings? Both? I want details!

1. You don't "want" details, you "demand" them.(!)

2. Go to the UpDates archives. Do your own work. I have already
taken the time to share my experiences over the years on this
List. I'm not going to rewrite it all because you have
'immediate gratification' issues.

>(I am the curious-by-nature type.)

I would have made a different choice for a descriptive adjective,
but let's press on. ;)

>I am not trying to be disrespectful or doubt your word.

Never occurred to me... until now. ;)

A freudian slip is defined as, "saying one thing and meaning a
mother." purrrrrs. <LMAO>

>However,
>you are SO openly and publically vociferous about being an
>abductee that I can't imagine you would object to a query for
>details.

Not at all. Go to the archives. Everything you need to quell the
"nagging" need to know, is there, Wendy. Do your own homework.

>I realize that this might be a deeply painful or
>personal subject for you.

Don't worry. I'm dealing with it all just fine (so far) and
thank you for your concern.

>But you have said many, many times
>that your aim is to get to the bottom of this, to find out
>what's happening. Would not telling your own story, in as much
>detail as possible, to as many people as possible, do much
>towards possibly accomplishing this worthy goal?

I have been sharing my experiences (when appropriate and/or
relevant to something being discussed on the List) for five
years. It's all in the archives. I spend time with Errol on
his program, 'Strange Days... Indeed', every-other Saturday
night. I participate actively on the UpDates List. I think I can
safely say that I am talking to a lot of people on a very
regular basis wouldn't you? How much more public would anybody
need to be?

I do SDI because of EBK. I participate on this List because I
have made some really good and valued friends here. Also because
I get to talk to ufologists on a regular basis that are
otherwise hard to get a hold of because of their schedules. I
did TV and radio because Budd asked me to.

I have never sought out any of it. Ever. Ask people who
know me well Wendy. Ask Greg Sandow, or EBK. They will
tell you 'who' I am and what makes me tick (ufologically.)

>If all this has indeed happened to you, and you have "conscious
>memories" of it, and you aren't writing a book --- Why Not??

Can I ask what this obsession about my writing a book is all
about? Books don't legitimize anything or anybody. You seem to
have attached some kind of 'Mystical importance' to my having
written a book. This is only the third or fourth time you have
mentioned it in this one single post.

>A "lifetime of conscious memories" of the type you say you have,
>with the attendant clear details, might well make your case one
>worthy of examination by the scientific study team currently
>under discussion on this list.

Wendy, I have been friends and communicating with Dick Hall for

several years. He knows that all he ever has to do is ask me. As to my 'worthiness' as a case study, I am not in a position to make that kind of a determination. I am a witness/victim, not an investigator. I would never presume to interject myself into any study. The right folks already know I am available and will participate if asked.

But in answer to your question/statement up above:

Haven't you ever wondered why Budd Hopkins kept me tightly strapped to his hip like a loaded .45 for so many years? Everywhere he went. Think about it Wendy. You're a bright lady, you'll figure it out. ;)

>I'm not picking on you -- really.

Really? Again... why on earth would I ever think that Wendy? <LOL>

>I would pick on Mr.

>Mortellaro, too, but as I recall, he's in the process of writing
>a book about his own experiences, which I eagerly await.

<LMAO>Is the waiting like a "nagging" sensation?

>Extremely Curious Purrrrrrs...

Again, cute choice of words.

John Velez
Woof, woof!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 14:51:23 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:19:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>re the Arnold sighting.

>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>formation of any kind?

>I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be
>grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad
>similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings.
>Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of
>similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend
>credence to the overall phenom.

>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>may have been unique.

Very good questions. I don't know of any case in which a group or formation of crescent-shaped or bat-shaped or half-moon-shaped UFOs were seen. Dave Rudiak has pointed out a case or two in which half-moon shapes were seen, and Arnold did describe his objects as like that. That's fairly close (though Arnold's drawings for the AAF in July 1947 add a bit more detail as do his detailed verbal descriptions).

But this uniqueness factor cuts both ways, pro-UFO and anti-UFO (you've already covered the anti-UFO implications, if the UFO's were real why weren't they seen again, well maybe they were). The anti-UFO position, especially that of the psychosocialists, contends that media hysteria created waves of sightings where people imagined seeing what was popular in the press. But if so, in the alleged "saucer hysteria" of July 1947 and later shouldn't people have misidentified flocks of pelicans, geese, normal aircraft, meteors, etc., as UFO's with the shapes Arnold reported? One anti-UFO idea is that the media misrepresented Arnold's UFO's as "saucers" or "discs" so that is why such shapes were so popular. Arnold himself did sometimes describe his objects as "disc shaped" (AAF letter), apparently as an oversimplification. But more importantly, many stories about Arnold printed across the nation did include Arnold's more detailed non-disc-shape descriptions.

For example, the AP wire service on June 27, 1947, first described the UFO's in the lead paragraph as quote "nine shiny crescent-shaped planes or pilotless missiles." Then further down Arnold is directly quoted as saying "They were half-moon shaped, oval in front and convex in the rear." But Arnold is also quoted as saying "Some of them [pilots] guessed that I had seen some secret guided missiles. People began asking me if I thought they

were missiles sent over the North Pole."

So why didn't people hysterically imagine seeing "crescent-shaped" objects or "half-moon" shapes as Arnold reported? Why didn't lots of people imagine they saw "guided missiles" as well?

It could be that what Arnold saw was really in fact unique.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:10:28 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:21:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Sparks

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:40:43 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 23:37:10 -0000
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Hall

>Previously, I had written:

>>>>1) How does anyone define "the strongest cases they could find"
>>>>when, after 50 years of research, there isn't any physical
>>>>evidence that can be examined?

>Richard replied:

>>>>Well, Roger, you're wrong about that. There is lots of evidence
>>>>of a scientific nature that could be studied objectively. One
>>>>defines "the strongest cases..." based on standards of evidence,
>>>>depth of investigation, and recurring patterns or features. No,
>>>>I can't give you a crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory.

>To which I responded:

>>>So, in essence, I am correct after all. By your own admission
>>>there is no physical evidence that can be examined, which was my
>>>original point. All that's left is a collection of opinions
>>>about something that is as elusive as smoke; worse, we are left
>>>with opinions about other people's opinions.

>Richard now writes:

>>I have no idea "where you are coming from" with this line of
>>argument, but how you can conclude that I said there is no
>>evidence that can be examined makes me doubt that you heard what
>>I said. Radar sightings, physical trace evidence, and strong
>>testimonial evidence of recurring patterns does not amount to "a
>>collection of opinions..." If you seriously believe that, we
>>have nothing further to discuss.

>Hi, Richard!

>To use your words, "I have no idea "where you are coming from"
>with this line of argument." If you read what I wrote, I said
>that you had no physical evidence at your disposal, something
>that you agreed with when you wrote: "No, I can't give you a
>crashed saucer to examine in a laboratory." Only later did you
>add the idea of physical trace evidence. If you felt there was
>physical trace evidence to begin with, then why not say so in
>your first response? Besides, you and I both know that physical
>trace evidence is not the same thing as examination of an object
>of claimed ET origin. This is just a dodge of the real issue at
>hand: lack of physical evidence, i.e. objects of ET origin. Not
>mysterious burned grass at a supposed landing site or the like.

>Beyond that, if any other evidence at the disposal of the
>council had real scientific value, it would have already been
>examined. Therefore, the bottom line is that all the council has
>left are opinions about the "likelihood" of a given case;
>nothing can be proven one way or the other, no matter how long
>the council studies a given case.

>Regarding such, you wrote:

>>You keep insisting that the reality or "existence" of something
>>must be "proven" before qualifications to discuss it
>>intelligently matter.

><snip>

>>And, more relevant to the point, I
>>have been deeply involved in UFO investigations for most of my
>>adult life. And I still don't understand "where you are coming
>>from." Let me hear your blueprint for establishing the "truth"
>>about UFOs and how it differs from mine.

>I never claimed to have one, Richard. Is it your contention that
>the council does?

>After all, it has already been discussed that one of the first
>acts of the council is to "weed through" the UFO reports to
>determine which are more likely to be valid than the others.
>Let's say, for the sake of argument, that some valid ones don't
>get left behind. Just what happens after the council appraises
>the cream of the crop? How much further will the discussion of
>UFOs be advanced after the smoke clears? Will there be a "Eureka
>moment" when the council proclaims a UFO report as "valid" and,
>as a result, ET craft will be validated?

>I understand the good intentions, however, without real physical
>evidence I don't see how much will be accomplished beyond the
>very opinion mongering that you previously showed such disdain
>for. It would seem that the only difference is whether it is the
>opinion of "the council" or the opinion of the average UFO
>enthusiast. In either case, it's still only an opinion. Nothing
>will be proven one way or the other, I'm afraid. I hope I am
>wrong. Perhaps there's a speck of evidence that hasn't been seen
>that will turn the tide, but I doubt it.

>Good luck, guys! I would like nothing better than for the
>existence of ET life to be proven, no matter who does it.

As I see it the point of this exercise is that we don't know all
of the best evidence, there are too many thousands of cases, no
one person can be on top of it all. As to crashed saucer remains
we all know these are not generally available. It's the lesser
levels of evidence where the state of the evidence isn't so
obvious. The council proposal is intended to try to clarify the
exact state of the best evidence. Hence, one mustn't jump to
conclusions in advance about what will turn up because neither
you, Roger, nor I, know the full extent of the UFO case files
worldwide. Hopefully, after this program moves forward, we all
will know or at least have a better appreciation.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Re: Green Fireballs - Guenter

From: Daniel Guenther <daniel_g@t-online.de>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:30:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:26:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Green Fireballs - Guenter

Could you please post this link to UFO UpDates?

<http://cs.tu-berlin.de/~thomasg/gf.htm>

part of

<http://cs.tu-berlin.de/~thomasg/ufodb.htm>

--
Just the Cases - UFO sightings database
<http://cs.tu-berlin.de/~thomasg/ufodb.htm>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [daniel_g](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 20](#)

Weird World Hot Gossip - March 2001

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 21:06:25 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:34:02 -0500
Subject: Weird World Hot Gossip - March 2001

Hot Gossip UK March 2001
Weird World by Nick Pope

Time marches on, so here's the March 2001 round-up of news and views on ufology, the paranormal, the weird and the wonderful. Doing It By The Book

First off, a clarification. The past few years have seen an explosion in the number of books by politicians, military personnel and other insiders with interesting stories to tell. There are clear procedures for such books, designed to strike a balance between the rights of the individual, the public interest and the need to ensure that no information is disclosed which would be detrimental to national security. Manuscripts have to be submitted in advance and amendments made if called for. My own books went through this clearance procedure, and even my two science fiction novels (Operation Thunder Child and Operation Lightning Strike) needed to be officially vetted! None of this is new and none of this should be contentious. Unfortunately, there have been one or two cases where books have been published without clearance, the most recent instance being Richard Tomlinson's book, The Big Breach. Accusations of treachery and treason fly around and the talk is of irresponsible whistle-blowers. The problem is that the mud sticks, often to the wrong targets, and those of us who abided by the procedures are tarred with the same brush as the likes of Shayler and Tomlinson, whose actions I condemn. Some openly criticise, while others criticise a little more subtly, making holier-than-thou pronouncements about how once they retire they would never write a book - the implication being that this would amount to a betrayal. I went through the proper channels for all my books, as did the authors of just about every other book that draws on official information and experience, be it from the world of politics, military, the civil service or the intelligence agencies. Implications of disloyalty are distasteful, ignorant and offensive, where procedures have been followed. Those who make such accusations - explicit or implicit - should grow up and think more carefully before opening their mouths: on my bookshelf, next to each other, are the memoirs of Ted Heath, Margaret Thatcher and John Major. Traitors? I think not.

X Planes and X-Files

X Planes is a fascinating title that has sneaked into bookshops without having attracted the attention of many ufologists. Written by David Oliver and Mike Ryan, it tells the story of how various aircraft and UAVs were developed as black projects, with experimental prototypes flying long before the public got to hear about the final product. If you're interested in stealth, HALO, Aurora and suchlike, and if you're fascinated by theories about how alien technology is being back-engineered at Area 51, this book is well worth a look. It's difficult to draw the line between what's real and what's theoretical with some of this material, but the book is packed with numerous excellent photographs and drawings. There's no bibliography, which is lazy, and no index which is downright criminal in any non-fiction book (all publishers and authors please note). The book costs £14.99 and is published by HarperCollins.

Mystery Sonic Boom

A mystery tremor shattered the peace and calm of North Yorkshire on 21 February, sparking rumours about an earthquake or asteroid. Although it's more likely this was a sonic boom caused by an aircraft, buildings were shaken along the coastline between Scarborough and Whitby, and the British Geological Survey launched an investigation into the incident.

UFO Magazine

The latest edition of UFO Magazine is out now, and contains details of their conference in Leeds on 21, 22 and 23 September. Aside from Georgina Bruni's lecture on the Rendlesham Forest incident, Saturday will focus on abductions. Speakers are Budd Hopkins and John Mack from America, while I'll be giving a UK perspective on the abduction mystery, and dipping into my own casefiles. Check out www.ufomag.co.uk for more details of the magazine, the latest edition of which includes the UFO 2001 Directory - a separate booklet packed with contact details of UFO researchers and groups, together with details of numerous books, videos and audio tapes. There's a massive list of websites and e-mail contact addresses, so on-line ufologists had better check this out. UFO Magazine is going monthly from the May issue, which will be available on 26 April.

Asteroid Alert

On the subject of asteroids, pressure is mounting for action to deal with the threat from comets and asteroids. The Government is currently considering a wide-ranging list of recommendations put to them by the Near Earth Objects Task Force, and this has been raised twice in the House of Commons in recent months, first at Prime Minister's questions on 17 January and again in the course of an Adjournment Debate on the Space Industry, on 1 February. A recent study published in the respected journal Science should focus minds on this issue, as it highlighted evidence of an impact earlier than the one believed to have wiped out the dinosaurs around 65 millions years ago. This impact, around 250 million years ago, wiped out around 90 percent of all marine life and 70 percent of all land vertebrates. Evidence for the impact is provided by the chemical traces left in certain rocks found in China, Japan and Hungary. The comet or asteroid responsible released an amount of energy around a million times greater than the largest earthquake recorded in the last hundred years.

Eye Spy

Unopened Files magazine, edited by Mark Birdsall, is being re-launched under the title Eye Spy! The first edition of what promises to be a fascinating and highly controversial publication will be available in May, and will feature some sensational articles and interviews, focusing on the world of intelligence. Check out www.eyespy.co.uk for details.

UFOs and Music

West Country band Muse have a new album out, entitled Plug in Baby. The front cover features the heads of three Greys, which is another interesting example of how alien imagery is getting into popular culture. On the subject of music with an alien connection, it's great to see Dido making it in the UK at last, having conquered America some time ago. The North London singer's track Thank You was sampled by Eminem on his song Stan (she played the pregnant woman in the boot, in the video) has hit the number one spot with her album No Angel. While Thank You will doubtless be released as a single at some stage, her first single is the haunting Here With Me, which you may recognise as the theme song to the excellent TV series Roswell High. Dido plays the Shepherd's Bush Empire on 12 April. I shall be there.

Ed's Note: Nick Pope's four books, Open Skies, Closed Minds, The Uninvited, Operation Thunder Child and Operation Lightning Strike are available from all good bookshops and from the usual Internet book sites. His UK publishers are Simon & Schuster. In America, The Overlook Press publish his books in hardback while the paperbacks are produced by Dell Publishing.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:56:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 01:08:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 00:03:06 EST
>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:28:32 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Pelicans Redux - Maccabee
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>I'm leaning toward Phil Klass's fireball meteor explanation, see
>>>points #1, 3 & 4, above.

<snip>

>>Well, anyway, I wouldn't lean very far, if I were you. You might
>>find a tilted stance to be highly unstable, especially if you
>>accept Arnold's claim that the sighting lasted perhaps 2.5
>>minutes, but certainly more than the 103 seconds Arnold reported
>>as the time to travel from Rainier to Mt. Adams. A meteor would
>>over that distance in 1/10 of the time.

>Unless it was in the far distance, and actually a great deal
>further away. Meteors glow above 20 kms or so. A meteor
>photographed in the early 1970s had a horizon to distance time
>of 110 seconds.

You mean horizon-to-horizon. The fireball was in 1972. Most
observers saw it for less than 40 seconds.. The famous film
shows it for 26 seconds. A satellite tracked it for 100 seconds
or so. This is discussed in relation to the USS Supply sighting
of 1904 along with other general meteor information at
<http://brumac.8k.com/RemarkableMeteors/> RemarkableMeteors.html.

>>And meteors in a
>>nominally level trajectory at an altitude less than 2 miles is
>>"unheard of." (They would slow down,. cool down and not glow
>>anymore... and furthermore, would fall to earth.)

>That's true, unless they were at a great distance.

The question then is, given "clear skies," what are the
consequences of assuming a VERY distant bright meteor .

HEADS UP FOLKS: you've been looking for "real science." Well,
here it is: propose an explanation and then TEST it against the
data. How do you test it? You determine all the significant
characteristics of the proposed Candidate Explanatory Phenomenon
(CEP) and compare those characteristics with the reported
sighting data.

CEP: meteor train - a bunch of rocks travel past the earth from
north toward south, passing through the atmosphere at an
unusually low altitude and glow brightly at around 3 PM June 24,
1947. Said meteor train passes FAR east of Arnold and (for some
reason) he is the only one to report same. (Fred Johnson's
report would have no bearing on distant meteor observations by

Arnold since Johnson was at "ground level" and looking upward.). It is assume that the meteor train was not captured by the earth (no reports of associated meteorites) but rather continued into space, having had their previous path through the solar system greatly altered.

Characteristic (1) of a fireball meteor: minimum altitude 40 miles. Meteors approach the earth and the distance from the surface continually decreases at first. As they enter the sensible atmosphere they cause the atmosphere to glow brightly (and the meteor itself gets hot). Any body approaching the earth from the outside will reach a minimum altitude and, if it isn't captured (by being slowed by the atmosphere) will continue past the minimum altitude and "climb" back up out of the atmosphere as it travels rapidly over the earth's surface. The meteor enters the "thin atmosphere" and may start to glow (the air in front of the meteor is heated to ionization and incandescence) at about 60 miles altitude and it continues to glow until it again reaches about same altitude after making a slight arc over the surface of the earth. The total distance traveled within the sensible atmosphere for a meteor that reaches 40 miles minimum altitude is about 800 miles (straight path approximation). If the meteor arcs around the earth it can travel a bit farther.

(Most meteors do not penetrate as low as 40 miles... but to make the hypopthesis most favorable to the explanation... yes, a bias in FAVOR of explanation.... use a lower than typical altitude as long as it is physically possible.... but too low and the meteor would stop glowing and fall to earth)

see further discussion at brumac.8k.com listed above

Characteristic (2) high speed; at least higher than orbital speed (17,000 mph) since it is coming from "outside" the earth. Let's say, 20,000 mph as a minimum likely for a really slow fireball.

For the 800 mile glow distance mentioned above the total time within the sensible atmosphere would be about $800 \text{ mi} / 20,000 \text{ mph} = 0.04 \text{ hr} = 2.4 \text{ min}$.

Typically meteor speeds are several times larger than this and the corresponding sighting durations are lower.

Characteristic (3): it can be very bright. Assume all are about the same size so all produce about the same brightness. Once they heat (by atmospheric friction) to glowing they continue to glow as long as the atmosphere is thick enough. But eventually the atmosphere gets too thin as the rocks travel back into space.

CONSEQUENCE OF (1) (2) and (3)

It takes a while to "get hot" as it enters the denser atmosphere and then after it has passed the minimum altutude the glow diminishes as the atmosphere gets thin again. This limits the period of observability. Reports of visible meteors are consistently lower than 2 minutes duration, and generally less than 1 minute.

Characteristic (4) "ballistic trajectory", that is travel in straight line unless caused to deviate by air pressure. In this case, the assumed meteors would tend to follow one another directly without any noticeable sideways motion.

.....

Relative to (1) above: how far away would the meteor train be? To compare the CEP with Arnold's sighting we must combine some of Arnold's information with what is known about meteors.

Arnold said they were about at his altitude.

This would mean that his sighting line was nearly horizontal. (I have argued they were several thousand feet lower, but that's irrelevant here. Obviously if they were lower they would have crashed into the earth.). Let's assume for calculation that his sighting line was exactly toward the horizon. He was about 1.8

miles high or about 4001.8 miles above the center of the spherical earth (radius = 4000 miles, about). (Here I make some approximations to make calculation easy; ideally one would take into account the slight non-sphericity of the earth and the local mountainous topology.) Assume a spherical earth and let his sighting line graze the earth's surface (where the sighting line meets the earth is at "the horizon"... which is quite explicit over large bodies of water, but no as explicit over mountains). One can show that the distance X, from an observer at height H to the horizon (point of tangency of the sighting line with the spherical earth) is $X = (DH)^{0.5}$. That is, the square root of the product of the diameter of the earth, D, times the height.

For Arnold's height, H = 1.8, and with D = 8000 miles (about) we have $(8000 \times 1.8)^{0.5} = 120$ miles.

The meteors could not have been between Arnold and the surface of the earth (they would have had to be below 1.8 miles to do that) so we must continue the line of sight past the point of tangency with the earth and project it outward toward higher and higher altitudes, eventually reaching, say, 40 miles. How far from the point of tangency to an "observer" or a source of light (meteor) at 40 miles altitude? Same formula: $(8000 \times 40)^{0.5} = 565$ mi. Thus the total distance would be the sum $120 + 565 = 685$ miles (about),. This is not completely accurate, but demonstrates that the meteors were DEFINITELY farther than Mt. Rainier and so must have appeared to pass BEHIND Rainier....

Intermediate conclusion about the witness' statement:

If he saw meteors, then Arnold must have been mistaken when he said he could see them against the snow on the mountain.

(It is at this point that the explanation itself becomes questionable. Dare we ignore what the information in Arnold's report indicates, that they passed between him and the mountain? Dare we ignore his claim that the objects passed behind a peak other than Mt Rainier, and if so, would have been several thousand feet lower than he... about a 2 degree depression angle from his plane?)

An alternative geometry is to assume that the sighting line to the meteors at their closest. from Arnold's position made a right angle with a line from Arnold to the center of the earth. This means Arnold's sighting line was slightly above the horizon (less than 1 degree upward). In this case we have a simple right triangle: one side is Arnold's altitude above center the earth: $4000+1.8$.

The hypotenuse is the radial distance to the meteor altitude, $4000+40$ and the unknown side is simply $[(4000+40)^2 - (4000+1.8)^2]^{0.5} = 554$ miles. This is about 10 miles less than the previous number, so the actual "on the horizon" distance from Arnold to a hypothetical meteor 40 miles high would be on the order of 560 miles..

If we "want" to shrink the distance to make this CEP seem more convincing (see below; increased distance means lowered meteor brightness and coloration), then we have to assume Arnold was looking upward more than a degree above the horizon.

Calculations show that for a 50 mile altitude as viewed from a 1.8 miles altitude, if the distance is 400 miles the sighting line is about 4 deg up
" " " " 300 " " " "
" " 6 " "
200
11
100
23

(I hope I did the math correctly).

The shorter the viewing distance the brighter the meteors. And they have to be bright in order to be seen in the daylight sky.

The 1972 fireball that was filmed for 26 seconds was very bright and seen at a high angular elevation. It was less than 100 miles from the observer.

But, in order to shrink the distance and make the meteors bright we have to ignore Arnold's claim that they were "about at his

level" and his claim that he could see them silhouetted against the mountain.

On the other hand, if we accept Arnold's "about at my altitude" we are stuck with hundreds of miles to the meteor train. One consequence of that is atmospheric extinction would greatly reduce the brightness and redden the meteors, just as happens with the sun at sunrise or sunset. The sunlight passes through the atmosphere once on its trip to the ground. At sunset the sun is about 1/1000 as bright as overhead. (Obviously the exact ratio would depend upon the atmospheric clarity at the time of any measurement. The above is for a "clear sky".) Light from a hypothetical meteor at 40 miles altitude would travel nearly tangent to the earth's surface, i.e., reaching a low altitude, and then to Arnold's eye. It would pass through the atmosphere once in going from the meteor to the near surface of the earth (grazing rays) and then through the lower, densest part of the atmosphere once again in traveling from the near-surface to Arnold. Hence it would be reduced even more than sunlight on the horizon. Perhaps by 1/10,000 or 1/100,000. And, of course, because the atmosphere tends to scatter more blue light out of the "beam" from the light source (sun, meteor) the light reaching Arnold would be definitely reddish colored. (Once can see this reddish coloration even when the sun is rather high in the sky when one rides in an airplane and sees a reflection from a body of water far below. The amount of reddening increases as sun elevation decreases.)

Another point for comparison with the meteor CEP:

As pointed out above, as long as the meteors were in the sensible atmosphere and within dense enough air they would glow.

But Arnold reported only occasional flashes. How could this be? Pieces breaking off meteors, meteors flaring up and diminishing and also, for meteors on the horizon, the possibility of distant clouds momentarily blocking the view. These MIGHT explain be consistent with the flashing described by Arnold.

But Arnold also said he could see thin dark lines when these objects appeared to be "on edge" to him. I don't see how a meteor could appear as a "thin dark line."

I have used 40 miles as the altitude for the meteors in the above calculations. This would be at their closest to Arnold, the middle of their trajectory. However, they would have been farther away when he first noticed them (and confused them with pelicans, I presume.... hmmm, Pelicans Plus Meteors, now there's an interesting hypothesis!) and much farther away when they appeared to travel past Mt. Adams (where he could still see flashes.)

It is a challenge to the meteor theorist to prove that a meteor train could remain within the sensible atmosphere from a location somewhat north or Arnold (a direction north of Mt. Rainier when first seen) to a location quite far south (in the direction of Mt Adams).

The above are some of the considerations that must be taken into account when trying to scientifically evaluate the meteor hypothesis as a CEP for the Arnold sighting.

"Real Science" can be used to compare the known or predicted (retrodicted) characteristics of a meteor observation with the information provided by the witness.

(Note: this sort of analysis has been applied Coyne/helicopter case meteor hypothesis....and has been shown to fail if the witnesses are correct in the timing. It was also applied to the USS Supply sighting, as mentioned above.)

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:04:57 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 01:34:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Aubeck

>From: Pat McCartney <ElPatricio@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 04:15:40 EST
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 09:47:18 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>To return to the main thread of our correspondence, lack of
>>3-3s in pre-Strieber reports is suspicious, and that is true
>>whether the 'nine beeps' can be proved real or not. The same
>>is true about the Greys. Where are the pre-1980s reports of
>>Greys? They are few and far between, despite descriptions
>>of similar entities (but not identical ones) in the UFO
>>literature of that period and far more ancient
>>descriptions in folklore etc.

>Chris,

>I've also wondered about the shift in witness descriptions
>over time and across cultures. Just as greys are now more
>often reported, the description of UFOs has changed over
>the years too. (Although flying discs have a very long
>pedigree.) Wasn't it common in the late 19th century, for
>instance, for witnesses to report the occupants of flying
>machines using an anchor or some other, distinctly
>Victorian equipment?

Hi Pat and John,

Reports of Greys haven't just appeared out of nowhere in recent years, but are a return to an earlier period. Greys would fit in so well in the world fairy faith of centuries past and with medieval demonology that I have yet to find a watertight explanation for it. Physical and behavioural descriptions of Greys have their parallels in very early beliefs and stories. The problem is a vexing one as, if the overlap was caused by an overlap of belief systems and nothing else (I mean, if imaginary monsters became imaginary aliens in people's minds) the Grey should have been present in 1947 reports. Or even in the 60s. All this applies to abductions, too.

>Of course, some of those descriptions may have been tall
>tales rather than real reports.

This is my chief concern, as you may have noticed if you've followed my posts at all. But I will not tire of repeating that even known frauds are significant in this research. Known frauds (modern or ancient, abduction or UFO) are good examples of how modern abductees (or false abductees, depending on the case) recycle the claims of others to embellish their own. Strieber may be the best example of this, though there are others, of course.

>But maybe, also, the descriptions reflected cultural
>limits to a witness' ability to describe things outside
>their larger society's experience. For instance, I've
>always wondered why medieval artists couldn't draw cats,
>dogs or wild animals as accurately as artists later than,
>say, the late 18th century. Could it have been an inherent
>inability to see the animal for what it was? Or a cultural
>reason?

There are some excellent depictions of real life in medieval art. Visit your local library. And just because much of that period's less lifelike style has survived, it doesn't mean other "better" work did not exist.

As an aside I could mention how even today more abstract art (Mickey Mouse, for example) has become more widespread and popular than more realistic depictions of people, animals or things. But really you should pay a visit to the library.

>I think the cultural component is related to the escalation
>of hypothesis many UFO witnesses have described they've gone
>through.

You've hit the nail on the head!

>So, what I'm saying is that I think descriptions of alien
>or UFO encounters _taken at face value as raw data_ may
>reflect a greater ability by humans to recognize something
>that is _completely_ outside our experience.

But I'm not so sure about this - except in the sense they were more likely to reproduce things they had seen when designing paintings. Let's not forget how much work (geometric patterning, for example) went in to Medieval paintings. Everything was often calculated beforehand, there was a lot of symbolism. You must read up on the art of the period (and the artists) before you can even speculate about its contents.

>I mean, look at that gawdawful original Star Trek set
>decoration! Was that the best humans could do to imagine 23rd
>century technology? How about the latest Star Trek Voyager?
>Could either television show's set designers really imagine
>what a hundredth-, thousandth- or millionth-century technology
>might look like? I doubt it.

I recall that a 1949 edition of Popular Mechanics optimistically predicted that the computers of the future "may weigh no more than 1.5 tons."

Does anyone really think they can work out what a little light on a stick in the hands of an alien could be for?

Chris Aubeck

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Filer's Files #12 -- 2001

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:38:12 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 11:35:12 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #12 -- 2001

Filer's Files #12 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
March 21, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

HAPPY SPRINGTIME FOR UFOs IN NORTHERN HEMISPHERE

US SURPASSES RUSSIA IN SPACE: We can certainly argue who has had supremacy in space since Sputnik and Yuri Gagarin became the first man in orbit, but with the downfall of the Mir Space Station scheduled for March 22, 2001, few will argue that the US is now supreme. The Russian space station will be de-orbited during its four final orbits around the planet that will take about six hours. The Progress cargo ship docked with the MIR will fire its maneuvering thrusters for the first time around 0100 GMT (8:00 p.m. EST on 21st). A second firing of the Progress engines, one orbit later, will leave the Mir in an elliptical path. The Mir's third and last maneuver will start around 0700 GMT (2 a.m. EST) with the firing of the Progress thrusters and its main engine joining in later in the burn.

The reentry and disintegration of the station will take place in the next thirty minutes over the Pacific Ocean. New Zealand will have the best view. The Mir's speed is expected to fall from 17,000 miles (27,000 km) an hour to about 400 mph as it hits the atmosphere causing to break into 1500 pieces. U.S. Space Command will track the MIR as it disintegrates. Sensors will know the MIR no longer exists and one correlated target will be removed from a list of 8,300 in Space Command's computers. The 140-ton MIR was the largest man-made object in space. However, it is not the largest object ever tracked in space. About twenty tons of MIR will likely survive re-entry into the Pacific Ocean. These Files are most interested in the regular passage of uncorrelated targets picked up by Space Command's sensors. Uncorrelated targets are those not in the data base and most likely represent UFOs. Those entering and leaving our atmosphere usually amount to about one of each type per week. Space travelers apparently stop and refuel, obtain water, food, and have a little recreation.

STS 102 -- Meanwhile, three fresh astronauts were sent to replace the weary crew of the International Space Station aboard the Shuttle Discovery STS 102. During the launch on March 8, several strange flashes and unidentified anomalous objects were seen in the distance from the Space Shuttle. These are being investigated further. With anomalous activity occurring around the shuttle very little download of normal video was observed. Two days later during the shuttle's docking with the station, little was shown in the slide like presentation as Russian cosmonaut Yuri Usachev and American astronauts Jim Voss and Susan Helms moved into the station for a four-month stay," NASA knows the anomalous objects tend to move in closer during docking operations. "Besides a new station crew, four other astronauts, and 10,000 pounds of supplies were carried. Susan Helms is the first woman to live aboard the International Space Station.

SENATOR GLENN ON "FRASIER TV SHOW" CONTROVERSY

Several people wrote saying that what Senator John Glenn' statements concerning UFOs in space were not valid since he was on a comedy show. Glenn was the first American to orbit Earth. The Mercury-6 astronaut successfully completed a three-orbit mission around Earth on February 20, 1962, in Friendship 7, but was forced to manually pilot his spacecraft for reentry when the autopilot failed. Flaming chunks of his spacecraft flew past his window, but he landed safely. In 1998, at age 77 he returned to space aboard the space shuttle STS-95 Discovery, where anomalous objects were also observed. Glenn has logged over 218 hours in space. He appeared on "Frasier" a nationwide situation comedy television show on March 6, 2001, where Frasier and a female character are arguing, while Glenn faces the camera and delivers the following speech playing himself:

"Back in those glory days, I was very uncomfortable when they asked us to say things we didn't want to say and deny other things. Some people asked, you know, were you alone out there? We never gave the real answer, and yet we see things out there, strange things, but we know what we saw out there. And we couldn't really say anything. The bosses were really afraid of this, they were afraid of the War of the Worlds type stuff, and about panic in the streets. So, we had to keep quiet. And now we only see these things in our nightmares or maybe in the movies, and some of them are pretty close to being the truth."

Lets assume that Senator John Glenn during the Frasier show made prejudiced statements against a particular race or religion, there is no doubt he would be held accountable, sitcom or not. I personally feel his remarks on a national TV show were designed to tell us what he saw in space, but to give him reasonable deniability if pressed. It is interesting that many of his fellow astronauts have made similar statements. Astronaut Dr. Brian O'Leary, told me, "We have contact with alien cultures." James McDivet often claims he saw an unidentified object in space, and even took photos of a beer can like device and the famous "tadpole". I have never talked to an astronaut or seen a quote from one that claims its all nonsense. Astronaut Dr. Edgar Mitchell, 1971 said, "We all know UFOs are real. All we need to ask is where are they from." Just before my televised talk with him, he said something like, "Listen to Major George Filer and these other speakers they're telling the truth."

GORDON COOPER'S MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

Astronaut Gordon L. Cooper, one of America's original seven Mercury Astronauts orbited the Earth for a record 34-hour, and 22 orbits in May of 1963 on board Faith 7. He personally saw and his men filmed UFOs so he has been outspoken about the need for an open inquiry into UFOs. In 1978, he sent the following letter to the United Nations:

"I believe that these extraterrestrial vehicles and their crews are visiting this planet from other planets, which are a little more technically advanced than we are on Earth. I feel that we need to have a top level, coordinated program to scientifically collect and analyze data from all over the Earth concerning any type of encounter, and to determine how best to interfere with these visitors in a friendly fashion. We may first have to show them that we have learned how to resolve our problems by peaceful means rather than warfare, before we are accepted as fully qualified universal team members. Their acceptance will have tremendous possibilities of advancing our world in all areas. Certainly then it would seem that the U.N. has a vested interest in handling the subject quickly and properly. I should point out that I am not an experienced UFO professional researcher - I have not yet had the privilege of flying a UFO nor of meeting the crew of one. However, I do feel that I am somewhat qualified to discuss them, since I have been into the fringes of the vast areas of which they travel. Also, I did have occasion in 1951 to have two days of observation of many flights of them, of different sizes flying in fighter formation, generally from west to east over Europe. They were at a higher altitude than we could reach with our jet fighters. If the U.N. agrees to pursue this project and lend the credibility to it, perhaps many more well qualified people will agree to step forth and provide help and information." Sincerely Astronaut Gordon Cooper.

NEW YORK STRANGE OBJECT WITH LIGHTED WINDOWS

PARISH -- On Sunday, March 3, 2001, an object was seen in the southwestern sky at 7:30 PM. At first, it looked like a very large and bright light. It was several times brighter than any planet. The witness stated, "I'm an amateur astronomer and know how to identify planets. When I viewed this object through my 10 x 50 binoculars it seemed to have several lighted windows and beams of light coming from it, like a cross formation. I have never seen anything like this before." Thanks to KPolaris60@aol.com: nymufon@NYCAP.rr.com (nymufon)

NEW YORK UFO CRASH NEAR NIAGARA FALLS?

BUFFALO-- A former professor at Temple University revealed the following story regarding UFOs that are frequently sighted above Lake Ontario. On or about April 15, 1992, a large disc shaped craft was observed coming out of the lake around 7:00 AM and flying erratically south towards Lockport, NY. The object appeared to wobble and moved lower appearing to be in trouble. Observers claim it appeared to search for a landing spot, continued to lose altitude and crashed on Campbell Boulevard (Route 270) four miles west of Lockport and ten miles north of Buffalo. The crash was similar to that seen in the movie "MIB". When the UFO crashed it managed to avoid hitting the cars traveling the road. However, the drivers of the cars stopped to examine the UFO and most waited until the police arrived. The UFO was 100 feet in diameter and 25 feet high. Military, fire and police quickly arrived and cleaned up the crash site and cautioned those there not to talk about the incident. Somehow the authorities were able to keep the crash quiet and only family members of those who observed the crash site have been told. We are looking for further information on this alleged crash. We would like to hear from anyone having additional information at Majorstar@aol.com.

WISCONSIN DEAFENING ROAR

MILWAUKEE -- On March 7, 2001, a citizen reported to ISUR an occurrence that involved his whole family. He stated that they were at home about 11:30 PM on Tuesday March 6, 2001, when he heard what sounded like a jet engine. He considered this unusual, but went down to his basement office. His family remained upstairs, then indicated to him the roar was continuing and had become deafening. His wife complained that it was so loud, as if directly overhead, that she was experiencing ear discomfort. Meanwhile the witness' 15 year old daughter was getting ready to turn in, when in response to the noise, she looked out of her window and observed a ball of light about the size of the moon. As it zoomed across the sky at what appeared to be about twice treetop level. She indicated that the brilliance was about that of a star, and that as it moved away, the noise stopped almost immediately. The witness then phoned the Mitchell International Airport and was advised that no aircraft were in his area. This event occurred in a suburban neighborhood where the witness polled his neighbors about what they might have heard or observed. Several told him that they thought it might be an earthquake due to their houses shaking during the roar. Another went out to investigate, but saw nothing even though the noise was deafening. The case has been referred to MUFON of Wisconsin for investigation. This witness is searching for additional neighborhood witnesses. Thanks to Tom Sheets, ISUR Board, State Director MUFONGA

TEXAS UFO OVER PRESIDENT BUSH'S TEXAS WHITE HOUSE?

COVINGTON -- While working Sunday, February 25, 2001, with my computer upstairs, I had an unobstructed view to the S.W. through two large windows at 5:45 PM when I happened to notice an unusual contrail arcing toward the North from the direction of Waco. As a former commercial pilot, with instrument and multiengine ratings, I noticed that this particular contrail had a base, which appeared over the apparent SW horizon, and the angle was so steep (probable 60 degrees) that it immediately caught my attention. I went to the window for further investigation (thinking, perhaps this is an airliner in distress--when much to my amazement, this object did an abrupt vertical ascent from a fixed point. That's right, no pull up with a normal curve at contrail bottom. I'm talking about a change of direction, speed and ascent almost instantaneously to the vertical-90 degrees ascent and it accelerated as it went forward. Since the sun was setting in the clear Western sky and this contrail and object was clearly visible, especially since

it was reflecting in varying intensities as it passed through our upper atmosphere. I caught a very good reflection of the object with binoculars. It had no wings and was egg shaped, (not tubular like a missile). It was metallic silver with reflectivity of brightly polished chrome. It was at 25-30 thousand feet range when I first saw it. As it accelerated upward, the contrail was not continuous, but rather periodic as if it were passing through different temperatures. I watched it till it disappeared from the sky still in a vertical ascent. Good God; I thought this might have been a missile launch the way this craft behaved. The only major military base is Fort Hood, located a 100 miles south. President Bush's Texas compound is 60 miles south. My parents saw a portion of the contrail that went vertical and they were amazed as to the phenomena. Hope this wasn't Saddam's avowed first attempt at retribution. If it was however, our missile defense worked, because I'm still here to report this sighting. There was no sound involved in this incident. From now on, I will replace the binoculars with a video camera. Thanks to Peter Davenport NUFORC www.ufocenter.com who spoke with this witness and found him to be credible. Editor's Note: Perhaps it was "the angel rides in a whirlwind and directs this storm," that President Bush twice discussed in his inaugural address.

"PSEUDO CRYSTALS" FOUND IN ABDUCTEE HOUSE DUST

M. J. Ruben writes: "One year ago, Dr. William Levensgood of Pinelandia Biophysics Laboratory announced his exciting discovery of unidentified microscopic particles which were found in house dust of abductees." This research has steadily continued and new types of particles or "pseudo crystals" have been discovered. More unusual "pseudo crystals" have been found in household dust of individuals claiming alien abduction. The research continues through the work of biophysicist Dr. William C. Levensgood of Michigan. The "glassy particles" were first discovered in 1997, when an experiencer (abductee) recalled her nighttime encounter with aliens and a beam of light that shined on the floor next to her bed. The woman was awakened by the beam of light. She thrust her arm into the sparkling beam of white light and watched it shimmer on her arm. In the morning, she contacted Dr. Levensgood and told him what happened. He went to her home and collected dust samples from the whitish dust residue on her furniture where she had reported seeing the sparkling beam of light during the night. This dust contained unexplainable "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" which were unidentifiable. This discovery led Dr. Levensgood to search for other clues in household dust. Our readers may be interested in seeing the latest photographic evidence of new "pseudo crystals." There are five pages of photos at the Alien Abduction Experience and Research web site [<http://www.abduct.com/aaer2/r10.htm>]. Thanks to Marilyn Ruben and Dr. Levensgood.

CANADIAN UFO SIGHTINGS HIGH LAST YEAR

UFO sightings are high this year, but no alien abductions were reported. British Columbia and the Yukon recorded unusually high sightings of UFOs in 2000, a year that kept researchers with Canada's main UFO study group busy with the third highest number of incidents in the 11-year history of its annual report. According to Chris Rutkowski, research co-coordinator for Ufology Research of Manitoba, or UFOROM, British Columbians reported 102 UFO sightings, while Yukon residents claimed to have seen 26, numbers that he said are disproportionate in relation to their respective populations. "I suppose people can come up with their own explanations about B.C.," said Mr. Rutkowski, a recreational Ufologist and self-proclaimed "open-minded skeptic" with a degree in astronomy. "As far as the Yukon goes, it's very odd. The number of sightings is usually high relative to the population density." Ontario, with Canada's largest population of more than 11 million people, should record the highest number of reports. However, at 53 sightings, Ontario ranked second behind B.C., with its population of just over four million. The Yukon's 26 sightings placed the territory third in Canada, despite its population of 30,600 residents. Mr. Rutkowski said the popularity of provincial groups like UFO BC, which has its own hotline and Web site and whose members are monthly guests on a radio talk show, helps explain the propensity of UFO reports in that province. UFO investigators in the Yukon, meanwhile, suspect the jump in sightings and the number of cases involving triangular-shaped flying objects may

suggest the testing of secret military aircraft in the area, said Mr. Rutkowski.

UFOROM compiles its data from reports filed to the research group by provincial counterparts, police, and federal agencies like Transport Canada and the Department of National Defense. Across Canada, reports of UFOs totaled 263 in 2000, ranking the year third behind 1997, when 284 UFOs were sighted, and 1993, with its record 489 sightings. In an average year, there are 236 reported sightings, according UFOROM data. Mr. Rutkowski said most of the sightings in 1993 were attributed to a cosmic fireball, or bolide. Similarly, the 263 sightings in 2000 only produced 34 cases that remained unknown after further investigation. "But if they're watching this star and it gets bigger and bigger and turns out to be a saucer that lands next to them and two men with antennas get out, that's a high strangeness event that's difficult to write off as a star." Among the 263 reports across Canada were two close encounters of the third kind, in which a witness saw figures or entities along with the UFO. In one such incident in Mission, B.C., a man claimed he saw a flying saucer outside his home, in which he observed a being that appeared human, clad in coveralls and staring back at him. Thanks to Louise A. Lowry HnSASSY1 and para-discuss@yahoogroups.com

MEXICO REPTOID SIGHTED IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

ROSARITO -- An alien was sighted on the beach in, in Mexico's state of Baja California on Wednesday, February 29, 2001 by two Mexican policemen. According to Urak Pavlov, director of UTRENE, a UFO research group based in Tijuana, B.V., Mexico, The two policemen were on patrol near the thermoelectric plant in Rosarito" when "they saw what appeared to be a reptilian creature walking on the beach with a black suit on and with glaring red eyes. The creature was seen at 3:17 a.m. At first they were too scared to talk to anyone about the incident and preferred not to speak of it." The Reptoid sighting is only one of many UFO incidents that have taken place in Baja California recently, Pavlov said. "There has been "a wave of sightings in Baja California, especially in the mountains and along the coast." On Monday, March 5, 2001, Pavlov reported, "There were 50 sheep mutilated on ranches near Tocate, B.C. All of the sheep were left without any blood" On Wednesday, February 28, 2001, "in the evening, my wife and I closed the office, and she said, 'Look! What is that!?' I said, 'Let me get the video camera.' So I did," he recalled. "This big luminescent object reflected all the colors of the spectrum--yellow, red, blue, white, etc. and stopped at one place in the sky in Tijuana." Thanks to Scott Corrales, Urak Pavlov para las noticias de Baja and UFO ROUNDUP Volume 6, # 11, March 15, 2001 Editor: Joseph Trainor
<http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

RUSSIA UFOs HOVER OVER AIRPORT AGAIN

BARNAUL -- Anatoli reports that on March 6,7 and 9, 2001, a UFO was observed above the city around 2200 hours (10:00 PM) in Southern Siberia. It hovered above Vlasikha, the southeast part of Barnaul. The object had the form of a sphere. In the first evening the sphere did not change in any way, in the following two nights it "danced" in the sky. It would increase and decrease in size, "blow up" similarly to salute, joined again and changed. The colors, moved sharply. One inhabitant of Vlasikha videotaped more than 1.5 of hours of the object on three evenings. See newspaper "Free Rate" (Svobodniy Kurs). On January 27, 2001, UFOs were observed above Barnaul, and the pilots of two IL-76 four-engine jet aircraft refused to take off with the UFO hovering over the airport. Other flights were diverted to other airports for the ninety minutes according to Ivan Komarov the local aviation company director. Thanks to Anatolij kutovoj@mail.iae.lt UTRO.RU
<http://www.utro.ru/news/200103131236343539.shtml>

NATIONAL SECURITY SKEWED UFO NEWS COVERAGE

SEATTLE -- Some of the nation's best-known news organizations have quietly cooperated with U.S. government authorities to deceive the public about unidentified flying objects UFOs, according to a new book by Terry Hansen a Seattle journalist. According to Hansen, "They did this mainly by suppressing their own coverage and distributing government propaganda under the guise of factual reporting." In "The Missing Times" news media

complicity in the UFO conspiracy, author Hansen explains how the same deception techniques used during wars and other national-security crises have been used to manage public perceptions about UFOs. Beginning in the 1940s, UFOs raised a variety of urgent national-security concerns among government policymakers who responded by deploying an array of standard censorship and propaganda methods, sometimes with the help of cooperative news organizations. Although the CIA has acknowledged it planned a covert mass-media program of "training and debunking" designed to discourage public interest in the UFO phenomenon, the Agency has not told the full story, Hansen reports. Documentation now confirms that the CIA orchestrated production of a 1966, CBS TV program about UFOs, narrated by famed newsman Walter Cronkite. The program filled with false and misleading information, was broadcast as part of the "CBS Reports" documentary series during a period of especially intense UFO activity across the nation. A range of evidence suggests that other elite news organizations known to have had close ties to the CIA also played key roles in the deception program. Hansen said. "My book argues that these assignments were related to UFOs, as well. Despite official denials, UFOs have long been one of the most pressing national-security issues facing the U.S. government." whansen@pscu.com or by fax at 206-855-8075. The Missing Times is available at 1-888-7-XLIBRIS www.themissingtimes.com.

NEW JERSEY GREAT UFO CONGRESS 2001

BORDENTOWN -- March 31 and April 1 at the Days Inn on Route 206 at the NJ Turnpike Exit #7. Jan Aldrich, Don and Viki Ecker, Dolores Cannon, Richard Cassaro, Bob Durant, and Nancy Talbot have been invited to speak. Call Pat Marcatillio for reservations at 609 631-8955

CIRAEP CONFERENCE WITH DR. JONATHAN REED

Dr. Jonathan Reed will be present a briefing at the Club Hotel by Doubletree, 9461 Roosevelt Blvd., Northeast Philadelphia, Pa. 19114. onn on Sunday, .March 25, at 4:00 PM. White Eagle, a Native American Elder will speak first. Dr. Jonathan Reed's claims an incredible encounter with a being not of this world: \$10.00 admission fee. <http://www.odysseylink.net/Story1.htm>

Call Bob Eure at 215-659-3673 for reservations and information

NEW NASA SHUTTLE VIDEO OF UFOs IN SPACE

Jeff Challender has prepared a new tape of various UFOs that were caught on recent Shuttle video footage. Jeff has over an hour long tape of UFOs shot in space. Jeff spends hundreds of hours watching the shuttle broadcasts from space and is now an expert on NASA missions and even those onboard the shuttle are unlikely to see what Jeff does. Using Jeff's directions you will be able to learn the difference between space junk, ice crystals and real UFOs. One segment has 24 UFOs watching the shuttle from space. I feel confident we could go into a court of law and convince any jury that there are UFOs moving at high speed around the Earth. Send \$25 to: Jeff Challender 2768 Mendel Way - Sacramento, California 95833-2011

BEFORE YOU BUY OR SELL A HOME SEE MY FREE REPORT

All real estate agents are not the same? Some real estate agents or sales representatives are part timers and inexperienced. Others are experts with an excellent experience and capabilities. When you are selling or buying your home, you need to make sure you have the best real estate agent working for you before you make any important financial decisions on one your biggest investments! Remember, the majority of people do not know the right questions to ask, and what pit falls can cause major problems. Picking the right real estate agent can be a wonderful experience, and picking the wrong one can be a big mistake that can waste your time and cost you thousands! Find out, " What you need to understand before hiring any real estate agent!" These are the questions that many agents do not want you to ask. Learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent for your needs. To get a free copy of this report, just call (609) 654-0020 or e-mail us at Majorstar@aol.com. We can also help you with your own or corporate Worldwide Relocation to Australia, Benelux, Canada, Cayman Is, England, France, Guam, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the US.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL that costs only \$30 per year by contacting MUFONHO@aol.com. Mention that I recommended you for membership. Filer's Files is copyrighted 2001 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the files on their Web Sites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. These reports and comments are not necessarily the official MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar@aol.com. Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name, address, or story confidential. Caution: Most of these are initial reports and require further investigation.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [nymufon](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

The Real X-Files - 03-20-01

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 23:59:54 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:36:57 -0500
Subject: The Real X-Files - 03-20-01

Hot Gossip UK Announcement

Apologies for not posting my regular Real X-Files column this month but I am very busy at the moment and will be taking a break from writing this particular column for the next six months.

However, I am pleased to announce that Neil Spring will be standing in for me and I am sure he will do an excellent job.

Neil is a second year undergraduate reading Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE) at Somerville, Oxford University. He is also the founder and President of 'Open Minds', The Oxford UFO Research Society, which is dedicated to the serious research of UFO phenomena.

I am pleased to have been invited to talk at a seminar at Oxford University next term, which is organised by Neil and his group. Graham Birdsall was their last guest speaker and also present was Brian James, the current chairman of BUFORA. Photographs are available at their web site: <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~openmind>

I will continue to post The Real X-Files and of course Nick Pope's Weird World on UFO Updates and will post any news I think list members might be interested in.

Thanks to Errol for his patience and great list, I don't intend quitting Updates, but Hot Gossip UK is a big magazine to edit at the end of every month and one less deadline will make my life a little easier, I hope.

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 16:28:56 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:40:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 13:08:33 +0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

<snip>

>Forwarded. For your information.

<snip>

>At the time of publication, Diana was the "Director, Policy
>Development-National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
>Office of Policy and Plans".

>From what I've read of Diana's thesis so far, it seems well
>researched and an objective perspective on the issues addressed.

>In her summary conclusions, Diana writes:

>"In the case of UFOs, the evidence is circumstantial and
>originates in personal testimony and eyewitness accounts, which
>are not considered sufficient proof, or even credible evidence
>in the scientific community..."

<snip>

James,

Are you in the right thread?

In my dictionary I read:

"Circumstantial evidence: evidence that tends to prove a fact by
proving other events or circumstances which afford a basis for a
reasonable inference of the occurrence of the fact at issue"

Well now, Science is mostly a collage of 'circumstantial
evidence'. A theory by definition is "a plausible or
scientifically acceptable general principle or body of
principles offered to explain phenomena" or "a hypothesis
assumed for the sake of argument or investigation".

From dark matter to quantas, from black holes to viruses, our
mind interprets the manifestations of the unreachable, and does
so with 'circumstantial evidence'.

'Circumstantial UFO evidence' does not discredit the phenomena.

Does beauty discredit intelligence?

Regards,

Serge Salvaille

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:42:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>re the Arnold sighting.

>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>formation of any kind?

>I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be
>grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad
>similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings.
>Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of
>similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend
>credence to the overall phenom.

>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>may have been unique.

>Curious Purrrrrs....

>Wendy Christensen

Hi Wendy,

I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00 pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:05:21 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:45:29 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

>Here's another nagging question.

<snip>

>... I would pick on Mr. Mortellaro, too...

Dear Wendy;

I address my points to your statement about writing a book. Some folks seem to be of the opinion that writing a journal about their experiences does not legitimize the experience.

Duh!

Of course it don't. I've had this discussion with John Velez. I understand his views, but I do not agree with them. While true about legitimization, it ends there. The purpose of researching one's own experiences is to present them in an organized way so that others may garner some measure of comfort, succor ... whatever, from hearing about someone else's lifetime of events, events which I perceive to be UFO/abduction related. And to legitimize one's OWN recall, too. That's so important to me.

It is in my opinion, a positive effort. One which can help others. Presenting one's experiences on UpDates, on various other venues such as Rense and Strange Days, then answering what appears to be an honest question posed in complete friendship by saying, "Go look up my posts... the information is all there..." or the equivalent, is (to me) the wrong answer. It may be the only one. But the assumption appears to be that you, the person making the request, is doing the injustice. Defend yourself if you deem it to be appropriate, this is just my opinion.

Writing a book is a catharsis for me. But the problem which presents is that after only less than a full year, the project turns out to be a terrible effort - and for a number of important reasons. I would like to present them here, so that people understand them.

Recall happens almost instantaneously in my case. I then become agitated, depressed and leave the project for a while. It appears to be similar to what I understand often happen in hypnosis. The subject remembers, it all comes back in a rush, there is another shock to the already traumatized individual, he lives the event all over again, even the physical feelings which occurred during the original experience.

Same thing with me. My body and my mind respond to the event all over again. It is another trauma to an already traumatized man. That'd be me. It hurts. All over again.

I note that in writing the journal, I've had recall of dozens of

things which I can say in all truth, I remember as if it just occurred. And I say to myself, Cripes, how the hell come I didn't remember such a thing until now? I can't explain it.

There are other reasons which make the effort very difficult. The research in one's own life is massive. Verifying the times, ages, places, in which the memory takes place, validating this information with any witnesses such as my parents or grandparents, friends, etc., is a bear. I've had to find friends I haven't seen hide nor hair of for more than 50 years!

There are many other reasons. A project which I believed would take less than a year, will take much more. And then comes life, which must be led, making money, spending it and other worthwhile projects, one of which is very important to me and which involves writing a great deal.

This work will be published. "Nagging?" Yah, John. I get that a lot already from people who really care. I am blessed.

Last, the "nagging" truth is, that neither this book nor any other which is written about this subject, no matter how well done, will make anyone any money. Least of all me. That's not the reason for the project. Ask anyone, even people who have published very successful books in this subject area... whether the time spent on the project was worth the return garnered by the book sales.

I'll bet the condos (both of 'em) that they will tell you truth. It just ain't worth eh dough. It's worth lots more though. It just ain't money.

Meanwhile, the work goes on. You may see a great deal of it on

WWW.WORLDDWIDERENAISSANCE.COM.

Check out the section under Pandora's Box and click on UFO's. There you will find a plethora of stories not only to entertain, but to point to what I've already written... this ain't for me, or the other authors who write on Renaissance, or even those of us who write our stories for publication ..it's for everyone who won't, can't or is afraid to even broach the subject with anyone else. It's for them. All of them.

Jim Mortellaro

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:43:49 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:49:43 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Young

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 21:37:06 EST
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>For example we have been told since the 30s' that the Universe
>is/was 4-6 billion years old. All based on the scientific study,
>all available evidence and so on. Hubble space telescope comes
>along and snaps photographs.

>In some of these photographs so called scientists and
>astronomers tell us that there are pockets of matter that are 15
>billion years old i.e. older then the big bang shockwave.

>Based upon that we are now told that the universe is at least 15
>billion years old. Essentially 75 years of scientific theory and
>pronouncements was changed on the basis of a photographs and
>interpretation of photographs.

>Now, if a person came up with a photograph of a UFO, these same
>so called scientists and people would instantly start telling us
>why it is a hoax, why it is not to be believed, why it is
>absolutely impossible for any kind of alien space ships to be
>.real etc etc. All based upon the photograph and "their"
>interpretation of said photo.

>Interesting isn't it.

Robert, Jim, List:

The difference is that the positions of the objects are
published along with the pixs and anyone can go there and look
for themselves, and take the pixs again. Also, provenance of
the pixs, how they were taken, etc., is available.

If anybody could go to the location of a UFO and take their own
pix, it might be different. Of course, it has been tried at
Gulf Breeze.

But, it wasn't very interesting.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 18:41:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:51:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Salvaille

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:10:28 EST
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:40:43 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>Good luck, guys! I would like nothing better than for the
>>existence of ET life to be proven, no matter who does it.

>As I see it the point of this exercise is that we don't know all
>of the best evidence, there are too many thousands of cases, no
>one person can be on top of it all. As to crashed saucer remains
>we all know these are not generally available. It's the lesser
>levels of evidence where the state of the evidence isn't so
>obvious. The council proposal is intended to try to clarify the
>exact state of the best evidence. Hence, one mustn't jump to
>conclusions in advance about what will turn up because neither
>you, Roger, nor I, know the full extent of the UFO case files
>worldwide. Hopefully, after this program moves forward, we all
>will know or at least have a better appreciation.

<snip>

Yo Brad and Roger.

What Council? What format? What structure? For what purpose?

Specify the problem. Define the constraints. Draw the means.

Draw a map.

Analyze.

I've tried to do this in a previous post.

Of course, my proposal did imply that only people with papers
and credentials should address the problem if we want any
credibility.

Fell in dead water.

Some much for the Boys and Girls Club of Ufology.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 22:29:08 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:53:55 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Evans - Mortellaro

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 18:21:23 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 21:53:09 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01 - Mortellaro

>>>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-16-01
>>>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 08:39:40 -0600

>Previously, Jimmy wrote:

>>Alfred, the problem with mainstream science, Sagan and the
>>skeptidopeys out there in the void, is that ANY evidence which
>>is not hard and contains no hard evidence, extraordinary
>>evidence, is discounted.

>>Now the question, Alfred, is why!?! And my answer, (mine alone)
>>is short and sweet. To me at least. They are afraid. Broken
>>paradigms mean new knowledge and new knowledge means starting
>>all over again. They are scared little weenies. Without
>>portfolio. Never will have what it takes to engage in,
>>participate in and contribute to, the Renaissance of this
>>planet. The New Renaissance! They who remain standing still
>>will fall far behind faster than those who walk only more
>>slowly.

>Hi, Jim!

>What about AA? Or Dr. Reed and company? Or Billy Meier? Or the
>Mexico City sighting? Or how about crop circles? Are these not
>evidence, as well? Or does your common sense tell you that some
>things just don't pass the smell test? Regardless, there are
>those that will swear on a stack of Bibles that these are all
>real and that you are the skeptic!

>As a healthy skeptic, I can assure you that I am not afraid. On
>the contrary, I can't wait for the day that ET life is proven.
>In the mean time, I grow tired of the false profits... er, I
>mean prophets...that come along and muddy the waters.

>Ya' can call me "jaded" but ya' don't have to call me "sir".
>(for all you old timers out there)

Hey, them's my pair of dimes, er, paradigms... methodology.
Notice I did not reefer to skeptics. 'S OK to be one a them. 'S
not OK to be a Skeptidopey. Them's the folks who are culpably
ignorant. There is a difference.

And I am certain that Doctor Bruce will recall the lines, as he
must be old enough...

"Ah, you can call me Ray.
Or you can call me Ray-Jay.
But ya dasn't hafta calls me Johnson "

Etc.

I prefer to be called in time for dinner.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:55:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hale

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 13:08:33 +0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>List members might be interested in the following publication
>I've come across:

>UFOCRITIQUE

>UFOs, Social Intelligence, and the Condon Committee

>Diana Palmer Hoyt

>In her summary conclusions, Diana writes:

>"In the case of UFOs, the evidence is circumstantial and
>originates in personal testimony and eyewitness accounts, which
>are not considered sufficient proof, or even credible evidence
>in the scientific community. There is no conclusive direct
>evidence that would settle the matter, one way or the other. The
>eyewitness functions as the instrument of discovery. In ufology,
>the principal investigators are amateurs; thus the evidence is
>ambiguous and colored by the perspective and frame of reference
>of the individual investigator. Thus a great deal of time and
>effort is understandably spent calibrating the instrumentation-
>which means determining the credibility of the UFO witnesses
>themselves (as instruments of measurement) and the integrity of
>the data they produce. While this is understandable, it is not
>useful in the analysis of the UFO phenomenon. In addition, the
>use of human instrumentation is not precise enough or reliable
>enough for science. Because of the nature of the problem and the
>question of the status of the evidence, UFO investigators fail
>to publish their findings in standard scientific peer reviewed
>journals.

Hi All,

After reading the above, I can reveal I have solved the UFO
mystery. Why I did not find this answer sooner I will never
know.

If I read the above correctly, it is quite simple to solve the
UFO question once and for all, and here it is!

Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!

Problem solved....

God I feel really great, I hope you all thank me for solving
this long and drawn argument!

Roy

"Is that really me in my mirror?"

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 21:21:33 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:59:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Strickland

>From: Pat McCartney <ElPatricio@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 04:15:40 EST
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 09:47:18 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>...But maybe, also, the descriptions reflected cultural limits
>to a witness' ability to describe things outside their larger
>society's experience. Could it have been an inherent
>inability to see the animal for what it was? Or a cultural
>reason?

Ummmmm. You surely make me think about things I'd rather not think about, and write about, too. Nope. I drew what I saw when I was 10 (1955). The drawings I did of the UFOs I saw and rode in did not resemble the rocket ships shown on TV; nor did the aliens I regularly encountered resemble the aliens depicted on TV at that time nor in the present (although they are getting closer and closer to matching up to them). What does that mean? Are there more TV producers who are also becoming abductees? Maybe, but I doubt it.

I think that perhaps there is a mind recognition of the truth taking place over time...a subliminal acceptance by the general public that our 3-dimensional reality is not all there is, and never has been.

>I think the cultural component is related to the escalation of
>hypothesis many UFO witnesses have described they've gone
>through. The first, sensible response when confronted with
>something that's very different is to describe it in familiar
>terms. In that regard, Kenneth Arnold's initial consideration of
>a flight of geese in his 1947 sighting was a classic response to
>seeing a group of objects flying in the sky. And as a further
>comment about Arnold's subsequent sighting of "copper
>colored," duck-like objects, his having earlier seen something
>he ultimately found inexplicable UFO! UFO!, changed his
>expectation that he could see something similar, even if it
>later proved to be mundane.

What I feel is more likely, is that Arnold had an initial screen memory of geese or ducks. After several months, the screen memory may have become a less viable explanation to him for what he remembered seeing (i.e., the mind begins to slowly accept what has been seen, despite the person's cultural unwillingness to accept the plausibility of what was seen or experienced).

As children our minds are less entrenched and more open to what is possible (because we don't know enough to know what is implausible). As adults, our minds really do want to distort reality. We tend to accept the simple and discard the less plausible as "a trick our mind plays on us," a "slight of hand," a "hoax," a "nightmare," or that "we're seeing things." Anything

would be preferable than to have to accept what we thought we saw or experienced as real.

At 5 I had a hard time accepting what was happening to me. At 55, it's not a whole lot easier. We understand how difficult it is for non-experiencers to accept that with which we abductees find so difficult. That's part of why some of us don't write books. We would really rather not think too hard about it (it happens often enough as it is); and writing about it seems to make it all the more real. For those that do write books, it probably acts as a catharsis.

>So, what I'm saying is that I think descriptions of alien or UFO encounters taken at face value as raw data may reflect a greater ability by humans to recognize something that is completely outside our experience.

>I mean, look at that gawdawful original Star Trek set decoration! Was that the best humans could do to imagine 23rd century technology? How about the latest Star Trek Voyager? >Could either television show's set designers really imagine what a hundredth-, thousandth- or millionth-century technology might look like? I doubt it.

Actually, both sets are fairly colorless (black & white), functional, plain and simple...a lot like the real thing!

>I still don't understand how those medieval artists made cats look like dogs.

I don't either. They're so 2-dimensional. But then, Picasso's is too 4th dimensional for me. And, I've been in a few other dimensions.

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Serious Research - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 19:58:41 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:01:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Strickland

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 13:20:45 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Kaeser
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Steven Kaeser <Steve@konsulting.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 16:01:32 -0500

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 14:09:07 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Mr. Young,

I respect your opinion, however, your response to the Steve K's request for an explanation re the increase in sightings in the 40's and 50's, followed by a decline in sightings, is a bit simplified, I think.

>>There may be three prosaic possibilities, and another related
>>to TRUFOS:

- >1) An actual increase during that time of green fireballs.
- >2) An increase of brighter fireballs, which because of their intense brightness, appeared green.
- >3) An increase during that time of interest in the green color of fireballs.
- >4) Something about the ET craft at that time caused them to be green, or they were much more intensely bright.

I was abducted all through the 50's and never saw a "fireball" until 1992, which missed my truck by a few inches, and was closely tailed by a UFO, which stopped on a dime when parallel to my truck. I have never seen a green fireball, or green ufo, or green alien. The fireball looked like a ball on fire, the ufo's were metallic or silver in color, and the aliens I've seen range in color from dark gray to pasty white to lizard brown.

Sue

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

MidAtlanticMUFONatFortfest

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 00:25:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:05:08 -0500
Subject: MidAtlanticMUFONatFortfest

Instead of the Mid Atlantic MUFON symposium which has been held annually (almost) for several years, this year we are linking up with the Forteans for a "Fortfest."

UFO lectures will be featured on Saturday. See below:
Everyone is invited.

Bruce Maccabee
MUFON State Director for Maryland.

.....
31th Annual Conference on Anomalous
Phenomena

THE INTERNATIONAL FORTEAN ORGANIZATION (INFO)
presents
*FortNite '01!

Grand Ballroom, Holiday Inn, College Park, MD
(This is at the junction of the 495 Beltway and Route 1
in Maryland. The hotel is at the north side of the
Beltway, which runs east-west at this location.)

May 5th & 6th, 2001

Saturday Lecture Program-10:00 A.M.-6:00 P.M John Anthony West,
Keynote Speaker, internationally acclaimed and Emmy Award
winning (The Mystery of the Sphinx documentary narrated by
Charlton Heston) prolific author and independent Egyptologist
whose non-fiction works include The Serpent in the Sky: The Case
for High Wisdom of Ancient Egypt and The Travelers Key to Egypt
will present the latest astounding discoveries from the Middle
East which provides further evidence for a highly advanced lost
civilization.

Philip Imbrogno, author of Night Siege , Contact of the Fifth
Kind, and Celtic Mysteries in New England will explore Contact
Phenomena. His data documents his investigation into non-human
intelligence and includes channeling, UFO abductions, alien
contacts, psychic phenomena and those who claim contact of a
religious nature.

Michael Glickman, a British former architect and professor, is
considered by many to be the world's leading authority on Crop
Circles. He has devoted the last eleven years to the study and
analysis of this most enigmatic and beautiful of phenomena.
This will be a presentation/slide show ("The Pi Factor") like no
other; he brings a wide range of skills and disciplines to bear
on the subject, including Numerology and Sacred Geometry.
Though humorous, Michael's presentation will engage some of the
fundamental issues of our time.

John A. Keel, the great Daddy-O of Forteana, prolific writer
(Jadoo, Operation Trojan Horse, Our Haunted Planet, Strange
Creatures from Time and Space, The Mothman Prophecies, The
Eighth Tower and Disneyland of the Gods), columnist (Playboy,
Fate, etc.) and humorist on "Mothman Out of Mothballs; Monsters
& Mania" -soon to be a major motion picture with Richard

Gere-get the inside scoop on this and other Cryptozoological mysteries!

Tracy R. Twyman, Editor/Publisher of Dagoberts Revenge Magazine (the mag that examines Judeo-Christian history, conspiracy theories, the Holy Grail, the Knights Templar, the occult and fringe science) with a slide show on "The Secret of Rennes-le-Chateau and the Atlantean Connection". Tracy, a writer/publisher/film producer is a recognized expert on secret societies and the occult. She will present the latest research from her trip to France for the Fox Television program In Search of Secret Societies and for her upcoming book on the subject.

Dr. Bruce Maccabee, naval optical physicist of MUFON (Mutual UFO Network) and the Fund for UFO Research (past president) will ask if the U.S. Air Force thinks UFOs are real and will also discuss his latest book, The UFO-FBI Connection. New, not-to-be-missed information!

Including...12:30 P.M. Buffet Luncheon and the Phenomenal I-Would-Almost Sell-My-Mother-Sale of Books, Tapes and Periodicals!
Plus: Friday Night, May 4th at 8:00 p.m., The Ultimate Connection, an informal networking party with Authors and Friends in the Moosehead Lounge at the College Park Holiday Inn! Plus, Saturday Night Gab Fest (what Charles Fort called "rocks to strike with our suspicions") in the Moosehead Lounge starting at 8:30 p.m.!

Sunday Bus Tour of Weird Baltimore-11:00 A.M -5:00P.M.

Join us for a knock-your-socks-off TOUR of The Dime Museum and The American Visionary Art Museum. The Dime Museum is in a 19th-century building stuffed with oddities (unicorn, two-headed calf, mummified remains of an Amazon giantess, the renown Feejee Mermaid, Samoan Sea Wurm, etc.) plus other special exhibits including a complete 1934 Sideshow. The American Visionary Art Museum, dedicated to works by self-taught "outsider" artists, features kinetic sculptures and a new show, "Treasures of the Soul". These are insider-behind the scenes tours that will leave you breathless! *Lunch on your own when the bus stops at the water side Food Court at the Inner Harbor.

*RESERVATIONS ESSENTIAL!

___ Saturday Lecture Program, \$65

(after April 20, \$75) Includes Buffet Luncheon, Lectures, Book Sale plus Socials!

___ FortNite Combo-Mambo, \$100

(after April 20, \$115) Includes Everything! Sat. & Sun..

___ Sunday Are-You-On-Or Off-The-Bus-Tour*, \$45

(after April 20, \$50) Includes Insider Tours.

* Lunch on Your Own.

Reservations Essential Before April 30th!

___Sorry, I cannot attend. Please accept my tax-deductable contribution towards your work.

Make checks payable to INFO and return to:
RESERVATIONS

ARE A MUST
FortFest Chair, P.O. Box N, College Park, MD 20740.
FOR ALL

EVENTS...

PLEASE

RESERVE EARLY!

Name.....
 Address.....
 City.....State.....Zip.....
 INFO is a non-profit, educational
 Phone.....Fax.....
 corporation.
 E-mail.....Website?.....

For more information on FortFest '00...
 E-mail us at: fortfest99@yahoo.com or
davesvideo@aol.com or call INFO at 301-294-4315

FortNite '01!
 May 5 & 6th!
 P.O. Box N
 College Park, MD 20740

Leap into the 21st Century!
 Reserve Now!

Free Parking...Free Metro Shuttle.. FortNite at The
 College Park Holiday Inn!

*REGISTRATION FORM

\$89 Double or Single accommodations are available
 for Friday, Saturday & Sunday nights at the Holiday
 Inn College Park. Call or fax the hotel directly (FOR
 ROOM RESERVATIONS ONLY)> Ask for Group RES
 and the "A14" FortNite 2001 rate. Reserve ASAP!
 Rooms only held at special rate until April 10!
 The Holiday Inn College Park
 10000 Baltimore Avenue
 College Park, MD 20740
 301-345-6700 Phone 301-441-4923 Fax
 The hotel is located at I-95 anbd U.S. Rt. 1 (exit
 25A)

For discount Air book Southwest Airlines (\$100 fares
 from Hartford, Buffalo, Manchester) or Metrojet
 form the East Coast, Florida, LAX, SFO, Chicago.
 Virgin from Europe. Greyhound Bus in the States.
 Amtrak-2nd 1/2 fare, 3rd FREE!
 Hotel offers free pickup from METRO (subway).
 Shuttles to hotel are available from BWI (closest),
 Washington Regan-National or Dulles Airports.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 00:25:57 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:10:16 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Maccabee

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 13:08:33 +0000
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>Forwarded. For your information.

>To: "UFO Skeptics" <debunk@listbot.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 10:57:26 +0000
>From: "James Easton" <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>Subject: 'UFO' Thesis

>List members might be interested in the following publication
>I've come across:

>UFOCRITIQUE

>UFOs, Social Intelligence, and the Condon Committee

>Diana Palmer Hoyt

>In her summary conclusions, Diana writes:

>"In the case of UFOs, the evidence is circumstantial and
>originates in personal testimony and eyewitness accounts, which
>are not considered sufficient proof, or even credible evidence
>in the scientific community. There is no conclusive direct
>evidence that would settle the matter, one way or the other. The
>eyewitness functions as the instrument of discovery. In ufology,
>the principal investigators are amateurs; thus the evidence is
>ambiguous and colored by the perspective and frame of reference
>of the individual investigator. Thus a great deal of time and
>effort is understandably spent calibrating the instrumentation-
>which means determining the credibility of the UFO witnesses
>themselves (as instruments of measurement) and the integrity of
>the data they produce. While this is understandable, it is not
>useful in the analysis of the UFO phenomenon. In addition, the
>use of human instrumentation is not precise enough or reliable
>enough for science. Because of the nature of the problem and the
>question of the status of the evidence, UFO investigators fail
>to publish their findings in standard scientific peer reviewed
>journals.

> From all perspectives, the study of UFOs does not meet the
>standards of science. That which does not meet the standards of
>science, yet engages in science controversies claiming
>discoveries, impedes science in the eyes of the scientific
>community. Unlike science, in the UFO research arena, there is
>no guild for investigators; since there are no socially
>stabilized norms, there are no identified rewards and
>punishments readily available to the amateur investigator. In a
>field where notoriety helps, for the less than scrupulous
>amateur, there is no reason not to attempt hoaxes. Most UFO
>investigators do not have credentials in astronomy or
>astrophysics and are considered to be charlatans by the
>pedigreed scientific community. In fact, the entire field of
>ufology is tainted by the lack of credentials of the UFO

>hunters".

After reading this I wonder if she could just go one step further and conclude; UFOs? Witnesses? Ignore them. It all means nothing.

But, more seriously, whereas I'm sure she was serious about doing her research and completing her degree, its obvious that her research itself was only marginal. (though greatly appreciated by her advisor and others who haven't thoroughly researched the field of ufology.) I wonder what she would have written if Dr. James McDonald had been one of her thesis advisors.

Since I don't have a degree in astrophysics or astronomy, I presume she would consider me one of the charlatans.

Charlatan Bruce.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:56:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:12:31 -0500
Subject: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

To Errol and List,

Having been a witness to 18 separate sightings of true UFOs (in this case, UFO meaning an unusual light or object whose behaviour, color patterns, performance, brilliance, shape, speed, maneuverability, etc. clearly falls outside of the brackets of Natural Phenomena or man-made devices), I am pretty confident that I can distinguish between something that is unknown and something that isn't.

But there are people out there who will look at Venus, a satellite or a bolide, and claim that they saw a UFO. I want to put together a list of these objects/phenomena and their characteristics in order for people to familiarize themselves with the knowns and learn to distinguish those from the unknowns.

I would like to know where I could get information on the following:

Natural Phenomena:

Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets, shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

Man-made devices:

Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket, missile, flare, satellite, weather balloon, remote control model airplanes/helicopters, etc.

If you think I missed anything, please include them in the list.

Basically, I'm saying that we know how these things behave, and how they look, whether they are natural or man-made.

From what I have read on UFOs in the past 26 years, these objects / lights seem to defy our law of physics, as we know it. Personally, I don't believe so, but that's the way we humans have always looked at it.

To my knowledge, our man-made devices cannot even match some (if not all) of the characteristics of these things, despite arguments to the contrary from those who would like us to believe that the U.S. military are piloting objects the size of skyscrapers, illuminated with lights that are brighter than daylight, that can defy gravity, and maneuver all over the world at great speeds (ie: 0 - 22,000 mph, which was recorded on radar in one UFO case), in complete silence!

Personally, I think those people are idiots. And they should be the first ones to be taught the difference between the knowns and the unknowns.

Somehow, giving so much credit to the military R&D for having developed highly-advanced technology of that caliber in less than 60 earth years is a ridiculous notion. It would be akin to giving a digital watch to Christopher Columbus and saying:

Chris, old boy, build me one just like it!

Most of the arguments about whether or not true UFOs/Flying saucers are ET spacecraft or man-made, would fall by the wayside, if only people used good ol' common sense.

Cordially,

Michel M. Deschamps
UFO Eyewitness/Researcher/Historian

with both feet firmly on the ground!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Puerto Rico: UFO over Caguas

From: lornisl@juno.com
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 05:44:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:14:16 -0500
Subject: Puerto Rico: UFO over Caguas

SOURCE: www.ovni.net
DATE: March 20, 2001

Researchers Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman have brought to our attention a sighting (CE-1) which took place on March 12, 2001 at 02:00 hrs. AST over the city of Caguas's Barrio Beatriz sector, located between state routes 172 and 1. Witnesses to the event were A. Serrano and A. Leon, who were sitting on their porch at that time and saw a bright light heading toward them from the mountains near Aguas Buenas and over Hwy 1. The object's brightness increased as it approached, as did its size. It flew at low altitude over a farm located some 15 meters away from where the witnesses sat. The flying object was flying in general direction from Puerto Rico's northern coast toward its southern coast, finally vanishing over Las Piñas hill.

The witnesses did not detect any unusual smells related to the event, but remarked that the sighting left an odd taste in their mouths, which they described as similar to "putting a battery between one's lips". An almost imperceptible buzzing sound, "like that of bees" also accompanied the event.

Both witnesses agreed that the object was so bright that it was painful to look at, and that its true shape could not be made out because of the brightness. It appeared to have "something like luminous mirrors" along its bottom section which seemed to rotate. They estimate that the UFO was some 10 meters in length.

Scott Corrales

Institute of Hispanic Ufology
www.inexplicata.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 12:58:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:23:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:06:59 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:46:05 -0000

>Hi,

>Remember, we're trying to find cases that suggest ETH and as you
>so rightly pointed out earlier, this goes beyond just finding
>cases that are simply Unexplained and not misperceptions. We
>don't want to lose the focus on ETH evidence. My point about
>metallic-appearing Daylight Discs is not that they are less
>likely to be misperceptions/IFO's etc., but that they are far
>more suggestive of alien spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere
>than any others, except daylight CE's of landed spacecraft.

Hi,

I agree - of course - and see the logic of this. All I am pointing out is that we should not assume a daylight disk has a more credible status simply because this is how a witness describes it. I recognise that you are not arguing this - but I have often seen Ufologists claim that a UFO cannot possibly be a this or a that because the witness said it was disk like and had portholes. But this does not follow.

But in principle I do agree with your thinking as regards to the superiority value of such cases for what we are seeking to do here. Simply not their invulnerability. Which is why giving a weighting to a DD is fine, provided it is accompanied by a measure of both its potential to be a hoax and potential to be an IFO - both of which are independent of its DD description.

>>I have seen quite a few that turn out to
>>be aircraft or balloons, etc.

>The screening criteria I suggested -- angular size Full Moon or
>larger, duration 1-minute+, multiple witnesses,
>date-time-location known -- are intended to screen the
>_stronger_ UFO cases from the _weaker_ UFO cases, not to weed
>out IFO's from UFO's -- as you yourself mention further down
>about how such prerequisites will help distinguish the "strong
>case."

This is perfectly reasonable.

>Though these criteria can be helpful guidelines in that
>sort of preliminary IFO/UFO investigation they don't
>automatically generate lists of UFO cases from raw sighting
>reports without even having to investigate. Investigation is
>still necessary.

Indeed, which is why I propose that we only go with cases that

have had at least two independent investigations - both of which found the case to be unresolved. They do not have to agree on probabilities of explanation. But this will offer a useful cross check to guard against personal bias (and I am sure we all display it to some extent) favouring our own cases owing to our commitment to them.

>But these screening criteria would IMO shift
>the percentages into a much higher framework so that instead of,
>say, 95% of all sightings reported turning out to be IFO's
>(numbers for illustration only), which I challenge anyway, maybe
>only 10-30% of such screened sightings would turn out to be
>IFO's (here as everywhere I include all conventional
>explanations within the term "IFO"). In any event, that is not
>the point I was trying to make, I digress here just for sake of
>completeness.

Like I said, I don't think we should be so insistent on UFO and IFO status. We ought to accept that all cases are guesstimates and either more or less likely to be IFOs or UFOs. Very few cases aspire to the extremities at either end of this sliding scale.

Which is why I suggested agreeing a three part scoring system for defining strong cases. This being deduced one third from parameters of the case (such as DDs scoring much higher than NLs and extra points for visual or physical evidence). One third for a rating on the probability that the case is not hoaxed - the higher the less likely that it is. One third for a rating on the probability that the case cannot be resolved as an IFO of any sort. Again the higher the less likely that probability.

Then - combined - these three scores give a figure for the ETI value of the case. The higher it is the better. Its just intended as a working guideline to help out. Not a hard and fast rule. This will get us away from an argument as to whether a case is - or is not - a pelican or whatever.

For instance, take Arnold. We are all going to disagree forever on what did happen and we will probably never know. But we might be able to define a consensus score for the ETI rating of the case without too much hassle.

If we agree parameters and points based on the features of the case then that one third of the score for Arnold would be an objective one not a subjective call. We might say that it has - say - a total score of 3 points.

Deciding its hoax probability rating and its IFO probability would be more subjective - but we easily add an objective element. Say the panel has 8 members, then each ascribes their own hoax and IFO rating to the case and we average out and round up to the nearest whole number. So if the average hoax score given by the panel is, say, 8 (I think with Arnold it would be pretty high as there is little reason to believe a hoax occurred) and the average IFO score - which would be much more variable - turned out to be, say, 4 - then we have an agreed ETI score for this case of $3 + 8 + 4 = 15$.

This rating is arrived at by a reasonably objective means and whilst many will dispute the total - saying it should have been higher or lower - the beauty of this idea is that it doesn't matter. The ETI measures nothing specifically it simply gives a relative total to judge alongside other cases.

In other words, cases with an ETI under 10 would not be up to much. Cases with an ETI over 20 would be pretty strong. And so on.

Its simply an easy way to know which cases are the better ones without constantly rowing over whether case A was 'really' a balloon, or case B a meteor.

>Agreed. Again, I would say that I propose these screening rules
>not as absolutes, but that exceptions would need to be argued.
>The idea is to try to prevent endless bickering over marginal
>cases right at the outset by cutting out most of them.

Agreed, which fits in with what I am suggesting about this scoring system.

>Hoaxes are extremely rare, a few percentage points.

I agree they are generally under 1% - BUT (I have certainly

found) they actually rise quite markedly the stranger the case. In other words there are more hoaxed close encounters than hoaxed LITS. Stands to reason really - as if you are going to make something up its pretty dumb to make up something that could be easily dismissed as a passing satellite!

So the question of hoaxing takes on greater significance with this study, I think.

In any case, all I am suggesting is a semi objective measure of the hoaxing potential of a case. Any case rated a definite hoax would surely be rejected - just as will any rated 1 in the IFO category (i.e. we all agree it IS an IFO) (yes - I know - this will only happen in CUCUFOS - the Cuckooland UFO society) For every case in the real world we will have an agreed measure to put into the pot. If you are right (and you are certainly not wholly wrong on this) the cases we pick will aspire towards 9 on the hoaxing scale because most witnesses are, indeed, not hoaxers.

>Hynek
>articulated the multiple witness criterion in order to get more
>data for calibration of the witnesses, not to try to rule out
>hoaxes, though it would certainly help in that respect.

Yes, it achieves both aims which is why independent witnesses are so important. Although - we do have to remember that there are signs within the UFO field that close encounters are people/place centred events that have a kind of 'zone of inclusion' around them. I have certainly had cases which I consider strong in which only one witness saw / experienced something and people nearby who ought to have done seemingly did not. This, in fact, is a basic feature of the Oz Factor.

So I am aware that we ought not to be rejecting cases purely because they do not have multiple, independent witnesses. This could simply be an inherent feature of close encounter events. But its a good pointer to science of a strong case and so that's why - for the purposes of this exercise - its useful to have.

>A group
>of people who know each other can also be a good resource for
>uncovering any hoax because many people tend to blab or spill
>secrets, so the larger the number the more likely a hoax will be
>uncovered. Unfortunately there is one other countervailing
>tendency about larger groups and that is that it increases the
>chances of _false charges_ of hoax or whatever from unstable
>individuals.

There are numerous subtleties like this to cases that if we try to take them all into account all the time we will never go forward. I think they are useful to brief people with before they make a case judgement but - lets face it - we are never going to catch all hoaxes and we are going to be suspicious of totally genuine cases from time to time. Ufology is not an exact science. It is about judging human nature and witness perception so we can only ever make educated guesses. That's where a scoring system like the ETI helps. It objectifies this guesswork.

>See above on why multiple independent witnesses is not
>necessary, and it may be too stringent a requirement. It leaves
>in the gray zone what to do about multiple witnesses who are in
>independent locations but are in radio or electronic
>communication with each other, e.g., air defense nets involved
>in a UFO interception.

Like I say, with the ETI no case is excluded because it does not have a certain criterion. That's another value of this system. It gains points by having multiple independent witnesses, but if the case makes up for this in other criteria then its overall ETI will still make it qualify for our consideration.

>I don't have your book but assume the movie film case wouldn't
>pass the screening criteria I suggested. Was a saucer or disc
>reported?

Yes, a structured disk was seen by some witnesses. But mostly not. And the footage itself shows an orange blob around which most witnesses 'saw' cones and other shapes that were - thanks to the film - seen to be largely perceptual rather than literal.

>This (scoring system) is really a scoring of the relative
>strength of the case as an Unexplained phenomenon rather than
>of its strength in indicating ETH, and we may start losing
>sight of the goal, which is ETH evidence.

Only if we do not define the criteria for case parameters correctly - which will make up at least a third (in fact probably more like a half) of all the points a case could claim. The things I noted as criteria were quick back of the envelope ideas. Not intended to be a definitive version by any stretch. This is something we should all debate.

But it is surely possible to define a scoring system for the criteria that we should look for in a case in order to make it qualify to a greater or lesser degree as supportive of the ETH.

The IFO and hoaxing probabilities are necessary counter checks - as science will scoff (rightly) at a pile of cases we say are suggestive of the ETH if we base our judgement only on case parameters but then tell them - well, this one was reported by Billy Liesalot - who was on his own whilst out looking for work to feed his starving kids - when he just happened to see this spaceship land.

Or, in this next case, Mona Plenty saw this daylight disk with portholes on the 31 December 1978 during the time when a Cosmos rocket burned up. We know it wasn't that rocket being misperceived but was a spaceship flying in covertly under the cloak provided by this widespread IFO sighting.

We have to combine a rating for ETH case parameters with one for hoaxing and one for IFO probability if we are to make any kind of strong argument here. Science will expect us to only offer the cases that score best in 'all' these areas.

>If we extract the weight of evidence of
>unexplainability there are really only three items of ETH
>indication here: Crashed spacecraft. Alien. Functioning
>spacecraft. Everything else goes to the _weight_ of the evidence
>and mode of observation rather than the strength of ETH
>indication. A sighting of a structured craft and a photo of a
>structured craft still points to a structured craft, only the
>level and reliability of detail is different.

We need to thrash this out - I agree. But we will only ever have cases that 'suggest' the ETH. If we had really strong hard evidence backed crashed spaceship cases this exercise would be redundant.

What I was proposing was a weighted score whereby we gave points for physical evidence of a non terrestrial nature (assuming there is any!) and evidence of an ambiguous nature. And I don't mean 'reports of' physical evidence - I mean actual evidence - because we would be laughed at if we said - well we heard that there was this stuff that someone saw but nobody knows what happened to it.

Say we ascribe a score of 8 to ET physical evidence and 5 to ambiguous physical evidence, then we can always agree that any particular case comes somewhere in between and give it a rating of 6 or 7, say, to satisfy the debate. This allows for cases such as the recent Sydney DNA hair sample case where the DNA is not alien but not readily identifiable either. Its ambiguous but I would personally say a 6 or a 7 on this scoring not simply a 5.

Crashed UFO stories would in my view rate lower than actual hard evidence - although I wouldn't be averse to including a scoring parameter for them in the rating.

But we can - surely - get together as a team and mutually agree what things need to be included and what relative scores to give each criterion? If Ufology cannot do that simple thing we may as well not try to do anything much harder!

>If we don't
>clearly segregate these measures we may find ourselves getting
>bogged down in arguments over the strength of unexplainability
>rather than of extraterrestriality.

I don't think that's going to happen on the basis of the scoring system I suggest. It allows every person involved to give their own hoax and IFO rating and we go with the average. If the panel make up is balanced (a vital step) and has enough people on it (8 minimum) then we should have a painlessly agreed figure.

And if we define the scoring system up front for the different criteria - as we have started to do here - that will preclude the arguments later as the panel will simply have to agree to abide by whatever scoring system we mutually define ahead of its operation.

After all, go back to what I said earlier - the ETI is a relative figure to allow judgement against other cases. It says little in absolute terms.

>As a scoring system it is a good start but needs fine tuning as
>I'm sure you anticipated.

Absolutely - as I said it was merely to kick start this discussion. I would like to see many more on this list offer ideas of criteria for features of a case that they feel we should look for that help define that case as suggestive of the ETH.

Brad has put in a few above (eg daylight disks and crashes). I put in several last time (eg multiple independent witnesses and photographic evidence of alien presence). We have a few others on the table (such as physical evidence of an ET or ambiguously terrestrial origin).

What else do you all feel we need to consider? Heres your chance to say.

Then when we have a list on the table we can try to ascribe points values to each one (I suggest from 1 to 10 according to what we consider most importance). I don't think this should prove an impossible task.

Lets try anyhow. What do we have to lose?

So - first up - out there - suggest the case parameters you think we should be considering. The ones that you believe make a case suggestive of the ETH.

Its that simple.

Actually, why bother listing items we
>know don't exist in our possession or cannot indisputably be
>proved to exist somewhere, such as the 10 points for physical
>evidence of unambiguously ET material? If we really had the
>"goods" in that way we wouldn't have to be going through this
>exercise in the first place. Likewise with photos of aliens. Why
>not list Landing on White House Lawn or Alien Nuclear War if
>we're going to go that far?

No - I disagree. There may well be people out there who believe we do have unambiguous physical evidence for aliens. (Roger Lier perhaps?) I don't personally think we have seen it but we need to leave the opportunity open for someone to say they have it. The IFO and hoaxing ratings will counterbalance the tendency to submit ludicrous ETI physical evidence as proof since a case that generates 10 for this will not get far if its hoaxing and IFO probability ratings are zero or 1 !

As for alien photos - I've seen at least one - the Ilkley entity photo. This is a real photo purporting to show an alien involved in an abduction. Whether it dies or does not would be determined by the cases scoring in the IFO and hoaxing levels. But its a genuine photo - that is not in dispute - and its an either / or - that is either a hoax or an alien.

So I don't think including these things is absurd. They are feasible (indeed science will rightly ask for cases of this type) and I think we will leave ourselves open for dismissal if we said in reply - we didn't include this kind of thing because we knew they wouldn't exist.

It would be a bit like an astronomer studying planets around other stars and deciding not to include any photographs in their

study because right now it seems unlikely there's any hope of getting any.

We should define the kind of evidence any scientist would seek to try to verify the ETH and include it in the study. If its there - fine - if it isn't then even admitting in the report that no such cases were found is a step into the light.

But photographs of landed UFOs are not of the same order as a landing on the White House lawn. Why? Because the latter would end the mystery and preclude the debate. The former would become a contentious piece of evidence to be debated and would solve nothing (as the Ilkley alien photo has not). But it is nonetheless potentially achievable evidence and so evidence that we need to seek.

>Ambiguous physical evidence shouldn't rank higher than good
>photos of structured craft. Where would instrumentation data fit
>into this, such as radar, astronomical instruments, electronic
>intelligence gear, etc.? It may be that this scoring system will
>get too complicated to get common agreement on the scoring
>values.

It will if we try to include 'everything'. I think we should focus on perhaps about 10 criteria that argue most strongly towards the ETH. We will have to include one or two that merely argue towards a strong case, but the ETH criteria should get higher points because that's what we are trying to measure.

If a UFO is tracked on radar this in of itself is not a support for the ETH - because meteors can be, so can lots of other things. But if a UFO is tracked on radar doing something totally 'impossible' - such as stopping dead, changing direction and accelerating vertically upwards at several times the speed of a jet aircraft - then it offers support for the ETH and - yes - we should have a figure for it.

This wont mean it WAS a spaceship that got tracked any more than rating the Ilkley entity means this WAS an alien. But we are not scoring proof of the ETH - only elements of a case that suggest it.

However, if we start including things like - observed via a telescope - then we will get unduly complex. Since I don't see how this enhances the ETH probability of a case enough to warrant special inclusion. And we should concentrate on including those features of a case that do.

>And as I say I fear that this scale tends to emphasize a
>scoring >of the strength of the UFO case as an Unexplained
phenomenon, >not the ET origin indication. There should be a
separate scale >for reliability and strength of evidence as
evidence.

We are trying to measure the probability that a case suggests the ETH. So we need a set of parameters that make a case seem to do that. And we need scores for its IFO and hoaxing potential (which I think probably are the 'strength of evidence as evidence' scales to which you refer above).

But in general we seem to agree on what is needed here.

That's a good starting point. Now lets hear from a few others out there.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/21/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 13:08:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:37:32 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/21/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 21, 2001

**AN EXEMPLARY FOIA RULING
**SANDIA WAS-- OR WAS NOT-- HACKED
**NEW NON-LETHAL WEAPON WILL NOT "FRY PEOPLE"

AN EXEMPLARY FOIA RULING

A new federal court decision found "enormous public benefit" from documents released under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), illustrating the enduring value of that 35 year old law.

The case involved nuclear workers seeking records on the government's decision to "privatize" the U.S. Enrichment Corp. (USEC), a government corporation that produced enriched uranium. The decision to sell off USEC in 1998 was made behind closed doors and, as it turned out, involved gross conflicts of interest.

By using the FOIA to challenge the secrecy of the decision-making process, the workers "have forced the public release of countless important documents relating to the privatization of USEC," wrote DC District Court Judge Gladys Kessler in a March 16 ruling.

"The public benefits of Plaintiff's [FOIA] lawsuits are substantial," she found. Among other things, "the released documents have been, and will continue to be, greatly beneficial to academic and scholarly commentators who are interested in privatization, 'reinvention of government', non-proliferation policy, and/or decision-making theory."

"The transcripts of the closed [USEC] Board meetings... reveal the ways in which bias, self-interest, and self-dealing can influence the decision-making process, especially when that process is kept entirely secretive," Judge Kessler wrote. "The Board's deliberations... were a model of what not to do when considering various options for privatizing a federal entity."

The March 16 decision focused on the question of whether the nuclear workers who filed the FOIA lawsuit, and their legal team, led by attorney Dan Guttman, should be awarded attorney's fees. (Mr. Guttman, some will recall, was the outstanding executive director of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments in 1994-95.)

The government argued that the Plaintiffs were not entitled to attorney's fees because their interest in the released documents "was the narrow one of saving [their] jobs."

But at a time when corporate interests increasingly dominate public policy, Judge Kessler boldly found that the worker's interest was "substantially identical to a concern for the public interest-- for the protection of the environment, worker's safety and government integrity, among other things."

She ruled that the Plaintiffs were entitled to attorney's fees. "Given the nature of the [FOIA] lawsuits, and the vitally important public benefits that resulted therefrom, Plaintiff's request for fees is well within the range of reasonableness."

Judge Kessler's ruling is a thing of beauty. It might, however, tempt younger readers to want to go to law school. A copy is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/foia/usec.html>

SANDIA WAS-- OR WAS NOT-- HACKED

Sandia National Laboratory recently suffered a "major hacker incident," according to a March 16 article by Bill Gertz in the Washington Times. He cited anonymous "U.S. intelligence officials" to the effect that "hackers suspected of having links to a foreign government successfully broke into Sandia's computer system and were able to access sensitive classified information." See:

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/inring-2001316211918.htm>

But that story is "untrue", Sen. Pete Domenici told the Albuquerque Journal in a March 17 article. "My staff and I have been regularly briefed by Sandia, and I don't believe that's an accurate statement," Domenici said. See:

<http://www.abqjournal.com/scitech/279548scitech03-17-01.htm>

It is hard not to notice that a number of recent news reports purportedly based on classified information are turning out to be wrong, or at least are plausibly disputed. Another Washington Times story that appeared on January 3 reported, based on classified sources, that Russia had moved tactical nuclear weapons to the Baltic Sea port of Kaliningrad. This unconfirmed claim has been vigorously denied by senior Russian officials up to and including President Putin.

The publication of possibly erroneous news stories involving classified information provides another reason not to try to criminalize the unauthorized disclosure of classified information to the news media, as some in Congress have proposed to do. Prosecuting such acts would have the undesired effect of publicly distinguishing the true from the bogus "classified" stories.

NEW NON-LETHAL WEAPON WILL NOT "FRY PEOPLE"

Senator Domenici took to the Senate floor yesterday to defend a newly declassified non-lethal weapon known as the Vehicle Mounted Active Denial System (VMADS).

"This is a non-lethal weapons system based on a microwave source. This device, mounted on a humvee or other mobile platform, could serve as a riot control method in our peacekeeping operations or in other situations involving civilians. This project and technology was kept classified until very recently," Sen. Domenici said.

"The Pentagon noted that further testing, both on humans and, evidently, goats will be done to ensure that it truly is a non-lethal method of crowd control or a means to disperse potentially hostile mobs."

"The notion that the Pentagon is using 'microwave's on humans, and especially on animals, has inflamed some human and animal rights groups."

"Among others it has simply sparked fear that a new weapon exists that will fry people," he said. "This is not the case."

Senator Domenici's full statement is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2001/s032001.html>

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe

secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood

Project on Government Secrecy

Federation of American Scientists

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>

Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: Filer's Files #12 & 'Dust Bunny Hunt' - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:08:18 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:42:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12 & 'Dust Bunny Hunt' - Velez

>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:38:12 EST
>Subject: Filer's Files #12 -- 2001
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Filer's Files #12 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>March 21, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

<snip>

>"PSEUDO CRYSTALS" FOUND IN ABDUCTEE HOUSE DUST

>M. J. Ruben writes: "One year ago, Dr. William Levengood of
>Pinelandia Biophysics Laboratory announced his exciting
>discovery of unidentified microscopic particles which were found
>in house dust of abductees." This research has steadily
>continued and new types of particles or "pseudo crystals" have
>been discovered. More unusual "pseudo crystals" have been found
>in household dust of individuals claiming alien abduction. The
>research continues through the work of biophysicist Dr. William
>C. Levengood of Michigan. The "glassy particles" were first
>discovered in 1997, when an experiencer (abductee) recalled her
>nighttime encounter with aliens and a beam of light that shined
>on the floor next to her bed. The woman was awakened by the beam
>of light. She thrust her arm into the sparkling beam of white
>light and watched it shimmer on her arm. In the morning, she
>contacted Dr. Levengood and told him what happened. He went to
>her home and collected dust samples from the whitish dust
>residue on her furniture where she had reported seeing the
>sparkling beam of light during the night. This dust contained
>unexplainable "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" which
>were unidentifiable. This discovery led Dr. Levengood to search
>for other clues in household dust. Our readers may be interested
>in seeing the latest photographic evidence of new "pseudo
>crystals." There are five pages of photos at the Alien Abduction
>Experience and Research web site
>[<http://www.abduct.com/aaer2/r10.htm>]." Thanks to Marilyn Ruben
>and Dr. Levengood.

Hiya George, List and especially participants in the 'Dust Bunny Hunt',

I received the following from Nick Balaskas regarding the status of the dust bunny experiment:

Hi John!

I checked out the web site for the article below and saw some examples of the "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" found in the dust from the homes of UFO abductees. I was not very much impressed with what I saw, especially since such objects were extremely common in the 'Dust Bunny' samples and in nearly everything else I have had a chance to examine with a light microscope. (personal-deleted) To me they were nothing more than

contamination from poor prior handling of the specimens. For example, if a specimen was carried for a while in someone's coat pocket, one would not be surprised to find many small segments of transparent colourless or colored glassy looking cloth fibers.

As for the latest items I got from you, in consideration of the comments in your most recent e-mail, I will use the video projector we have in our labs instead of the VCR. The photos I take of the microscope images projected onto a screen should be easier for you to readily copy and share with others than images in a video cassette.

Nick Balaskas

Nick, I hope you don't mind that I'm doing this 'on List' as I think it's important to include everyone concerned in our dialog from this point forward. We're "in public" dude!

First:

After I receive the images from Nick I will need to convert them into a format that will lend itself to high resolution repro's that I can burn to disc/CD. Please, -only- if you have legitimate research interest (you -are- a researcher) should anyone request a CD. They will cost me time and money to make and I don't plan on "selling them" to anybody. That's not what this was all about. If you are doing research that this data will have some relevance to, I will be happy to make you a CD of the images that Nick captured through the microscope at my expense. (You pay mailing, especially if it's International. I'm not Daddy Deep Pockets! I'll pony up for the CD and invest the time to burn and ship. But again, please, - serious and relevant inquiries only.-)

For everyone else: I will be posting as many photos as I can and a copy of Nick's final report on a few webpages. You will be able to access them via the AIC website. Any comments or questions can be posted to UFO UpDates and we'll deal with them on the List.

Next:

Nick mentioned above that he found that "such objects" as were found in the original study were "common" in the dust bunny samples that were submitted.

Question: Nick were the particles you found in our dust bunny hunt (identical) to the little glass beads and spiders, or just 'similar'?

Did the glass thingies appear in 'all' of the samples submitted?

If not, what was the breakdown of abductee samples to non-abductee samples that the particles appear in?

Even if they turn out to be ubiquitous, I would still like to know how tiny particles of silica get heated to the point where they demonstrate the 'glass bubble' and 'glass spider' appearance of Dr. Levengood's samples. That is still going to be a mystery no matter what the results. Those particles would have to be super-heated in order to form those hollow structures.

I look forward to receiving the pix and report Nick. On behalf of all of us, I'd like to thank you (publicly) for all the effort and work that you put into our dust bunny hunt.

You're a good man Charlie Brown!;)

Warm regards,

John Velez

Dust Collector - at least my wife seems to think so!

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:07:34 -0000
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:36 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:05:21 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

>>Here's another nagging question.

><snip>

>>... I would pick on Mr. Mortellaro, too...

>Dear Wendy;

>I address my points to your statement about writing a book. Some
>folks seem to be of the opinion that writing a journal about
>their experiences does not legitimize the experience.

>Duh!

>Of course it don't. I've had this discussion with John Velez. I
>understand his views, but I do not agree with them. While true
>about legitimization, it ends there. The purpose of researching
>one's own experiences is to present them in an organized way so
>that others may garner some measure of comfort, succor ...
>whatever, from hearing about someone else's lifetime of events,
>events which I perceive to be UFO/abduction related. And to
>legitimize one's OWN recall, too. That's so important to me.

>It is in my opinion, a positive effort. One which can help
>others. Presenting one's experiences on UpDates, on various
>other venues such as Rense and Strange Days, then answering what
>appears to be an honest question posed in complete friendship by
>saying, "Go look up my posts... the information is all
>there..." or the equivalent, is (to me) the wrong answer. It may
>be the only one. But the assumption appears to be that you, the
>person making the request, is doing the injustice. Defend
>yourself if you deem it to be appropriate, this is just my
>opinion.

<snip>

Jim,

I have found some of your previous wisecracks offputting, but I
identify with what you are saying here.

Having dealt with more than 100 "victims" I have perceived that
even among themselves, there is "no pity." Each is trying as
best they can to deal with their experiences and they often lash
out at fellow experiencers who don't see things quite the same
way.

To some, writing a book or going public is cathartic, to others
not so.

Therefore, I suggest that you stop "trashing" each other and learn to be more tolerant.

How else can you expect outside, non-experiencers to have any toleration for you at all?

Who can legitimately claim to have the "one truth" when none of us really knows what is going on?

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 21](#)

New Effects Website

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:17:34 -0600
Fwd Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:57:21 -0500
Subject: New Effects Website

Hi, all!

As I have waxed philosophically in the past about fake UFO shots, models, foreground miniatures, photography and special effects in general, I figure I should at least put my money where my mouth is and show some of my own work. It's taken me a while, but I managed to cobble together a modest website. It's at:

<http://www.afterimagephoto.tv/moviestuff.html>

I'll be adding a special section dedicate to fake UFO shots, in the very near future (maybe with..... a mirror?). So stay tuned. Oh, and one other thing; there are a variety of AVIs for the Windows Media Player associated with the gallery. They range from .5 to 1.5 megs in size, just in case you don't have high speed internet access and want to go get a sandwich or something while loading.

Enjoy!

Roger Evans

(If the site has problems, please contact me off-list. I don't want to bog down EBK with non-UFO related email.)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:32:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 03:59:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>After reading the above, I can reveal I have solved the UFO
>mystery. Why I did not find this answer sooner I will never
>know.

>If I read the above correctly, it is quite simple to solve the
>UFO question once and for all, and here it is!

>Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!

>Problem solved....

>God I feel really great, I hope you all thank me for solving
>this long and drawn argument!

Many thanks, Roy!

The method used in this thesis and elsewhere is really pretty simple. Goes something like this:

1. Somebody claims to have seen something.
2. Scientists and others say that they couldn't have seen it - they're either lying, or mistaken.
3. Scientists and others then conclude there's nothing to this sighting, or - by applying the same reasoning - to any other sightings.
4. Scientists then declare, with complete confidence, that there's no evidence that UFO sightings amount to anything.

Note that I'm not condemning science or scientists. Just saying that they, like the rest of us, have their blind spots.

Note further that I'm aware James Easton and others will say they don't take step two, that they don't just dismiss sightings, but instead find serious alternative explanations. Let them argue with Bruce.

Greg Sandow

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:01:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Serious Research - Randles
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 17:23:41 -0500

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 12:58:39 -0000

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:06:59 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:46:05 -0000

>>Hi,

>>Remember, we're trying to find cases that suggest ETH and as you
>>so rightly pointed out earlier, this goes beyond just finding
>>cases that are simply Unexplained and not misperceptions. We
>>don't want to lose the focus on ETH evidence. My point about
>>metallic-appearing Daylight Discs is not that they are less
>>likely to be misperceptions/IFO's etc., but that they are far
>>more suggestive of alien spacecraft in the earth's atmosphere
>>than any others, except daylight CE's of landed spacecraft.

>Hi,

>I agree - of course - and see the logic of this. All I am
>pointing out is that we should not assume a daylight disk has a
>more credible status simply because this is how a witness
>describes it. I recognise that you are not arguing this - but I
>have often seen Ufologists claim that a UFO cannot possibly be a
>this or a that because the witness said it was disk like and had
>portholes. But this does not follow.

>But in principle I do agree with your thinking as regards to the
>superiority value of such cases for what we are seeking to do
>here. Simply not their invulnerability. Which is why giving a
>weighting to a DD is fine, provided it is accompanied by a
>measure of both its potential to be a hoax and potential to be
>an IFO - both of which are independent of its DD description.

>>>I have seen quite a few that turn out to
>>>be aircraft or balloons, etc.

>>The screening criteria I suggested -- angular size Full Moon or
>>larger, duration 1-minute+, multiple witnesses,
>>date-time-location known -- are intended to screen the
>>_stronger_ UFO cases from the _weaker_ UFO cases, not to weed
>>out IFO's from UFO's -- as you yourself mention further down
>>about how such prerequisites will help distinguish the "strong
>>case."

>This is perfectly reasonable.

Etc., etc.

Although I continue to have a philosophical problem with basing this exercise on cases "suggestive or supportive of the ETH" rather than of an unexplained phenomenon, I am very supportive of Jenny's initiative and will not quibble about the details. I will go along with whatever is decided as to criteria for case inclusion, and if I have strong disagreement in any area, I will say so. My main question is, who among the "doubters" or "skeptics" (by whatever definitions they choose) are volunteering to participate? Is that not a vital element of what we are hoping to accomplish?

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:53:12 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:11:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:56:38 -0500
>Subject: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

Previously, Michel wrote:

>Having been a witness to 18 separate sightings of true UFOs (in
>this case, UFO meaning an unusual light or object whose
>behaviour, color patterns, performance, brilliance, shape,
>speed, maneuverability, etc. clearly falls outside of the
>brackets of Natural Phenomena or man-made devices), I am
>pretty confident that I can distinguish between something that
>is unknown and something that isn't.

>But there are people out there who will look at Venus, a
>satellite or a bolide, and claim that they saw a UFO. I want to
>put together a list of these objects/phenomena and their
>characteristics in order for people to familiarize themselves
>with the knowns and learn to distinguish those from the
>unknowns.

>I would like to know where I could get information on the
>following:

>Natural Phenomena:

>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

>Man-made devices:

>Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket, missile, flare, satellite,
>weather balloon, remote control model airplanes/helicopters,
>etc.

>If you think I missed anything, please include them in the list.

Hi, Michel!

Now, let me get this straight:

On the one hand, you have enough knowledge to know the difference between a "true" UFO and natural phenomena such as Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets, shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc. as well as man-made devices such as Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket, missile, flare, satellite, weather balloon, remote control model airplanes/helicopters, etc.

On the other hand, you have no idea where to get information on these subjects? If you have no information on these subjects then how can you, with any certainty, differentiate a "true UFO" from any of the above? If you did have information on these subjects, then why do you need assistance in gathering such information again?

Again, just what sets your videos and sightings apart from an indistinguishable dot of smeary light in sky that could be just about anything? I haven't forgotten that you know flying saucers

are real because you've seen them with your own eyes. I'm just waiting for you to share these images with the rest of us.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Ledger

From: dledger@ns.sympatico.ca (Donald . Ledger)
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:00:27 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:13:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Ledger

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 00:25:57 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 13:08:33 +0000
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>Forwarded. For your information.

>>To: "UFO Skeptics" <debunk@listbot.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 10:57:26 +0000
>>From: "James Easton" <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>Subject: 'UFO' Thesis

>>List members might be interested in the following publication
>>I've come across:

>>UFOCRITIQUE

>>UFOs, Social Intelligence, and the Condon Committee

>>Diana Palmer Hoyt

>>In her summary conclusions, Diana writes:

>>"In the case of UFOs, the evidence is circumstantial and
>>originates in personal testimony and eyewitness accounts, which
>>are not considered sufficient proof, or even credible evidence
>>in the scientific community. There is no conclusive direct
>>evidence that would settle the matter, one way or the other. The
>>eyewitness functions as the instrument of discovery. In ufology,
>>the principal investigators are amateurs; thus the evidence is
>>ambiguous and colored by the perspective and frame of reference
>>of the individual investigator. Thus a great deal of time and
>>effort is understandably spent calibrating the instrumentation-
>>which means determining the credibility of the UFO witnesses
>>themselves (as instruments of measurement) and the integrity of
>>the data they produce. While this is understandable, it is not
>>useful in the analysis of the UFO phenomenon. In addition, the
>>use of human instrumentation is not precise enough or reliable
>>enough for science. Because of the nature of the problem and the
>>question of the status of the evidence, UFO investigators fail
>>to publish their findings in standard scientific peer reviewed
>>journals.

>>From all perspectives, the study of UFOs does not meet the
>>standards of science. That which does not meet the standards of
>>science, yet engages in science controversies claiming
>>discoveries, impedes science in the eyes of the scientific
>>community. Unlike science, in the UFO research arena, there is
>>no guild for investigators; since there are no socially
>>stabilized norms, there are no identified rewards and
>>punishments readily available to the amateur investigator. In a
>>field where notoriety helps, for the less than scrupulous
>>amateur, there is no reason not to attempt hoaxes. Most UFO
>>investigators do not have credentials in astronomy or

>>astrophysics and are considered to be charlatans by the
>>pedigreed scientific community. In fact, the entire field of
>>ufology is tainted by the lack of credentials of the UFO
>>hunters".

>After reading this I wonder if she could just go one step
>further and conclude; UFOs? Witnesses? Ignore them. It all means
>nothing.

>But, more seriously, whereas I'm sure she was serious about
>doing her research and completing her degree, its obvious that
>her research itself was only marginal. (though greatly
>appreciated by her advisor and others who haven't thoroughly
>researched the field of ufology.) I wonder what she would have
>written if Dr. James McDonald had been one of her thesis
>advisors.

>Since I don't have a degree in astrophysics or astronomy, I
>presume she would consider me one of the charlatans.

>Charlatan Bruce.

Hi Bruce and Bob,

I wonder why the fields of astrophysics or astronomy are
considered to be the enlightened and most qualified to speak on
the subject of UFOs? What have they got to do with it? What
expertise do they bring to the table? Without serious study of
the phenomenon first they are no more valuable to the quest than
welders or proctologists.

I've always wondered why they are dragged out as experts when
for the most part none of them have any experience at all in
the field. I'd welcome them once they are, but only after they've
had a chance to thoroughly study what has been reported over the
last century at least. But then that will take much courage.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:43:02 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:14:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Young

>From: Serge Salvable <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO Updates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 18:41:33 -0800

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 15:10:28 EST
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:40:43 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>Of course, my proposal did imply that only people with papers
>and credentials should address the problem if we want any
>credibility.

>Fell in dead water.

>Some much for the Boys and Girls Club of Ufology.

Serge, Brad, Roger, Dick, List:

Can't argue with Serge on this approach. It would be the most likely to get the attention of the wider world.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Selective Amnesia

From: David Gullick <mendiapl@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:46:29 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:21:58 -0500
Subject: Selective Amnesia

Source: The Daily Telegraph [London]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk>

Scientists unlock the secrets of selective amnesia

ISSUE 2120 Thursday 15 March 2001

Scientists unlock the secrets of selective amnesia
By Roger Highfield, Science Editor

Some choose to lose memory [15 Mar '01] - Nature

Faculty in Psychology - University of Oregon

British False Memory Society

MORE than a century after Freud suggested the existence of a repression mechanism that pushes unwanted memories into the unconscious, scientists now have hard evidence to explain how that mechanism works.

Whether we can choose to lose memories has been a controversial question since Freud claimed that it was possible, for example after traumatic events such as child abuse.

Drs Michael Anderson and Collin Green, of Oregon University, have mimicked memory repression in the laboratory. They report today that people who try to forget certain words do have trouble recalling them later - even when offered money for the right answer.

This is the clearest demonstration of a direct connection between people's efforts to control awareness of a specific unwanted memory and their later ability to recall it.

Dr Anderson says in today's Nature: "I do not believe that my subjects have 'erased' their memories. I believe that they have suppressed them. That is, I believe that the memories are still there, but they are difficult to access."

He believes the work could help develop new ways to unlock suppressed memories and start understanding how selective amnesia occurs. This type of amnesia may be related to that suffered by victims of child abuse or in post-traumatic stress disorder.

Dr Anderson says: "Our findings are consistent with Freud's notions of suppression and repression, but go a long way towards demystifying the process. Our work allows Freud's idea to be understood in terms of widely accepted mechanisms of cognitive control."

The amount of forgetting increases with the number of attempts

to exclude the unwanted memory. He says: "Amazingly, this type of forgetting is more likely to occur when people are continuously confronted with reminders of the memory they are trying to avoid. This is contrary to intuition, which says that seeing reminders a lot ought to make your memory better."

"When reminders are inescapable, people must learn to adapt their internal thought patterns whenever they confront the reminder if they are to have any hope of avoiding the unwanted memory."

This conforms with the discovery that people who were sexually abused by a person of trust, such as a parent, are more likely to report having forgotten the abuse than those abused by a stranger. A child growing up in a household in which they must continuously confront the person who committed the abuse is more likely to suppress the memory.

There are many everyday examples, such as the old telephone number. "You probably don't remember this any longer even though you may have dialled it thousands of times. This is because when you changed numbers, you had to learn to not accidentally dial the old one."

Dr Anderson acknowledges that there is a gap between the findings and real-life clinical cases of traumatic amnesia because he used simple pairs of words that are not emotionally significant to test subjects.

However, the research provides a promising start and also provides a useful test that can reveal the way an individual controls their attention to highlight the effects of age or disease, from schizophrenia to attention deficit disorder.

Another application might be in helping people who are undergoing withdrawal from drugs to control intrusive thoughts or cravings.

8 March 2001: [UK News] 'False recall' abuse case collapses
20 December 2000: [UK News] Life begins at forty - and don't you forget it
20 December 2000: [UK News] Thoughts on remembrance of things past
30 October 1997: [UK News] Forgotten 'memories' of child abuse corroborated

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk>

© Copyright of Telegraph Group Limited 2001.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 04:23:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

<snip>

>Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!
>Problem solved....

Hi, Roy:

Not exactly, but without anything else there will never be acceptable evidence for much of anything, beyond the human mind.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 01:13:01 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 09:32:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Goldstein

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>>re the Arnold sighting.

>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>formation of any kind?

>>I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be
>>grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad
>>similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings.
>>Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of
>>similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend
>>credence to the overall phenom.

>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>>may have been unique.

>>Curious Purrrrrs....

>>Wendy Christensen

>Hi Wendy,

>I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia
>University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00
>pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the
>sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped
>with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

Hi Don,

Can you give any more information, such as the source of the
report, flight characteristics (straight or skipping, etc.),
speed, any sound and so forth?

Thanks,

Josh

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:59:07 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 09:36:05 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:07:34 -0000

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:05:21 EST
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

>>>Here's another nagging question.

>><snip>

>>>... I would pick on Mr. Mortellaro, too...

>>Dear Wendy;

>>I address my points to your statement about writing a book. Some
>>folks seem to be of the opinion that writing a journal about
>>their experiences does not legitimize the experience.

>>Duh!

>>Of course it don't. I've had this discussion with John Velez. I
>>understand his views, but I do not agree with them. While true
>>about legitimization, it ends there. The purpose of researching
>>one's own experiences is to present them in an organized way so
>>that others may garner some measure of comfort, succor ...
>>whatever, from hearing about someone else's lifetime of events,
>>events which I perceive to be UFO/abduction related. And to
>>legitimize one's OWN recall, too. That's so important to me.

>>It is in my opinion, a positive effort. One which can help
>>others. Presenting one's experiences on UpDates, on various
>>other venues such as Rense and Strange Days, then answering what
>>appears to be an honest question posed in complete friendship by
>>saying, "Go look up my posts... the information is all
>>there..." or the equivalent, is (to me) the wrong answer. It may
>>be the only one. But the assumption appears to be that you, the
>>person making the request, is doing the injustice. Defend
>>yourself if you deem it to be appropriate, this is just my
>>opinion.

>><snip>

>Jim,

>I have found some of your previous wisecracks offputting, but I
>identify with what you are saying here.

>Having dealt with more than 100 "victims" I have perceived that
>even among themselves, there is "no pity." Each is trying as
>best they can to deal with their experiences and they often lash

>out at fellow experiencers who don't see things quite the same
>way.

>To some, writing a book or going public is cathartic, to others
>not so.

>Therefore, I suggest that you stop "trashing" each other and
>learn to be more tolerant.

>How else can you expect outside, non-experiencers to have any
>toleration for you at all?

>Who can legitimately claim to have the "one truth" when none of
>us really knows what is going on?

Hi Dick, and thanks for the words. I would like to point to a major and to me important, little factoid. Perhaps the most important (to me) on this subject. I have no truth. Even my own so-called truth is from memory which I trust I cannot fully trusted.

Just because it seems to my Gripple-Addled mind that the recall is so real that it cannot be anything else, I also agree that I cannot be certain as to the absolute reality of them. So I call my experiences "perceived."

The only truth is that, what I tell is true - to me. It may have no truth in reality. And I am the first to admit such.

Here are some of the rules I choose to live by:

o I will always be harsh with those who debunk without sense or sensibility.

o I will never doubt a man's word unless there is ample proof that he is lying. And the word "ample" is a lot in my pair of dimes.

o I will never accept absolute truth, because this is the only truth which requires extraordinary evidence.

o I will never be harsh except with cruelty and I will never abide meanness, for in meanness there is no truth, only lies.

o I shall never defend those who defend only themselves. "On that path lies danger." (Dune, Frank Herbert)

There are more rules, but these are the most important to me. To reiterate, my truth is mine alone and I admit to the possibility of misinterpreting it. To me, a man's word is his bond, and what he says is all there is. Those who reduce the validity of this bond by lying should be horse whipped.

Isn't it interesting that to me and my circle of abductees, there is no discrepancy, no lies, no disagreement. I perceived that this is the pervue of the researcher. And your view is the opposite, largely because of a few horses patooties whose lives revolve around themselves. One sour cherry on the tree, just one lousy sour cherry. And the whole tree is sour. Suck one sour cherry, just one lousy sour cherry, and for the rest of your life you are a sour cherry sucker.

Hmmmm....

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 03:46:28 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 12:49:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Easton

Regarding:

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

Wendy wrote:

>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>formation of any kind?

Wendy,

Yes, there are many accounts, although you'll have to look out some ornithological reports! And therein, we can find thoroughly documented observations which are remarkably and distinctly comparable.

>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports.

>Please enlighten me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly
>why his sightings may have been unique.

Although there were initial references to Arnold describing the objects as resembling a "pie plate that was cut in half, with a convex triangle at the rear" [KWRC radio interview], that was rapidly buried amidst the ensuing 'flying saucer' hysteria.

The extraordinary extent to which this occurred is illustrated by the following, as I mentioned in 'Voyager Newsletter No. 13':

Historical Newspaper Articles and Clippings

Arnold's quite incredible legacy is highlighted by a collection of newspaper reports which an acquaintance in the US kindly provided to myself a few years ago.

These reports span the period from July 1947 - just before the 'Roswell' debacle - to 1966 - just after Hynek's 'swamp gas' calamity.

It's been my intention for a couple of years to make the data available online and although this turned out to be much more time consuming than expected, I'm pleased to say the articles and clippings can now be downloaded.

Most are from The New York Times and overall, it's a 'potted history' of reports, Air Force concerns, scepticism and beliefs regarding 'flying saucers' during that period.

Although much of the material will be familiar to historians, there may be some which isn't so well-known and the reports include 'real time' insight into several celebrated cases, particularly the 1952 Washington 'flap'.

Where known, the date and source are identified to the best of my knowledge.

All copyrights are acknowledged and if there are any related objections to these historical articles being made available for research purposes, please let me know.

Otherwise, I'm sure they will be of interest:

'Flying Disks' Fail to Stir Air Forces
4 July, 1947

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/005.jpg>

'Flying Saucers' Mystify Experts; May Be Prank of Nature, They Say
6 July, 1947

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/010.jpg>
<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/011.jpg>

Military Planes Hunt Sky Discs With Cameras in Vain on Coast
7 July, 1947

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/020.jpg>
<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/021.jpg>

Front Page of the 'Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express'
7 July, 1947

[Note the extraordinary 'flying saucer' hysteria which has resulted from Kenneth Arnold's June 24th, 1947 account. Whilst many people report seeing the popularised 'flying saucers', no-one seems to be witnessing crescent-shaped objects like those Arnold actually reported!]

<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/030.jpg>
<http://www.ufoworld.co.uk/ftp/031.jpg>

[END OF EXTRACT]

The latter publication features a photograph of Arnold and claims, "he was the first man who saw mysterious 'flying discs in group'. Now many have seen them".

It consummately demonstrates that even a leading national newspaper is confirming how Arnold saw the same thing as others were now reporting.

Although it simply wasn't true, no-one was pointing out what was actually reported by Arnold and how the 'flying saucer' misnomer arose. By this time, it seems the last person who was about to burst that saucer-shaped bubble was Arnold himself.

How could he - it would be tantamount to claiming that people were 'seeing things'...

The only contemporary newspaper 'saucer' sighting I can think of dates from 12 July, 1947, when an aircrew reported that on 9 July they had spotted nine 'disks' weaving in formation (just like Arnold's nine objects) somewhere between Spokane and Portland.

As Capt. Gordon Moore related afterwards, "Suddenly we spotted nine big round disks weaving northward two thousand feet below us".

This would doubtless have become a landmark 'UFO' case in later years, especially in seemingly corroborating Arnold's observation that nine 'disc(k)s' of unknown origin were flying around and violating US airspace.

However, this was not to be. As Capt. Moore explained to the 'The British Columbian of New Westminster':

"We investigated and found they were real all right - real pelicans".

If they hadn't investigated those "nine big round disks", then this would presumably be proclaimed as a highly credible aircrew's report of... well... nine, big round disks.

Nonetheless, this remains a factual background to the specious origin of 'flying saucers' and Arnold's reported observation of echelon flying, undulating, fluttering and gliding objects which his sketch confirms resembled birds, remains unique.

As a 'UFO' sighting, that is.

Good question and incidentally, isn't Arnold's subsequent reported formation of "twenty to twenty-five, brass coloured objects that looked like ducks" and which were "about two or three feet in diameter", plus, "had the same flight characteristics of the large objects" which gave the world 'flying saucers', also an astonishingly peerless 'UFO' case?

Anyone care to speculate what these might have been...

James Easton.
E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 23:43:16 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:24:47 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin
>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>Alien Baloney

>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyynn Campbell

<snip>

Hi everyone!

Being very interested in any UFO physical evidence, my research has brought me in personal contact with the very few people actively involved in this area of ufology, including Dr. Roger Leir.

Roger has kindly provided me with a few of his suspected alien implants and UFO artifacts in the past (including alleged UFO crash debris and even Alien Autopsy film fragments with assorted images on them from Ray Santilli) for independent tests here. Although I did not find strong evidence that pointed towards an extraterrestrial origin for any of the specimens we examined, prosaic explanations could not be found for all and a few remained unidentified. Although it has been a long while since the last time I got something from Roger, I have agreed to examine another object that originated from within someone's body.

After I read the 'Alien Baloney' article which I found to be very unfair in its criticism of Roger and his research, I contacted Roger for his comments.

For the UFO UpDates subscribers who may be interested, I got permission from Roger to share with you his reply - I crossed out Roger's private e-mail address.

Although I can understand Roger's opinions about people who would promote unfair articles such as 'Alien Baloney', I think any form of selective self-imposed censorship in ufology would be wrong. We may argue and disagree a lot over many things in ufology but I would like to believe that we are all really good friends.

Nick Balaskas

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:50:49 EST
From: Leirxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx
To: nikolaos@yorku.ca
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: 'Alien Baloney' (fwd)

<snip>

Nick,

I will be sending the specimen along shortly. In reference to the article titled 'Alien Baloney'.

This was an article printed in a local, small rag newspaper here in Santa Monica. My attorney sued both the reporter and the paper and they did print a retraction apologizing for their inaccuracies.

I don't know who sent this to you but let me tell you that person should not be considered a friend of either one of us. I am sure they knew the circumstances and the truth behind the whole thing.

I will let you know when the specimen is on the way.

Take care.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 01:19:03 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:26:59 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Gates

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>To: Errol Bruce-Knapp <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:56:38 -0500

>Having been a witness to 18 separate sightings of true UFOs (in
>this case, UFO meaning an unusual light or object whose
>behaviour, color patterns, performance, brilliance, shape,
>speed, maneuverability, etc. clearly falls outside of the
>brackets of _Natural Phenomena_ or _man-made devices_), I am
>pretty confident that I can distinguish between something that
>is unknown and something that isn't.

>But there are people out there who will look at Venus, a
>satellite or a bolide, and claim that they saw a UFO. I want to
>put together a list of these objects/phenomena and their
>characteristics in order for people to familiarize themselves
>with the knowns and learn to distinguish those from the
>unknowns.

>I would like to know where I could get information on the
>following:

>Natural Phenomena:

>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

Don't forget Pelicans, lighthouses, venus, snow geese, and the
many others. :)

Also don't forget how the debunker mind works:

Witness: Well it looked like a star.....

Debunker: Ah ha, the idiot witness saw stars.....

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Beyond Cydonia

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 00:21:23 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:28:45 -0500
Subject: Beyond Cydonia

IN THE GALLERY

The Electric Warrior : Gallery March 22, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/gallery/>

BEYOND CYDONIA

An Artist's Conception of Organic Life Forms on Mars

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/gallery/ewArtWorks0006.htm>

"I'm fairly convinced that we have discovered life on Mars," says Arthur C. Clarke, who authored 2001: A Space Odyssey.

The acclaimed author told SPACE.com that the Jet Propulsion Laboratory has captured some incredible photographs. "Have a look at them. I don't see any other interpretation."

The artist took Clarke's extraordinary statement at face value and created a series of full color artworks based on the photographic record from NASA's Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft.

The images are from the Acidalia Planitia region of Mars. The area borders on Mars' north polar region, beyond Cydonia.

Clarke took an interest in at least one of these images, which Richard C. Hoagland of the Enterprise Mission said resembled a glass worm.

The artist's own notion that these features resemble roots is supported by the images, but the resemblance may be superficial. There are no known life-forms beyond Earth.

HERO'S JOURNEY

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/gallery/ewArtWorks0007.htm>

This image shows former astronaut John Glenn in a pressurized space suit and crammed into a tiny capsule traveling at 17,500 m.p.h. at an altitude of 160 miles above the earth.

The Mercury-Atlas was essentially a missile adapted to carry a NASA space capsule. The capsule was packed with so many scientific instruments that the occupant was confined to about as much space as a bathtub.

After successfully completing a historic three-orbit mission around Earth on February 20, 1962, Glenn was forced to manually pilot his Friendship 7 spacecraft for reentry when the autopilot failed.

He watched flaming chunks from his spacecraft fly past the window, wondering whether his heat shield might be breaking up.

NASA Mission Control had taken the unusual emergency precaution of retaining the retro pack, to keep a possibly loose heat shield in place. Without the shield, both Glenn and capsule would have been incinerated.

In 1998 at age 77 John Glenn returned to space aboard the space shuttle STS-95 Discovery, to help NASA study parallels between space flight and aging. Glenn has logged over 218 hours in space.

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 22, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/gallery/ewArtWorks0006.htm>
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/gallery/ewArtWorks0007.htm>

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 00:24:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:31:12 -0500
Subject: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars

EXTRAORDINARY ROOT COMPLEXES ON MARS

The Electric Warrior : Mars Online March 22, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/>

EXTRAORDINARY ROOT COMPLEXES ON MARS
by The Electric Warrior

BEYOND CYDONIA

Is there an elaborate system of root-like structures on the surface of Mars? And does the photographic record of NASA's Global Surveyor spacecraft reveal what an acclaimed author suggested about the existence of large life forms of life on Mars?

"I'm fairly convinced that we have discovered life on Mars," said Arthur C. Clarke, who authored '2001: A Space Odyssey.' In an interview last month Clarke told SPACE.com that the Jet Propulsion Laboratory has captured some incredible photographs. "Have a look at them. I don't see any other interpretation."

"It's not fully clear exactly what he is saying is currently present on Mars," said the 'Enterprise Mission Web site (TEM) in response to Clarke's comment. "Certainly, his reference to 'large forms of life' can be seen as referencing these specific features, not as fossils, but as current living things."

The Net's flagship Web site for online Mars anomaly research was founded by Richard C. Hoagland who is best known as the principal advocate of the Face on Mars. Hoagland wondered whether Clarke might be referring to an anomaly identified as 'glass worms' or tubes.

In July of last year TEM speculated that what appeared to be a semi-translucent tubular structure in the Acidalia Planitia region of Mars might be indicative of architectural features. The area borders on Mars' north polar region, beyond Cydonia.

At an event last December, according to TEM, Clarke told the Planetary Society "I'm still waiting for an explanation of that extraordinary glass worm on Mars."

COMPETING THEORIES DEFY EXPLANATION

The unusual feature is the subject of an intense, often acrimonious debate, with scientists and professionals of various disciplines posting online articles or emailed rebuttals.

Its salient characteristics were described by Ron Nicks, a Consulting Geologist for the Enterprise Mission, who said the anomaly was a challenge to define in purely geological terms:

"This remarkable 'tube,' roughly a mile in length and hundreds of feet wide, appears to cling to a desert canyon wall near the

canyon's bottom, and extend along its entire length. The feature has the appearance of being 'translucent,' of being supported at somewhat regular intervals by "ribs," and of being quite cylindrical.

The certified geologist ruled out geologic mechanisms before considering a large biological entity such as a worm. Finally, after citing the disputed evidence for artificially engineered structures in the Cydonia region of Mars, Nicks concluded that the simplest explanation was something analogous to the Lincoln Tunnel.

In an email message posted to the Net, Dr. David C. Pieri from the Earth and Space Sciences Division of JPL questioned both TEM's analysis and image processing. Pieri said the positive relief of the disputed feature is an optical illusion. That is, the feature is actually concave or popped-in, not popped-out. With appropriate image processing the "glass worm illusion vanishes, and we're left with a fairly mundane image."

According to Pieri, the phenomenon of regularly spaced white lines found in numerous MGS images are nothing new on either Mars or Earth; they are simply transverse dune-trains on the valley floor. "Dunes follow aerodynamic principles -- therefore they do often line up in really precise, repetitive ways."

Dr. Tom Van Flandern, a professional research astronomer, questioned whether the "glassy tubes" on Mars were really sand dunes. Van Flandern is known for his support of Cydonia research and is associated with the Society for Planetary SETI Research (SPSR). He said SPSR geologists ruled out dunes early on as a viable explanation, for various reasons.

On the Meta Research Web site, Van Flandern argued that winds on Mars are insufficient to build large dunes. Furthermore, the white bands are often seen in cracks and fissures where they ought to be sheltered from surface winds. He also noted that where shadows can be seen, they are consistent with the glassy tube interpretation, but not always with the dunes interpretation.

Mac Tonnies, an independent journalist who authors The Cydonian Imperative Web site, investigated the phenomenon in collaboration with Chris Joseph, who created a spectacular stereoscopic rendering. Joseph's shape-from-shading photoclinometric analysis was undertaken to ascertain whether the tubes were convex or concave.

Tonnies wrote that there was little doubt the Martian "tunnels" are three-dimensional features, and certainly not dunes in any recognizable sense of the term. "It is our hope to provide objective coverage of this controversy until an answer--be it geological or archaeological--becomes available."

With so many people investigating the issue, offering so many conflicting opinions, electric warriors may wonder why none have responded to Arthur C. Clarke's suggestion of titanic life forms on Mars.

AN ORGANIC EXPLANATION

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot1Thumb.jpg>

Figure 1 is cropped from M0400291, captured by Global Surveyor's Mars Orbital Camera (MOC) on August 11, 1999 at about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. It shows three of the disputed surface features, in a Y configuration. The lower one, running down to the bottom right edge of the image is the notorious glass worm alluded to by Arthur C. Clarke.

At the top right corner is a feature having striated white lines with non-uniform spacing, seen to be now closer together, now further apart as they progress toward the center of the Y configuration. The Enterprise Mission has suggested the variations occur for structural reasons; specifically, structural engineering.

This feature, as photographed by MOC, resembles a tube-like structure which snakes down into a pit at the center of the Y.

If the white lines are dunes then there are three valleys, going

off in three different directions, with three series of transverse dune-trains produced by winds that somehow didn't interfere with the deposition of the others.

Following the third tube-like structure from the center of the Y, it seems to disappear underground, only to appear again toward the left edge of the image.

The branching tube-like formations in this image lead to an unlikely idea: The tubes on Mars may be components of a root-like living organism. If they are, it's a big one like Clarke suggested, having no Earthly comparison.

There appears to be a fourth root-like feature emerging from the center of the Y, only this one is just below the surface. These root-like features may be snaking down toward a source of nourishment.

Water or something else beneath the surface could have fostered the growth of root-like tentacles, which cracked the surface as they grew and ultimately led to further surface erosion, as visible in this image.

Running along the bottom edge of the image is the suggestion of another root-like feature, at first exposed and then running along underground.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot1Strip.jpg>

The entire MOC image strip shows another example of these subterranean root-like features. It begins roughly at the bottom right edge of this image and runs diagonally down in a naturalistic jagged line, toward the left edge of the image, past a crater, finally emerging from underground and displaying more white striations.

RHIZOME

On Earth, plants known as rhizomes are horizontal, creeping underground stems that propagate themselves by producing the shoot and root system of a new plant. Unlike true roots, rhizomes have nodes and buds, where new sprouts appear.

Earthly rhizomes do not die when cut, like a root, but rather become several plants instead of one. So, a Martian rhizome, if such a thing could be said to exist, might be extremely hard to kill, even when pelted by an occasional meteorite.

A tuber is the enlarged part of a rhizome that stores food. Tubers swell without definite shape as food accumulates, and have buds and eyes, like a potato. It is the propagative part of a plant.

In keeping with what we know about Earthly organic processes, there is a feature which strongly resembles a tuber, located at the center of the Y, apparently clinging to the side of the eroded Martian crevice. The feature known as the glass worm emerges from the presumptive tuber, as if it were a new shoot.

It looks as if the wedge-shaped Martian tuber keeps the hole from collapsing, and may have played a part in opening the crevice. Perhaps this part of the speculative organism is more adaptive, more amenable to exposure.

There could be another tuberous root underneath the glass worm feature, which keeps the crevice wedged open, thus protecting the new shoot from being crushed.

The shiny surface of the tube could be indicative of a thriving, healthy branch, which has extended all the way to some other source of nourishment. The other two branches of the Y don't look nearly as robust.

The high albedo feature on this branch, a focal point reflecting sunlight, could be a new bud. Indeed, the striations at this point appear to be somewhat flattened, as if a new tube or shoot emerged here and snaked away.

The robust life-like impression of the bud suggested herein is testable. If Global Surveyor captured another image of this surface feature, and a sufficient amount of time had passed,

there might be evidence of new growth.

But we don't need a new image of the same feature to further develop the idea of root-like living organisms. All we have to do is gather more evidence, and observe whether the idea is either strengthened or invalidated at some point. We need to look at more images.

A SECOND ROOT CONFIGURATION

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot2Thumb.jpg>

Figure 2 is cropped from M0201270 and shows another root-like complex, remarkably similar to the first, in the same Y configuration.

This image was captured two months earlier than the first, on July 12, 1999, at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. The two features are actually very close to each other; the second is offset approximately one degree west. It was shot at the same resolution.

If these features are truly the same kind of organism, then it is not surprising that there are three shoots going off in three different directions, as in the first image.

The surrounding terrain is again cracked and eroded, but this time the pit or opening from which the shoots have emerged is not as large. One of the shoots burrows underground toward the right, not far from the center of the Y.

The image offers one more anomaly which strengthens the notion that these structures are living organisms: There is a crater or rounded depression near the top left of the image, and one of the shoots appears to have fastened itself to the edge, as if to anchor itself.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot2Strip.jpg>

The MOC image strip shows an impressive structure that climbs away from its point of origin and extends for an amazing distance before it stops. Near the tip, tentacles divide and spread out. One of these branches burrows underground, the other tapers off to a point.

This image by itself might pose just another unexplainable geological phenomenon. But the idea that these are living, organisms provides a simple explanation consistent with Earthly creeping plants called rhizomes or rootstock.

HAVE A LOOK

The notion that these are giant biological life forms on Mars might seem untenable, but if an examination of the images prompts further insight, why not discuss the idea? It can't hurt to take a closer look.

This second image gives the impression that a root-like tentacle emerged from beneath the surface and crept away in search of sustenance, attaching itself to a nearby crater or cavity as it grew.

Along the way some of the arc-like supports broke down or straitened out, and the structure flattened out as well. Near the tip, the organism ruptured and deposited some fluid that left a dark stain on the ground.

This rupture may explain why this tentacle is not as shiny as the one in the first Y complex we examined. It is possible that the first tentacle is filled with life-sustaining translucent fluid or gel. Perhaps the second tentacle is desiccated, or dying.

To the left of the second Y configuration is another branch, located at the extreme left of the image, which looks more robust. Do we dare speculate that there is another tentacle, one we can't see, which extends off to the left?

There is one more image to examine in this remarkable series.

A CREEPING SHOOT

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot3Thumb.jpg>

Figure 3 cropped from M0001504 shows another root-like tentacle which starts at the top and runs along the right edge of the image, tapering off to a point, like a shoot.

The image was captured on April 4, 1999 at about 10 o'clock in the morning. Its location is approximately 2 degrees south of the second image, south-west of the first. The image was shot at a lower resolution than the other two.

Again, this image is not remarkable by itself, and may have a convincing geological explanation. But the anomalous worm-like structure in this image, and the shadows to the right of it, give a strong impression that this is something on top of the surface, not sunk down into it.

This image, when considered in context with the others, appears to show what the speculative Martian rootstock looks like as it propagates. The tentacle looks like it has a smooth or gelatinous outer skin.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRoot3Strip.jpg>

The appearance of the well-formed tapered tip offers a convincing notion that this is a creeping stem or shoot, consistent with the idea that this is a living, biological organism of some kind.

To the left is another anomalous rounded structure, which looks like a dome. Highlight and shadow give a clear impression that this object pops-up from the surface, not down, like a crater.

Whatever it is, living or not, natural or artificially constructed, is beyond the scope of this discussion.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER THEORIES

It's worthwhile to examine how the idea of a biological root-like organism compares with other explanations for the disputed tube-like anomalies on Mars.

The Enterprise Mission, which discovered the tubes last summer, has done work to explain that the striated white lines may provide structural support. It has been suggested that the non-uniform spacing of the arch-like features would accommodate different topographies, and varying soil densities, by design.

TEM's explanation of artificially constructed tunnels is at variance with the idea of a plant-like organism, but their geologic analysis does not contradict it because the idea was never explored.

TEM's structural analysis can be adapted to explain the speculative biological organism. The arcs or rings may provide structural support when the shoots burrow underground. In the case of some kind of plant, the non-uniform spacing is not problematic.

Van Flandern has observed that faint white bands are visible between bright ones, and has concurred that the tubes appear to be translucent. This is consistent with the idea that the organism has a soft or gelatinous outer skin.

The shape-from-shading analysis offered by Joseph and Tonnies shows that the white features stick out from the surface of the tubes. But other images suggest that these features are recessed. This is evident from shadows on the long tentacle originating at the second Y complex.

The striated white lines, which have also been described as dunes, may present a conundrum because they are visible in two different contexts. The organic explanation might simplify the issue. Perhaps they give the organism tensile strength.

It's possible these arcing features are not attached to the ground as they grow, and only later become fixed in place to provide structural support. The apparently soft, pliable outer skin of the creeping shoots would be crushed underground.

The photographic record is not incompatible with this analysis: In Figure 2 there appear to be two or more shoots present, under the skin, in places where the white lines look broken or stretched out.

The geological explanation from JPL involves transverse dune-trains in concave valleys, and an assertion that at least one of these features has no positive relief. The second Y complex has a curved tube clinging to the side of a crevice. The mind resists efforts to mentally pop this feature in, so that it has negative relief. Perhaps a better geological explanation can be offered.

Although we don't know what life forms Clarke was alluding to, we know that one of the images he examined had features resembling large bushes or trees. If conditions on Mars were inhospitable to organic processes, we can surmise that an author known for basing fiction on hard science wouldn't have mentioned plant life.

In summary, none of the other explanations contradict the idea of a biological organism, except the JPL dune theory, which is not entirely satisfactory.

WHO CARES WHAT YOU THINK

Arthur C. Clarke was right, JPL has captured some incredible photographs. Let's be honest. Unless Clarke had suggested that they provide pretty convincing proof of the existence of large forms of life on Mars, you wouldn't be reading this today. It's an extraordinary statement.

The explanation offered herein for the tubes on Mars is not rigorous. It relies on facts that are commonly known to explain something unknown.

The notion that these features resemble roots is supported by the images, but the resemblance may be superficial. The idea may be elucidated by facts about rootstock and tuberous roots, but there are no known life-forms beyond Earth.

Further investigation of the enigmatic root-like complexes on Mars will require much more than extraordinary photographic evidence. It will require the efforts of extraordinary people.

People who open their minds before they open their mouths. People who can critically examine scientific evidence before criticizing conclusions. People who can evaluate new information, without clinging to apriori opinions.

As the late Richard Feynman once said, who cares what you _think_?

ABOUT THE IMAGES

The images discussed herein can be viewed at the USGS online PDS Mars Global Surveyor MOC Image Collection. The PDS images have been scaled to a normalized pixel aspect ratio.

<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m04002/m0400291.html>
<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m02012/m0201270.html>
<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m00015/m0001504.html>

RELATED RESOURCES

Clarke's Believe It or Not
http://www.space.com/peopleinterviews/clarke_believe_010227.html

Sir Arthur Ups the Ante
<http://www.enterprisemission.com/sir.htm>

JPL Scientist's Explanation Of The 'Tubes' On Mars
<http://www.sightings.com/general9/jpl.htm>

Glassy tubes" on Mars are sand dunes?
<http://www.metaresearch.org/home/Viewpoint/Meta-in-News.asp>

Shape-from-Shading Offers Perspective View of "Glass Tunnel"
<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/imperative15.html>

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 22, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/MarsOnline009.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 07:10:55 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:32:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

><snip>

>>Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!

>>Problem solved....

>Hi, Roy:

>Not exactly, but without anything else there will never be
>acceptable evidence for much of anything, beyond the human mind.

And if the same thing is done with scientific instrumentation on non-UFO topics, the same thing would happen because it all depends on human beings to conduct experiments, operate equipment, etc.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 09:30:33 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:34:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:00:27 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>I wonder why the fields of astrophysics or astronomy are
>considered to be the enlightened and most qualified to speak on
>the subject of UFOs? What have they got to do with it? What
>expertise do they bring to the table? Without serious study of
>the phenomenon first they are no more valuable to the quest than
>welders or proctologists>>

Astronomical objects are one of, or the largest category of IFOs,
so it's natural. Plus, nearly all astronomers nowadays are trained
in physics.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 15:42:50 -0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:38:32 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Hall

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:59:07 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:07:34 -0000

>>Having dealt with more than 100 "victims" I have perceived that
>>even among themselves, there is "no pity." Each is trying as
>>best they can to deal with their experiences and they often lash
>>out at fellow experiencers who don't see things quite the same
>>way.

>>To some, writing a book or going public is cathartic, to others
>>not so.

>>Therefore, I suggest that you stop "trashing" each other and
>>learn to be more tolerant.

>>How else can you expect outside, non-experiencers to have any
>>toleration for you at all?

>>Who can legitimately claim to have the "one truth" when none of
>>us really knows what is going on?

Jim replied:

>Hi Dick, and thanks for the words. I would like to point to a
>major and to me important, little factoid. Perhaps the most
>important (to me) on this subject. I have no truth. Even my own
>so-called truth is from memory which I trust I cannot fully
>trusted.

>Just because it seems to my Gripple-Addled mind that the recall
>is so real that it cannot be anything else, I also agree that I
>cannot be certain as to the absolute reality of them. So I call
>my experiences "perceived."

>The only truth is that, what I tell is true - to me. It may have
>no truth in reality. And I am the first to admit such.

Jim,

A lot of experiencers acknowledge that there may be no
consensual reality but it's very real to them. But as you say
and they say, it sure as hell feels real, so much so that you
doubt it could be anything but.

>Here are some of the rules I choose to live by:

>o I will always be harsh with those who debunk without sense or
>sensibility.

>o I will never doubt a man's word unless there is ample proof
>that he is lying. And the word "ample" is a lot in my pair of
>dimes.

>o I will never accept absolute truth, because this is the only
>truth which requires extraordinary evidence.

>o I will never be harsh except with cruelty and I will never
>abide meanness, for in meanness there is no truth, only lies.

>o I shall never defend those who defend only themselves. "On
>that path lies danger." (Dune, Frank Herbert)

Well, that's a mixed bag of principles, but not bad overall. But
my main response is below.

>Isn't it interesting that to me and my circle of abductees,
>there is no discrepancy, no lies, no disagreement. I perceived
>that this is the pervue of the researcher. And your view is the
>opposite, largely because of a few horses patooties whose lives
>revolve around themselves. One sour cherry on the tree, just one
>lousy sour cherry. And the whole tree is sour. Suck one sour
>cherry, just one lousy sour cherry, and for the rest of your
>life you are a sour cherry sucker.

You don't suppose that your "solidarity" could be because
abductees of a feather flock together, do you? Note how many of
those with a New Age perspective flock to John Mack. Hmmm! Note
how the camps tend to divide up into those who think the aliens
are "good guys" and those who think they are "bad guys."

In my investigator/researcher role I have observed this
phenomenon repeatedly and watched the schisms develop. I have
some ideas on why it happens, but basically all are looking for
some combination of answers and psychological support (or
solace). Their forced "belief system" about their experiences is
an important psychological defense, and they don't like to hear
others disagree with it.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>

Date: 22 Mar 2001 07:50:35 -0800

Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 14:20:00 -0500

Subject: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

Last night I attended my monthly dose of UFO talk by attending a presentation given by Budd Hopkins. We had a bigger room at the Beverly Garland Hotel where we usually meet. It took the Grand Ballroom to house the crowd that showed for Budd's talk.

Budd's subject was the childhood development stages of abductees vs normal childhood development. His assessment was that "abduction" has a significant impact on the development of children from infancy through their school years.

The abductee abducted as an infant in the first year of life suffers later with problems of trust and interpersonal relationships. He/she also has difficulty with body ownership and usually does not join in sports or games of skill where a demonstration of body control is required in team activities. He/she feels like a "loner" in social contacts and may develop unusual phobias connected to images obtained from the abduction experience - shadows, lights, or movements that resemble those in the experience may set the abductee "on edge".

I was amazed when at an abductee support group meeting when abductees were asked what athletic skill they had developed when in school - did they play football, basketball, baseball, soccer, etc? - and the majority replied "track". At this Budd joked they the abductees had learned how to run like hell.

Now what impressed me about Budd's profiling of an abductee fit my wife to a "T". He could have been talking only about her as an individual and would have seemed as if he were psychic. She also excelled at track in high school.

The usual body marks were covered. Again I was startled to see a triangular pattern of what looked like punctures to the skin. I photographed a similar triangle of puncture marks on my wife's hand a few years ago. The triangle was equilateral and all punctures were equal spaced - I believe they were 1.8 mm apart. She has also had a linear series of such marks especially after she believed to have had a visitation.

My wife has had abduction experiences since infancy as others. Many of these experiences happened when she was fully awake and conscious of what was going on. In one particular case when 3 of the so-called Grays entered her bedroom, a human in black stood near the bookcase against the wall. He had a black box in his hand and was swinging what looked like a cord from the box saying to her "you have no electricity". At the time she was living in a house in the foothills that ran on alternate generator power. She reached for a flashlight, hopped out of bed and pulled the light cord only to find that the lights, indeed, would not come on. She yelled for her husband (previous husband) to come to her room. The Grays had mysteriously left the room when the commotion started and were now outdoors on her 2.5 acres of desert property. There were several lights in the sky hanging low over her yard and another human in military uniform with a dog (which was barking at her big Lab retriever) was laying on an overhang from the roof of her house. He was yelling at two grays in the yard. To shorten this long story she went outside and stood underneath a large disc with a ring of rotating lights. The disc was also emitting smoke or fog

from openings underneath it. A neighbor witnessed this. 4.5 hours later she found herself sitting up on the side of the bed. That was on 5/14/1991. I arrived the next day to talk to her and found her in near hysteria over this event.

We have always tried to document these events and find as much evidence as possible, but never enough to present beyond all doubt. That is the way it is. Her medical records from that time were mysteriously sent by her Doctor to an Air Force MD at Edwards AFB without her authorization. She never had a personal or family connection with the AF. Her father was a Navy man. He also had experiences long ago.

The profiling of these cases that have so much in common is very compelling. Maybe we do not have the proof demanded by those who find it all too hard to believe, but I have had my proof. I have seen them up close and personal. That is a very convincing reality or "perceived" reality as Jim M. might put it.

I think John Velez may have some comments here.

Now, back to scientific skepticism (please, no debunking, scoffing, or laughter from the gallery).

-Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 22 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 14:24:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>>re the Arnold sighting.

>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>formation of any kind?

>>I've noticed that most sightings of any kind of UFO can be
>>grouped: discs, spheres, eggs, etc., and that there are broad
>>similarities among many sightings and groups of sightings.
>>Indeed, it is the similarities and the repeated reports of
>>similar objects with similar characteristics that tend to lend
>>credence to the overall phenom.

>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>>may have been unique.

>>I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia
>>University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00
>>pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the
>>sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped
>>with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

>Don Ledger

In 1959 Ray and Rex Stanford, then teenagers, visited the California desert near Giant Rock and took with them a Bell & Howell camera with color film.

Prompted by inner urges, Ray (a professed psychic) jumped up and walked more than a mile over the desert hills to the east when they looked up to see a crescent-shaped UFO with two arc cuts from the trailing edge pass overhead. The UFO had a glow around it visible against the daylight blue sky.

Stunned by this, Ray held camera in hand when he realized that he needed to film this event.

Soon, they heard a jet approaching from the west. At that point the UFO rose to a higher altitude and the jet started to converge on its position. The jet was high enough to form contrails.

Ray filmed what happened next.

As the jet closed on this crescent, the crescent just jumped a considerable distance ahead of the plane like a rabbit jumping away from a turtle closing on it.

You can see this amazing display in Ray's footage.

I am sure that if anyone knows how to get in touch with Ray (now about 60-61 yrs old), he could verify this. It was one of the more amazing pieces of footage I saw in the late 1950s - taken in July 1959.

-Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:09:13 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 14:28:12 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:05:21 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

>>Here's another nagging question.

><snip>

>>... I would pick on Mr. Mortellaro, too...

>Dear Wendy;

<snip>

>Of course it don't. I've had this discussion with John Velez. I
>understand his views, but I do not agree with them. While true
>about legitimization, it ends there. The purpose of researching
>one's own experiences is to present them in an organized way so
>that others may garner some measure of comfort, succor ...
>whatever, from hearing about someone else's lifetime of events,

There's enough of that stuff on the shelves already, and good ones too. The Debbie Kauble case, the Allagash four, all of Ray Fowlers "Andreasson" case books are brilliantly written and presented. Especially Ray's books. They convey the whole experience from the experiencers point of view much better than I ever could and I'm an abductee. For my money David Jacob's "Secret Lives" is as good as it gets in terms of laying out the similarities (and differences) in the abductee reports.

If you can make a new or meaningful contribution to the literature, then by all means go for it. Me personally, no. That shouldn't bother you. Apparently it does.

>It is in my opinion, a positive effort. One which can help
>others. Presenting one's experiences on UpDates, on various
>other venues such as Rense and Strange Days, then answering what
>appears to be an honest question posed in complete friendship by
>saying, "Go look up my posts... the information is all
>there..." or the equivalent, is (to me) the wrong answer. It may
>be the only one. But the assumption appears to be that you, the
>person making the request, is doing the injustice. Defend
>yourself if you deem it to be appropriate, this is just my
>opinion.

What you 'label' an "opinion" is also called "instigating!"

Why Jim?

Wendy 'clearly' addressed her post to me. Yet here you are going on about John this and Velez that. And in this case actually counselling Wendy to "defend herself." Why?

I can't begin to tell you how little I appreciate your efforts to fuel an argument between Wendy and myself. Or anybody else. How dare you? Where inside of yourself can you justify this kind of purely mean-spirited behavior. And why me?

Is it my deodorant?

FYI (and it's really none of your business but,...)

Wendy wrote to me privately. We are talking and communicating off-list and working out any misunderstandings we may have had about each other (just fine) without you coming along and trying to instigate a brawl. That's pretty low Jim. You really ought to look into your own heart and find out what makes you do stuff like that.

It's not the first time you've done this.

My apologies to Mr. Hall if it sounds like I'm "trashing" Mr. Mortellaro but, this kind of behavior (instigating a dispute) is clearly 'over the line.'

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder

From: **Bobbie Felder** <jilain@ebicom.net>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 12:37:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 14:29:52 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 23:43:16 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

<snip>

>Roger has kindly provided me with a few of his suspected alien
>implants and UFO artifacts in the past (including alleged UFO
>crash debris and even Alien Autopsy film fragments with assorted
>images on them from Ray Santilli) for independent tests here.
>Although I did not find strong evidence that pointed towards an
>extraterrestrial origin for any of the specimens we examined,
>prosaic explanations could not be found for all and a few
>remained unidentified. Although it has been a long while since
>the last time I got something from Roger, I have agreed to
>examine another object that originated from within someone's
>body.

<snip>

Hi Nick. Where can we find the results of your testing? I am
sure I'm not the only one who would really like a chance to
review your material.

Thanks :)

Bobbie

=====

Bobbie "Jilain" Felder
---> backwoods of Mississippi
---> USA
---> planet Earth
---> somewhere in the Cosmos
www.jilain.com
Point of View Webcast
www.dragoncrest.net
Online publishing
=====

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 22](#)

Re: Serious Research - Clark

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:44:52 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 14:51:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Clark

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 07:10:55 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!

>>>Problem solved....
>>Not exactly, but without anything else there will never be
>>acceptable evidence for much of anything, beyond the human mind.

>And if the same thing is done with scientific instrumentation on
>non-UFO topics, the same thing would happen because it all
>depends on human beings to conduct experiments, operate
>equipment, etc.

In the end just about everything is anecdotal testimony,
including scientific reports -- written by human beings with all
the biases, failings, and misceptions to which the species is
heir -- from the laboratory. Anybody who says that all
anecdotal human testimony is uniformly worthless is nobody to be
taken seriously.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Serious Research - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:58:04 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 08:04:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Clark

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:44:52 -0600

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 07:10:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>>>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>In the end just about everything is anecdotal testimony,
>including scientific reports -- written by human beings with all
>the biases, failings, and misceptions to which the species is
>heir -- from the laboratory.

Er, make that "misperceptions." I think I just made my own point.

Jerry Clark

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 12

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 10:14:57 +0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 08:14:11 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 12

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan@aol.com>
=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 6, Number 12
March 22, 2001
Editor: Joseph Trainor

<http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

UFO HOVERS OVER A TOWN IN MEXICO'S YUCATAN

"Hundreds of residents of Oxkutzcab witnessed last night (Thursday, March 8, 2001) the maneuvers of a strange luminous object that flew over the city for some 40 minutes."

Oxkutzcab is on the Yucatan Peninsula in southeastern Mexico, located about 120 kilometers (72 miles) southeast of Merida, the state capital.

"The unidentified flying object was observed at around 9 o'clock at night. Its appearance caused a variety of reactions among the townspeople, many of them screamed in excitement."

"It was the shouts and cries of these individuals which caused other residents to step out of their homes to see the UFO. Some even climbed up onto their rooftops. Although some pointed out that it could have been a kite, the majority seemed to agree that it was a dark object with a bright light issuing from it."

"Furthermore, in the time in which the luminous object flew over the city, there was no sound and no explanation could be found for the changing lights.. It was first seen in the north, and then in the west, and finally in the center of town. The sighting had a total duration of 40 minutes."

This was the second UFO sighting in the area recently. On February 1, 2001, "two brothers of this city were on their way to Mana when they saw a UFO."

"Antonio Bouzas, a researcher with Mexico's CONUESTAU group, noted that the UFO seen near Oxkutzcab could have been a military plane or a helicopter engaged in reconnaissance flights over the region."

"Interviewed about the subject, Antonio Bouzas commented that the object's flight characteristics lead him to believe that it was a military plane or helicopter which onlookers were unable to identify. He added that the flight characteristics of a military aircraft can be deceiving and that the true size of the vehicle cannot be determined." (See the Mexican newspapers Diario de Yucatan for March 9, 2001, "UFO flies over Oxkutzcab," and March 10, 2001, "Oxkutzcab UFO may have been a military aircraft." Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales, autor de los libros Chupacabras and Other Mysteries y Forbidden Mexico y tambien

Gloria Coluchi para esos articulos de diario.)

(Editor's Comment: Bouzas may be onto something. There was a black helicopter report from the Yucatan in April 1999.)

UFOs FLY OVER ROME

Italy's capital, Rome, had two UFO flyovers last week.

On Sunday, March 11, 2001, at 11:39 a.m., "several witnesses looking out a window on the west side of their apartment building observed a daylight disc moving in a rectilinear trajectory from south to north, The object was continually oscillating and alternately showing its bright sunlit side and dark shadowy side to the witnesses. One witness grabbed a camera and took a snapshot of the object as it streaked away towards the Mediterranean Sea."

The sighting is being investigated by Italian ufologists Stefano Innocenti and Matteo Leone.

On Wednesday, March 14, 2001, at 7 p.m., 'a large hovering red light' was observed by a Red Cross medical team responding to an emergency call. The team consisted of a physician, an orderly and the ambulance driver. The three witnesses 'saw a flame emanating from the light' and the light remained hovering in one spot for seven minutes. Then it changed color from red to white. It then departed at a high rate of speed."

The medical crew was interviewed by Italian ufologist Gildo Persone. (Grazie a Eduardo Russo di Centro Italiano di Studi Ufologici per questo rapporto.)

TWO UFOs FLY OVER ELK CITY, OKLAHOMA

Elk City further cemented its reputation as the "saucer capital" of Oklahoma last week when two more UFOs were seen flying over the community.

On Wednesday, March 14, 2001, at 10 p.m., "two unidentified flying objects flew over Elk City, Okla. and they were seen by several local residents. The objects flew at an estimated (altitude of) 500 feet. The objects were about 45 degrees above the horizon. They moved from the northwest to the southeast. in less than two minutes. The objects displayed one steady red light and one flashing red light. They moved in formation and stars were visible between the two objects."

Local ufologist Jim Hickman contacted the Elk City airport, the Clinton-Sherman regional airport, and Altus Air Force Base in western Oklahoma. He was told that no one had any aircraft in the (Elk City) area at that time."

However, an Elk City witness reported seeing "a small private plane" in the air at the same time as the UFOs. The plane displayed the standard Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) white navigation lights, Hickman said, "as opposed to the objects' two red lights." (Many thanks to Jim Hickman for this report.)

UFO VIDEOTAPED IN WASHINGTON STATE

On Saturday evening, March 19, 2001, two people from the Northwest Services Academy were hiking in the woods above Trout Lake, Washington, located about 40 miles (64 kilometers) northeast of Portland, Oregon when they saw "a bright object" land on Mount Adams.

The two quickly hurried down the trail to the Self-Mastery Earth Institute and alerted James A. Gilliland and his staff.

"When spotted, the two people, who will remain anonymous until we get their permission to use their names, moved quickly down to the ranch and told us to grab the camcorder," Gilliland reported. "We filmed the object from around 10 p.m. to 11:05 p.m.. The object traveled from the top of the mountain, moving over impassable terrain if it was on the ground. It was all over the mountain as if looking for something. ."

"It split into two objects, returning to one brilliant light on its way around the mountain. It would grow in intensity, dividing in two, and then each object would pit out a brilliant light as if they were still combined into one object. It was approximately 11 miles (18 kilometers) away. and there were four people who witnessed the event." (Many thanks to James A. Gilliland for this report.)

GREEN FIREBALL SEEN WEST OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

On Tuesday, February 20, 2001, at 1:15 a.m., a family of three from Farmington, New Mexico were driving home when they spotted a brilliant flash in the sky west of Grand Junction, Colorado.

The wife reported, "My husband, my daughter and I were driving home from Grand Junction, Colo. over Red Mountain Pass when we saw a huge greenish ball in the sky. It was not a meteor and it gave the snow a greenish cast. It went behind Engineers Peak while traveling slowly to the southeast. I was so shocked I'm not sure of the direction of the sighting, but I know that it was no low-flying jet."

Grand Junction is about 300 miles (480 kilometers) west-southwest of Denver, the state capital. (Many thanks to Peter B. Davenport of the National UFO Reporting Center and Rev. Billy Dee for this report.)

UFO BUZZES SMALL PLANE OVER IRVINGTON, ALABAMA

On Sunday, February 18, 2001, at 6:25 p.m., a small private plane was making its approach into the airport in Mobile, Alabama, when the youthful pilot spotted a blue UFO.

There were three people aboard the aircraft--the young man who was the pilot, his brother, and a male friend of their father, who was serving as the "check pilot." According to the witness, his "Dad's friend is a commercial and instrument-rated pilot."

The young pilot described the UFO as "a large blue light, fast-moving." He added, "I'm a private pilot. I had just gone flying and was on my way home when, to the left of me, a blue light appeared and shot forward at an incredible rate of speed. It then arced upward and streaked into the sky."

At the time of the encounter, their single-engine propellor plane was passing over Irvington, Alabama, near Mobile. (Many thanks to Peter B. Davenport of the National UFO Reporting Center and Rev. Billy Dee for this report.)

UTAH TOWN PELTED BY A RAIN OF EXCREMENT

"Dime-sized dollops of dung rained from the sky over Sevier County" in central Utah "this week, spattering a house and leaving health officials knee-deep in befuddlement as to their origin."

"The mess dropped Monday," March 12, 2001 "over a home on the outskirts of Richfield, covering two sides of the house and showering over the back yard and the hot tub, which was covered."

"The homeowner was gone at the time and discovered the mess just before 6 p.m. By then the spots appeared to be about three hours old."

"Health officials tested the splotches and confirmed the presence of coliform bacteria, including E. coli, confirming that the mess was fecal matter from an unknown source."

"The homeowner was advised to wash the mess away with disinfectant."

"'It could be very risky. Feces can carry viruses and other things that cause illness or health problems (like typhoid!--J.T.)," said Guy Dansie, an environmental scientist with the Central Utah Public Health Department."

"No one can say for sure where the mess originated."

"When a similar gooey mess hit Salt Lake County in the spring of 1999, homeowners blamed aircraft for dumping septic tanks while flying over the area, but this mess was devoid of any tell-tale blue chemicals used in jetliner toilets, and officials from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) maintain that aircraft do not have the ability to void their tanks while flying."

The feces "appeared to have come straight down from the sky, Dansie said, 'There was a spatter mark every three or four inches. It was quite a mess.'" (See the Salt Lake Tribune of Salt Lake City, Utah for March 15, 2001, "Dung rains on Sevier County home, leaving health officials mystified." Many thanks to Kenny Young of Cincinnati UFO Research for forwarding this newspaper article.)

(Editor's Comment: Welcome to Scary Skies Week at UFO Roundup. I hope you're all finished laughing because what's about to follow is not at all funny.)

TWO WARNINGS HAMPER DISCOVERY'S FLIGHT

The space shuttle Discovery has made history on this flight, including an epic nine-hour spacewalk by the astronauts on Sunday, March 11, 2001. But the flight has been enlivened by a pair of false alarms.

"The three new residents of the International Space Station got a scare on their first day when a smoke alarm went off. It turned out to be a false alarm. The Russian commander and his American crewmates were relieved about that but irritated by an apparently unrelated computer problem that prevented them from quickly accessing all the precautionary measures on a screen, NASA said. Space shuttle Discovery had undocked ten hours earlier," on Sunday, March 18, 2001, "to carry the space station's first crew home."

On Wednesday, March 14, 2001, "a warning of a possible collision between a piece of space junk and the International Space Station turned out to be a false alarm, NASA said."

"Astronauts used thrusters on the space shuttle Discovery, then docked to the space station, to boost the orbit of the outpost by about 10 miles (16 kilometers) Wednesday. "

"Mission Control's worry was a shoebox-sized piece of a foot restraint that floated away from the shuttle-station complex Sunday," March 11. "Ground trackers sent up a warning that that the debris was on a near-collision course with the station, but officials later said that the readings had been wrong." (See USA Today for March 16, 2001, "Station collision warning a false alarm," page 3A, and for March 20, 2001, "Space station's crew gets brief scare on first day," page 3A.)

ROUNDUP CORRIGENDA:

In last week's issue, UFO Roundup volume 6, number 11 for March 15, 2001, we ran a story entitled "Reptoid sighted in Baja California" on page 1. The text mentions that the two Mexican police officers sighted the creature on the beach near the thermoelectric plant in Rosarito, B.C, Mexico on "February 29." The actual date of the sighting was Wednesday, February 28, 2001.

Also in last week's issue in the "Triangular UFO seen over Lake Erie" we mentioned Port Erie, this should have been Fort Erie. UFO Roundup regrets the typographical errors.

From the UFO Files...

1819: CAT HOLLOW

A little over 20 miles (32 kilometers) south of Oneonta in New York state, near the West Branch of the Delaware River, is a little town called Delhi. Just down Route 10 from Delhi is one of the strangest spots in New York--Cat Hollow.

This small valley on the rim of the high Catskill Mountains has

been the site of many strange happenings dating back to the days of the Dutch colonists, when the valley was originally known as Spook Woods.

"Spook Woods deserved its name, because everyone knew that it was full of mystery. In fact, it was said that even dullwitted cattle would suddenly rush away in panic at what they had encountered. Certainly horses would balk at taking the road which ran through Spook Woods. The local people usually managed to go through Spook Woods only in broad daylight and preferably with company."

"A farmhand named Williams, the story goes, had been hired to work on a farm on the other side of the woods from his home. Williams had heard tales of Spook Woods, as who hadn't? But he was a big, rugged and ordinarily fearless man, who paid little attention to the tales of witches, spooks and supernatural happenings in the deep meadows."

"However, one winter night as he returned home through the woods on foot, he did feel a certain uneasiness. Perhaps it was because of the full moon which cast odd shadows along the side of the road, he reassured himself. But as he reached the center of the wooded stretch, he realized that one shadow was hurrying along ahead of him. The shadow was more than a trick of the moonlight, for it was moving quickly over the snow along the roadside."

As he hurried to pass it, he saw to his astonishment that the shadow was made by two cats who were dragging an obviously dead cat between them. What a strange way for animals to act, he thought.

"He quickened his steps to pass them. The cats hurried too and kept right up with him. Then, to his increasing horror, one of them called him by name."

"Yo, Williams!"

The farmhand stared in amazement. "Wha-What do you want?"

"We just want to talk to you," the other cat said.

"I-I don't want to talk," Williams babbled, taking hasty steps to get away.

What am I--nuts!? he thought, I'm having a conversation with cats.

"He knows too much," said the first cat, "Get him!"

Williams started running in earnest. "You cats better not try anything!"

"Yeah!?" the second cat replied, "What are you going to do about it?"

"Startled as he was, he wouldn't--he couldn't--stop. The terrified man began to run, desperately anxious to get out of the woods as fast as possible."

"The cats, slowed down by their burden, could not match his speed, but just as he was leaving the thick woods for the open country, one of them screeched in a loud, clear and almost human voice, "Mr. Williams, oh, Mr. Williams, when you get home, tell Molly Meyers that she can come home now; old man Hawkins is dead."

"Terribly shaken by his experience, Mr. Williams raced on to the security of his home. but when re reached the warm, friendly atmosphere he hesitated to tell his harrowing experience."

"Later in the evening, when his family was sitting around the fireplace, he half-jokingly told about it, and finally repeated the odd message one of the cats had cried out after him."

"To everyone's astonishment, the old white cat lying by the hearth sprang to her feet, and without once looking back, leaped up the chimney right over the burning logs and was never seen again."

"Had 'Molly Meyers' at last gone home?"

Yet this wasn't the only weird incident in Delhi, N.Y. In the 1830s, logging began in Spook Woods, furnishing lumber for the rapidly growing New York City downstate, and a lumber camp was built in the hollow.

The woods were "known as Cat Hollow since 1843. At that time there was a lumber camp operating in the valley that was dominated by an Amazon of a cook. Not only did she knock out the bully who killed her cat, but further punished the whole crew by by serving her pet in a surprise meat pie."

Famous last words at the lumber camp: "Well, Mrs. Lecter said it was cat meat."

Cat Hollow also played a small role in the Hollywood movie industry and in particular, in the career of movie director Val Lewton.

He was born Vladimir Ivanovich Leontonov in Yalta, Crimea, Russia on May 7, 1904. When he was five years old, his divorced mother brought him to the USA to live with his aunt, Russian actress Alla Nazimova, who had bought an estate near Tarrytown, N.Y.

Lewton attended Columbia University and wrote ten novels, including the Depression era classic No Pillow For Her Head. In the 1930s, he came to Hollywood and worked first for David O. Selznick and later for RKO.

In 1918, when Val was a teenager, his mother and aunt sent him to a private military school near Oneonta, N.Y. While a student there, he heard the legends of Cat Hollow and incorporated some of them, plus his actress aunt's many tales of Russian folklore, into the screenplay for his first big hit, the 1842 film Cat People, starring Simone Simon and Kent Smith.

Lewton did several classic horror movies for RKO and died in 1951 at the age of 47 from a heart attack.

Another distinguished visitor to Cat Hollow was none other than Howard Phillips Lovecraft (1890-1937). HPL, who once wrote of himself, "Grandpa Theobald loves his kitties," visited Delhi and Cat Hollow during his ramble through the Catskills in the 1920s.

(See the books Strangely Enough! by Carroll A. Gray, Sterline Publishing Co., New York, N.Y., 1959, pages 121 and 122; New York--A Guide to the Empire State, Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y., 1940, page 502; and Val Lewton--The Reality of Terror by Joel Siegel, London, 1972, pages 27 to 34.)

That's it for this week. Join us in seven days for more UFO and paranormal news from around the planet Earth, brought to you by "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you next week.

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2001 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their websites or in newsgroups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared.

E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan@aol.com> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

http://ufoinfo.com/forms/form_sighting.htm

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>

UFOINFO: <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives of the UK UFO Network Bulletin, AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI Magazine also available, plus archives of Filer's Files and Oz Files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:18:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA - Velez

>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA
>Date: 22 Mar 2001 07:50:35 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Last night I attended my monthly dose of UFO talk by attending a
>presentation given by Budd Hopkins. We had a bigger room at the
>Beverly Garland Hotel where we usually meet. It took the Grand
>Ballroom to house the crowd that showed for Budd's talk.

>Budd's subject was the childhood development stages of abductees
>vs normal childhood development. His assessment was that
>"abduction" has a significant impact on the development of
>children from infancy through their school years.

>The abductee abducted as an infant in the first year of life
>suffers later with problems of trust and interpersonal
>relationships. He/she also has difficulty with body ownership
>and usually does not join in sports or games of skill where a
>demonstration of body control is required in team activities.
>He/she feels like a "loner" in social contacts and may develop
>unusual phobias connected to images obtained from the abduction
>experience - shadows, lights, or movements that resemble those
>in the experience may set the abductee "on edge".

>I was amazed when at an abductee support group meeting when
>abductees were asked what athletic skill they had developed
>when in school - did they play football, basketball, baseball,
>soccer, etc? - and the majority replied "track". At this Budd
>joked they the abductees had learned how to run like hell.

>Now what impressed me about Budd's profiling of an abductee fit
>my wife to a "T". He could have been talking only about her as
>an individual and would have seemed as if he were psychic. She
>also excelled at track in high school.

>The usual body marks were covered. Again I was startled to see
>a triangular pattern of what looked like punctures to the skin.
>I photographed a similar triangle of puncture marks on my wife's
>hand a few years ago. The triangle was equilateral and all
>punctures were equal spaced - I believe they were 1.8 mm apart.
>She has also had a linear series of such marks especially after
>she believed to have had a visitation.

>My wife has had abduction experiences since infancy as others.
>Many of these experiences happened when she was fully awake and
>conscious of what was going on. In one particular case when 3
>of the so-called Grays entered her bedroom, a human in black
>stood near the bookcase against the wall. He had a black box in
>his hand and was swinging what looked like a cord from the box
>saying to her "you have no electricity". At the time she was
>living in a house in the foothills that ran on alternate
>generator power. She reached for a flashlight, hopped out of
>bed and pulled the light cord only to find that the lights,
>indeed, would not come on. She yelled for her husband (previous
>husband) to come to her room. The Grays had mysteriously left
>the room when the commotion started and were now outdoors on her
>2.5 acres of desert property. There were several lights in the
>sky hanging low over her yard and another human in military

>uniform with a dog (which was barking at her big Lab retriever)
>was laying on an overhang from the roof of her house. He was
>yelling at two grays in the yard. To shorten this long story
>she went outside and stood underneath a large disc with a ring
>of rotating lights. The disc was also emitting smoke or fog
>from openings underneath it. A neighbor witnessed this. 4.5
>hours later she found herself sitting up on the side of the bed.
>That was on 5/14/1991. I arrived the next day to talk to her
>and found her in near hysteria over this event.

>We have always tried to document these events and find as much
>evidence as possible, but never enough to present beyond all
>doubt. That is the way it is. Her medical records from that
>time were mysteriously sent by her Doctor to an Air Force MD at
>Edwards AFB without her authorization. She never had a personal
>or family connection with the AF. Her father was a Navy man.
>He also had experiences long ago.

>The profiling of these cases that have so much in common is very
>compelling. Maybe we do not have the proof demanded by those
>who find it all too hard to believe, but I have had my proof. I
>have seen them up close and personal. That is a very convincing
>reality or "perceived" reality as Jim M. might put it.

>I think John Velez may have some comments here.

>Now, back to scientific skepticism (please, no debunking,
>scoffing, or laughter from the gallery).

>-Bill Hamilton

Hi Bill,

I had the pleasure of meeting your lovely wife (and yourself)
face to face when we were all in Roswell for the 50th
anniversary celebration of the 'crash.' As you recall, when we
ran into each other Tom King and myself had lost our 'ride' back
to my hotel and we were frantically looking for our friend. ;) I
wish I'd been able to spend more time with you guys.

Regarding your following statement:

>Now, back to scientific skepticism (please, no debunking,
>scoffing, or laughter from the gallery).

Bill, nobody on this List would ever be insensitive enough to
'scoff' or 'laugh' at your wife's story. Besides, they would
have to go through me first. Who needs that hassle! <LOL>

Regarding some specific details you've mentioned:

>At this Budd joked that the abductees had learned how to run
>like hell.

>Now what impressed me about Budd's profiling of an abductee fit
>my wife to a "T". He could have been talking only about her as
>an individual and would have seemed as if he were psychic. She
>also excelled at track in high school.

<LOL> My only physical 'strengths' when I was growing up were, I
was fast and I could as Budd put it, "run like Hell!" ;)

>The usual body marks were covered. Again I was startled to see
>a triangular pattern of what looked like punctures to the skin.
>I photographed a similar triangle of puncture marks on my wife's
>hand a few years ago. The triangle was equilateral and all
>punctures were equal spaced - I believe they were 1.8 mm apart.

I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles. They
appear on the skin in either circular or rough edge circular
patterns. He had not ever seen anything like it he told me. It
didn't hurt or itch so he told me to keep an eye on any changes
(size or symptoms) and to call him if/when a change occurred.
Sometimes those marks disappear quickly in a matter of days or
they can linger for months. Budd has many examples of those. I
have collected four myself from people that have communicated
with me over the years.

>She has also had a linear series of such marks especially after
>she believed to have had a visitation.

As for the row of pin pricks; you can see photos of a couple at the AIC website. Just click on the "Physical Evidence" link.

<http://www.spacelab.net/~jvif/>

>My wife has had abduction experiences since infancy as others.

Me too.

>Many of these experiences happened when she was fully awake and
>conscious of what was going on.

Me too.

>In one particular case when 3
>of the so-called Grays entered her bedroom, a human in black
>stood near the bookcase against the wall. He had a black box in
>his hand and was swinging what looked like a cord from the box
>saying to her "you have no electricity".

That freakin black box comes up often enough to make me wonder as to its significance/meaning/use. Tell your wife I have seen that "black box" whatever it is or represents. I have e-mails from others who have volunteered descriptions of a "black box" in their letters to me.

>The disc was also emitting smoke or fog
>from openings underneath it.

A few months ago I detailed a multiple witness sighting of an enormous disc-shaped UFO that flew at fairly low altitude over the Hudson River. In my description of what we saw I mentioned that the bottom of the disc was exuding 'steam' or 'smoke' and looked like a roiling cloud coming off the bottom of it.

The witnesses involved were myself, the VP of the printing co. I worked for at the time, and my cameraman. I have seen this particular detail mentioned in other UFO sighting reports.

>I arrived the next day to talk to her
>and found her in near hysteria over this event.

My cameraman was badly shaken up but only days afterwards.

>We have always tried to document these events and find as much
>evidence as possible, but never enough to present beyond all
>doubt. That is the way it is.

The 'bane' of the existence of every abductee. It's why I stick around and do what I can. People have no idea of the -urgency- of the situation. Sometimes I sit back and watch all the give and take on the List and wonder how all these people are going to deal with the 'Reality' of what they now discuss at such a safe and comfortable distance. Each and everyone will have to go through the exact same thing that every abductee goes through when they discover their own involvement. A 'shattered world view' is the same whether you're an abductee or not. The bottom line effect of the reality of UFOs and their occupants is the same for all.

>Her father was a Navy man. He also had experiences long ago.

So did my mom and dad. Only in my mothers case she identifies the experiences as "Religious" in nature. The experiences themselves though are indistinguishable from abduction related reports. (ex: My mother recalls sitting in the living room alone one night back in the 50's, when a globe of light came through the wall, paralyzed her, (she was unable to move or speak) and then shone a beam of light on her chest. It then departed and she says she felt 'spent' like she had been working for many hours without rest. I asked her what she thought it was and she said, "Oh, I think it was Jesus coming to free my heart from worry. I was so worried and praying for your aunt at that time." (Her sister was dying from cancer.)

My father says that he "dreamed" that some midgets stuck something inside of his head and that the dream was so real that

he could actually feel pain in his head for days after the "dream."

There's more but I don't want to make this too long.

>The profiling of these cases that have so much in common is very >compelling. Maybe we do not have the proof demanded by those >who find it all too hard to believe, but I have had my proof. I >have seen them up close and personal.

You're not alone compadre. The number grows with each passing year. I can only hope and pray that all of this UFO business becomes a matter of 'common knowledge' within my lifetime. It would be such a reward for all the hard work and all the BS I and others have had to endure. On top of the abductions themselves!

Lots of people are going to feel righteously bad for how they thought of us and in some cases how they treated us.

Remember that old song, "Our Day Will Come,..." ;)

>I think John Velez may have some comments here.

Oh, you just got a mouthful Billy-boy! <LOL>

Warm regards, my very best to your wife,

John Velez

"Nothing is at last sacred but
the integrity of your own mind."
www.space-lab.net/~jvif/

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:47:28 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 11:05:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Sparks

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 03:46:28 -0000

>Regarding:

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Wendy wrote:

>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>formation of any kind?

>Wendy,

>Yes, there are many accounts, although you'll have to look out
>some ornithological reports! And therein, we can find thoroughly
>documented observations which are remarkably and distinctly
>comparable.

If there is so much flying saucer "hysteria" how come pelicans
didn't trigger a flood of similarly shaped UFOs to Arnold's?
That was her question. See next.

>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports.

>>Please enlighten me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly
>>why his sightings may have been unique.

>Although there were initial references to Arnold describing the
>objects as resembling a "pie plate that was cut in half, with a
>convex triangle at the rear" [KWRC radio interview], that was
>rapidly buried amidst the ensuing 'flying saucer' hysteria.

Sorry just flatout not true, Arnold's non-round shapes were not
"buried" by the press, as I pointed out a few days ago on
UpDates, see my post at:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m20-036.shtml>

The Associated Press, one of the world's largest wire news
services then and now, sent out a dispatch on June 27, 1947,
that very clearly described in the very first _lead paragraph_
that Arnold had seen, quote:

"nine shiny crescent-shaped planes or pilotless missiles."

Then further down Arnold is directly quoted as saying "They were
half-moon shaped, oval in front and convex in the rear." But
Arnold is also quoted as saying "Some of them [pilots] guessed

that I had seen some secret guided missiles. People began asking me if I thought they were missiles sent over the North Pole."

So why didn't people hysterically imagine seeing "crescent-shaped" objects or "half-moon" shapes as Arnold reported? Why didn't lots of people imagine they saw "guided missiles" as well? Surely the "ghost rockets" episode only the year before shows that supposedly imaginary or illusory "guided missile" shapes can be extremely popular among the masses.

Why weren't pelicans seen as "crescent-shaped" UFOs?

<snip>

>[Note the extraordinary 'flying saucer' hysteria which has
>resulted from Kenneth Arnold's June 24th, 1947 account. Whilst
>many people report seeing the popularised 'flying saucers', no-
>one seems to be witnessing crescent-shaped objects like those
>Arnold actually reported!]

If pelicans can generate spectacular views of crescent-shaped UFOs why aren't there any such pelican-generated UFO reports? Not even your phony-baloney Capt George Moore sighting has a pelican reported as "crescent-shaped" only as a "large round disk" which even you admit Arnold did not actually see.

In actual fact there are crescent-shaped genuine UFO reports actually paralleling Arnold's quite closely, and from none other than that obvious quack and fraud according to debunker theory, the legendary Lockheed aircraft designer Kelly Johnson and his top staff -- as I will very shortly post.

>Although it simply wasn't true, no-one was pointing out what was
>actually reported by Arnold

As I just showed above, AP was reporting and reporting widely what was "actually reported by Arnold."

<snip>

>The only contemporary newspaper 'saucer' sighting I can think of
>dates from 12 July, 1947, when an aircrew reported that on 9 July
>they had spotted nine 'disks' weaving in formation (just like
>Arnold's nine objects) somewhere between Spokane and Portland.

Where? Where "between Spokane and Portland"? Why don't we have an exact location to within a few miles like we do with Arnold?

What was the exact time? Why don't we have an exact time to the minute (or even to within an hour) as we do with Arnold?

Could it actually even have been at night? Could the pelicans have been lit up by the bright almost-full moonlight of July 9, 1947? If it was at night then how can this possibly be of any use in comparing it to Arnold's sighting in broad daylight with bright sun?

Was the plane flying toward Spokane or toward Portland? Why don't we have a flight heading like we do with Arnold?

What "formation"? What was the formation? Was it a V- or L-shape as typical for pelicans, but unlike the single file line that Arnold saw?

How do we know there were 9 of them? Did they say they actually counted them as Arnold said he did? Did they just pick out 9 from a larger group? Could the number have been smaller, say, 4 or 5, and it got enlarged in order to make it compare better with Arnold? One would have expected an estimate of about 10 as a round number, rather than an exact number such as the 9 which is suspiciously Arnold's exact number. Is there any ornithological reason why pelicans would prefer formations of exactly 9 and if not, why should we expect exactly 9, isn't that rather suspicious of a prank as they were admittedly "saucer-hunting"? Indeed it may have been over with too quickly to count them because of the airliner's speed in overtaking birds, unlike with Arnold who could not overtake.

Please note that the route between Spokane and Portland flies directly over a known rare/occasional habitat of American White Pelicans, namely the Columbia River Plateau and the lakes of SE

Washington State, whereas Arnold was nowhere near any such pelican habitat on the SW side of Mt. Rainier.

There are lots of unanswered questions about this uninvestigated newspaper clipping, which can't be propped up with other sightings made at the same time, as we can in Arnold's case.

>As Capt. Gordon Moore related afterwards, "Suddenly we spotted
>nine big round disks weaving northward two thousand feet below
>us".

But Arnold didn't see "round disks" as you even admit. Since Moore and his buddy were admittedly "saucer hunting" (in part of the story you omit) and they carried at least two movie cameras, where are the photographs, the movies?

>This would doubtless have become a landmark 'UFO' case in later
>years, especially in seemingly corroborating Arnold's
>observation that nine 'disc(k)s' of unknown origin were flying
>around and violating US airspace.

But they were "saucer-hunting" and carried movie cameras. The movies would prove what it was they had seen. Where are the movies?

>However, this was not to be. As Capt. Moore explained to the
>'The British Columbian of New Westminster':

>"We investigated and found they were real all right - real
>pelicans".

Where are the movies? They had two or more movie cameras for the specific purpose of "saucer-hunting" so where are the pictures? How long was it before they figured out the objects were pelicans? Could it have just been seconds so they didn't have time to take pictures? How does that compare with Arnold's 1-3 minutes of observation including a "clocking"? Doesn't this indicate they quickly overtook the pelicans in their much faster airliner, unlike Arnold who could not overtake his high-speed objects?

How sure was Moore that they were pelicans, since the article says he thought that "all" the things people were seeing were pelicans, "Or maybe geese or swans." (Another part of the story you omitted.) Could it be that Moore himself wasn't really sure what he had seen? Could it be that he wanted to debunk everyone's sightings with a blanket pelican explanation regardless how forced the fit?

What did his copilot Vern Kesler have to say? Did he confirm the story? Why isn't he quoted?

Where were the "arc-like" almost "blinding" flashes? If as you claim pelicans can "flash" like Arnold's objects where is Capt Moore's report of seeing these pelicans "flash"?

>If they hadn't investigated those "nine big round disks", then
>this would presumably be proclaimed as a highly credible
>aircrew's report of... well... nine, big round disks.

But not Arnold's "crescent" shapes... which seems a lot closer to pelican shapes than "big round disks." So how does in any way prove that Arnold's crescents could have been pelicans? This is totally illogical. Find cases of actual pelicans being seen as long-duration, crescent-shaped intensely bright almost blinding UFOs and then you might have the beginnings of a case instead of a superficial linguistic equation using distortions of testimony in a chain at three stages removed (Arnold's creseccents -->flying saucers -->big round disks -->pelicans).

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 19:14:16 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 11:09:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 01:13:01 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

<snip>

>>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>>>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>>>may have been unique.

>>I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia
>>University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00
>>pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the
>>sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped
>>with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

>Can you give any more information, such as the source of the
>report, flight characteristics (straight or skipping, etc.),
>speed, any sound and so forth?

Hi Josh,

This was a UFO report forwarded to me by Chris Rutkowski which he took while he was investigating for IUFOR. I used it in my book Maritime UFO Files[page 16]. The witness made the report in 1990 I believe of a sighting she had in 1938. She did not want to be identified even after 52 years had passed. She is identified as Mrs. W.

Other than what I reported above there was no sound or contrail. The sighting lasted for about 10 seconds.

I was in error describing her as a librarian. However she was returning home from the university.

There is not much to go on except for the drawing Chris R. included in the report which is the half moon shape with two bites out of the trailing edge leaving a trailing point in the trailing edge center and curved tips at either side of the object.

It is just curious that this shape showed up once again but, preceding Arnold's by 9 years.

Best,

Don Ledger

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 18:35:42 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 11:12:14 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Mortellaro

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 15:42:50 -0000

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:59:07 EST
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:07:34 -0000

>>>Having dealt with more than 100 "victims" I have perceived that
>>>even among themselves, there is "no pity." Each is trying as
>>>best they can to deal with their experiences and they often lash
>>>out at fellow experiencers who don't see things quite the same
>>>way.

>>>To some, writing a book or going public is cathartic, to others
>>>not so.

>>>Therefore, I suggest that you stop "trashing" each other and
>>>learn to be more tolerant.

>>>How else can you expect outside, non-experiencers to have any
>>>toleration for you at all?

>>>Who can legitimately claim to have the "one truth" when none of
>>>us really knows what is going on?

>Jim replied:

>>Hi Dick, and thanks for the words. I would like to point to a
>>major and to me important, little factoid. Perhaps the most
>>important (to me) on this subject. I have no truth. Even my own
>>so-called truth is from memory which I trust I cannot fully
>>trusted.

>>Just because it seems to my Gripple-Addled mind that the recall
>>is so real that it cannot be anything else, I also agree that I
>>cannot be certain as to the absolute reality of them. So I call
>>my experiences "perceived."

>>The only truth is that, what I tell is true - to me. It may have
>>no truth in reality. And I am the first to admit such.

>>A lot of experiencers acknowledge that there may be no
>>consensual reality but it's very real to them. But as you say
>>and they say, it sure as hell feels real, so much so that you
>>doubt it could be anything but.

<snip>

>Well, that's a mixed bag of principles, but not bad overall. But
>my main response is below.

>>Isn't it interesting that to me and my circle of abductees,
>>there is no discrepancy, no lies, no disagreement. I perceived
>>that this is the pervue of the researcher. And your view is the
>>opposite, largely because of a few horses patooties whose lives
>>revolve around themselves. One sour cherry on the tree, just one
>>lousy sour cherry. And the whole tree is sour. Suck one sour
>>cherry, just one lousy sour cherry, and for the rest of your
>>life you are a sour cherry sucker.

Hello again... No, I don't think so. For I've become involved,
during the research of my own experiences, with so many
disparate and divers groups, support and otherwise, as well as
individuals who've expressed suspicion of abduction phenomena,
that the statement remains true in my experience.

Some express belief in a strong spiritual element, some in a
physical one, some like Dr. Jacobs clients, in the evil intent
of alien entities, should they exist... etc. But there is always
that one recurring thread of systematic sharing of experiences
on several levels. Among these shared phenom are illnesses
common to abductees, perhaps related to Post Traumatic Stress
Syndrome ... shared and common events, shared sights, smells and
sometimes, the same type of entity. And there are sundry types.

Abductees differ in their views, but I refer to what we all
agree on. And there, only the self centered are spared the
special nature of that essential sympatico which I frankly
depend on in my research. No, we just don't fight. We don't
always see eye to eye, but the shared experiences make us
brothers and sisters to an extent.

There are some exceptions.

>You don't suppose that your "solidarity" could be because
>abductees of a feather flock together, do you? Note how many of
>those with a New Age perspective flock to John Mack. Hmmm! Note
>how the camps tend to divide up into those who think the aliens
>are "good guys" and those who think they are "bad guys."

As above...

>In my investigator/researcher role I have observed this
>phenomenon repeatedly and watched the schisms develop. I have
>some ideas on why it happens, but basically all are looking for
>some combination of answers and psychological support (or
>solace). Their forced "belief system" about their experiences is
>an important psychological defense, and they don't like to hear
>others disagree with it.

The number of people interviewed may make that difference
significant. My experience takes me to about a hundred or so
people... maybe even less.

??

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Serious Research - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 11:14:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Ledger

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 09:30:33 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:00:27 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>I wonder why the fields of astrophysics or astronomy are
>>considered to be the enlightened and most qualified to speak on
>>the subject of UFOs? What have they got to do with it? What
>>expertise do they bring to the table? Without serious study of
>>the phenomenon first they are no more valuable to the quest than
>>welders or proctologists>>

>Astronomical objects are one of, or the largest category of IFOs,
>so it's natural. Plus, nearly all astronomers nowadays are trained
>in physics.

Hi Bob,

First I'm not convinced that your first point is the case, but what I'm getting at is that trained in physics or not, if you don't read the material or get deeply into the subject no astronomer's opinion is worth zip coming at it cold. Which quite often they do, expounding upon something they have no knowledge of. Its like passing judgement on the merits of a movie you've never seen because you've heard that the director embraces a political party you despise.

Keep 'em flying.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:06:05 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:00:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Ledger

>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Date: 22 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>>formation of any kind?

<snip>

>>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>>>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>>>may have been unique.

>>I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia
>>University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00
>>pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the
>>sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped
>>with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

>In 1959 Ray and Rex Stanford, then teenagers, visited the
>California desert near Giant Rock and took with them a Bell &
>Howell camera with color film.

>Prompted by inner urges, Ray (a professed psychic) jumped up and
>walked more than a mile over the desert hills to the east when
>they looked up to see a crescent-shaped UFO with two arc cuts
>from the trailing edge pass overhead. The UFO had a glow around
>it visible against the daylight blue sky.

>Stunned by this, Ray held camera in hand when he realized that
>he needed to film this event.

>Soon, they heard a jet approaching from the west. At that point
>the UFO rose to a higher altitude and the jet started to
>converge on its position. The jet was high enough to form
>contrails.

>Ray filmed what happened next.

>As the jet closed on this crescent, the crescent just jumped a
>considerable distance ahead of the plane like a rabbit jumping
>away from a turtle closing on it.

>You can see this amazing display in Ray's footage.

>I am sure that if anyone knows how to get in touch with Ray (now
>about 60-61 yrs old), he could verify this. It was one of the
>more amazing pieces of footage I saw in the late 1950s - taken
>in July 1959.

Hi Bill,

Did you see this film? Certainly would be worth tracking down if it's still around. Sounds very interesting.

Best,

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

NFB's UFO?

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:12:46 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:03:04 -0500
Subject: NFB's UFO?

Hi Errol and List,

Does anyone remember seeing footage shot of a UFO on 16 mm film stock by the National Film Board of Canada?

If memory serves they were doing a setup out in western Canada, mid-day and filmed this object moving behind some Elm trees. It was diamond shaped, not stationary and sparkling as if mirrored. It's some of the best footage I've seen of a UFO.

Best,

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:03:13 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:04:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 07:10:55 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>And if the same thing is done with scientific instrumentation on
>non-UFO topics, the same thing would happen because it all
>depends on human beings to conduct experiments, operate
>equipment, etc.

Brad, Roy, List:

Science is a human enterprise and there is always the possibility of self-deception, hoaxes, screw-ups etc. But, I think that if physical testing, physically acquired data and experiments are used, this is not the same as unsupported eyewitness testimony.

Even the famous example of the breakthrough on meteorites was made possible by an extensive investigation, examination of physical evidence, the meteorites, etc. Thus, it was not just unsupported eyewitness testimony, but there was physical proof.

I predict that unless the millenium arrives, with physical proof of visitation, or the reality of a TRUFO, unsupported testimony will not be enough to convince the wider world.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:03:14 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:06:43 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Young

>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Date: 22 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>In 1959 Ray and Rex Stanford, then teenagers, visited the
>California desert near Giant Rock and took with them a Bell &
>Howell camera with color film.

>Prompted by inner urges, Ray (a professed psychic) jumped up and
>walked more than a mile over the desert hills to the east when
>they looked up to see a crescent-shaped UFO with two arc cuts
>from the trailing edge pass overhead. The UFO had a glow around
>it visible against the daylight blue sky.

<snip>

>Ray filmed what happened next.

>As the jet closed on this crescent, the crescent just jumped a
>considerable distance ahead of the plane like a rabbit jumping
>away from a turtle closing on it.

Hi, Bill, Don, Wendy, List:

Sounds like lens flare from the Sun in the camera lens. Of course, there is the matter of the witness saying that he saw the thing before he filmed it.

>You can see this amazing display in Ray's footage.

I wonder if the jumping rabbit happened as the camera was moved to follow the aircraft.

This would be a neat piece of film for somebody to have a look at. Even a still might throw evidence on the lens flare notion.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Secrecy News -- 03/21/01 - Goldstein

From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 02:24:24 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:09:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Secrecy News -- 03/21/01 - Goldstein

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 13:08:15 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
>Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/21/01

>SECRECY NEWS
>from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
>March 21, 2001

>***AN EXEMPLARY FOIA RULING
>***SANDIA WAS-- OR WAS NOT-- HACKED
>***NEW NON-LETHAL WEAPON WILL NOT "FRY PEOPLE"

>AN EXEMPLARY FOIA RULING

>A new federal court decision found "enormous public benefit"
>from documents released under the Freedom of Information Act
>(FOIA), illustrating the enduring value of that 35 year old law.

Yay.

<snip>

>Sandia National Laboratory recently suffered a "major hacker
>incident," according to a March 16 article by Bill Gertz in the
>Washington Times. He cited anonymous "U.S. intelligence
>officials" to the effect that "hackers suspected of having links
>to a foreign government successfully broke into Sandia's
>computer system and were able to access sensitive classified
>information." See:

><http://www.washtimes.com/national/inring-2001316211918.htm>

>But that story is "untrue", Sen. Pete Domenici told the
>Albuquerque Journal in a March 17 article. "My staff and I have
>been regularly briefed by Sandia, and I don't believe that's an
>accurate statement," Domenici said. See:

><http://www.abqjournal.com/scitech/279548scitech03-17-01.htm>

>It is hard not to notice that a number of recent news reports
>purportedly based on classified information are turning out to
>be wrong, or at least are plausibly disputed. Another Washington
>Times story that appeared on January 3 reported, based on
>classified sources, that Russia had moved tactical nuclear
>weapons to the Baltic Sea port of Kaliningrad. This unconfirmed
>claim has been vigorously denied by senior Russian officials up
>to and including President Putin.

>The publication of possibly erroneous news stories involving
>classified information provides another reason not to try to
>criminalize the unauthorized disclosure of classified
>information to the news media, as some in Congress have proposed
>to do. Prosecuting such acts would have the undesired effect of
>publicly distinguishing the true from the bogus "classified"
>stories.

<snip>

What do you expect? The Washington Times is a ragsheet owned by the wacko Reverend Moon. Remember him? His paper is total trash and it's not even a tabloid but a (gulp) daily. Please do not confuse this waste of typesetting with the Washington Post.

Buenos nachos,
Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Cydonian Imperative - 3-23-01

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:50:56 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 14:08:53 -0500
Subject: Cydonian Imperative - 3-23-01

3-23-01

The Cydonian Imperative

The Electric Warrior Gets to the Root of the Matter

by Mac Tonnies

IMAGE

This artistic rendering by eWarrior presents the Martian "tubes" as enormous organic tendrils.

Kurt Jonach of The Electric Warrior has presented a startling and well-conceived theory to explain the Martian "tubes" in a new essay posted on his site: www.electricwarrior.com/mol/index.htm. According to Jonach, the simplest answer for the enigmatic tube-like formations might be that they are parts of a ground-hugging root system, comparable to that of a terrestrial rhizome.

Jonach's "Organic Hypothesis" is a decisively novel and welcome addition to the debate over the origin of these strange formations.

For more, visit:

<http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>

-end-

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 02:17:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 14:13:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:53:12 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

>>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:56:38 -0500
>>Subject: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

>Previously, Michel wrote:

>>Having been a witness to 18 separate sightings of true UFOs (in
>>this case, UFO meaning an unusual light or object whose
>>behaviour, color patterns, performance, brilliance, shape,
>>speed, maneuverability, etc. clearly falls outside of the
>>brackets of Natural Phenomena or man-made devices), I am
>>pretty confident that I can distinguish between something that
>>is unknown and something that isn't.

>>But there are people out there who will look at Venus, a
>>satellite or a bolide, and claim that they saw a UFO. I want to
>>put together a list of these objects/phenomena and their
>>characteristics in order for people to familiarize themselves
>>with the knowns and learn to distinguish those from the
>>unknowns.

>>I would like to know where I could get information on the
>>following:

>>Natural Phenomena:

>>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

>>Man-made devices:

>>Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket, missile, flare, satellite,
>>weather balloon, remote control model airplanes/helicopters,
>>etc.

>>If you think I missed anything, please include them in the list.

>Now, let me get this straight:

>On the one hand, you have enough knowledge to know the
>difference between a "true" UFO and natural phenomena such as
>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc. as well
>as man-made devices such as Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket,
>missile, flare, satellite, weather balloon, remote control model
>airplanes/helicopters, etc.

>On the other hand, you have no idea where to get information on
>these subjects? If you have no information on these subjects
>then how can you, with any certainty, differentiate a "true UFO"
>from any of the above? If you did have information on these
>subjects, then why do you need assistance in gathering such
>information again?

>Again, just what sets your videos and sightings apart from an
>indistinguishable dot of smeary light in sky that could be just
>about anything? I haven't forgotten that you know flying saucers
>are real because you've seen them with your own eyes. I'm just
>waiting for you to share these images with the rest of us.

My request for the information is not for my own benefit, but for the benefit of others in this city, who may not be sure what to look for when faced with something which they can't readily explain in conventional terms. Sometimes, an eyewitness will satisfy himself with the most mundane explanation given to him by some authority figure, even if the description and characteristics of the observed phenomena/object does not coincide with the explanation. I want to be absolutely sure that I get all relevant data on these phenomena and man-made objects in regards to their capabilities and/or characteristics...so that first-time observers of UFOs/Flying Saucers can educate themselves about these objects and their characteristics, which seem to exhibit a level of technology and/or physics which exceeds our present-day technological know-how and science. And not be so quick to accept any explanation given by someone who has not witnessed anything themselves. I'm in the process of developing a web page which will serve as an educational tool, and this information will be on there...kind of like having a check list by which someone can cross out items that do not match with the behaviour of the observed phenomena/object.

There really is a distinguishable difference, you know, between earth vehicles, natural phenomena and these objects, when one takes a closer look at the behaviour, performance, appearance, size, etc., etc., etc., of these UFOs. Only a person who has been fortunate enough to see these objects on many occasions, can know for sure. And I'm only one amongst thousands around the world. We are not stupid. We know what we know. Take it or leave it!

Truth really is in the eye of the beholder!

Roger added:

>I'm just waiting for you to share these images with
>the rest of us.

All in due time, Roger. Patience is a virtue.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 02:19:12 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 14:16:11 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 01:19:03 EST
>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>>To: Errol Bruce-Knapp <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:56:38 -0500

<snip>

>>I would like to know where I could get information on the
>>following:

>>Natural Phenomena:

>>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

>Don't forget Pelicans, lighthouses, venus, snow geese, and the
>many others. :)

>Also don't forget how the debunker mind works:

>Witness: Well it looked like a star.....

>Debunker: Ah ha, the idiot witness saw stars.....

Thanks for your support, Robert.

Been there, Heard that!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 09:44:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:18:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Aldrich

>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 00:24:36 -0800
>Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:31:12 -0500
>Subject: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars

EXTRAORDINARY ROOT COMPLEXES ON MARS

What we learn from history is we don't learn anything from history.

Most are probably too young to remember the Martian canals. People drew elaborate maps of these things. Stories abounded, as the polar cap melted in Mars' northern hemisphere, the water was collected and directed through the canals southward, there are seasonal changes of color indicating farming of some type. Etc., etc., etc.

It was simple, logical, and wrong. Most scientists didn't believe it, but it was a popular myth in newspapers and books.

On the way West from here there is a rock along the road that some people say looks like a frog, and others say looks like a hawk. The two sides are at war. One side paints the rock green and with features of a frog, others paint rock brown with the features of a hawk with a golden bill.

Fact is the thing is a rock.

There are probably more unusual features on Mars than can be catalogued in a life time. Doesn't mean that the features are indication of life or even intelligence life.

Jan Aldrich

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]

From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:20:53 -0500
Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

John, and everyone --

This is a very small but important point. We need to be more specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect -- especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal length. Or at least an isosceles triangle, with two sides the same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just means you have three marks.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:39:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:24:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 03:46:28 -0000

>Regarding:

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Wendy wrote:

>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>formation of any kind?

>Wendy,

>Yes, there are many accounts, although you'll have to look out
>some ornithological reports! And therein, we can find thoroughly
>documented observations which are remarkably and distinctly
>comparable.

>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports.

>>Please enlighten me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly
>>why his sightings may have been unique.

Everyone seems to have forgotten the Rhoads photo case from
Phoenix, AZ.

Recall that it showed a semicircular dark (against the sky)
object with a crescent indentation at the trailing edge, sort of
like the heel of a shoe. Resemblance to a pelican is minimal and
so ornithologists have not spoken out on this case.

The Air Force and the FBI investigated. I guess the official
explanation of this is hoax because it had to be either a hoax
or the real thing. And "real thing" does not equal pelican,
meteor, mote in the eye, water drops on the windshield, mirage,
snow blowing, ice meteors, or round discs dragged by aircraft
until released to whirl their way to the ground (this latter
Candidate Explanatory Phenomenon... CEP... was offered to the
FBI by AF intel when AF intel asked the FBI to investigate
sighting... see 'UFO-FBI Connection').

You would think, based on "eastonian reasoning" that if Rhoads
had decided to create hoax photos he would have made the object
agree with the popularized version of Arnold's sighting: round,
dislike, discus (Russian ambassador) or "frisbee" like.
Certainly the hoax objects that were found (several were found)
were round, even the saw blades(!) in Chicago(?).

Air Force intelligence did not reject the Rhoads photos as a

hoax. Instead, they included it in a Top Secret document written in 1948. The best prints of these photos I have seen are in the master copy of that document in the National Archives. Unfortunately the prints are severely cropped, showing only the object.

Of course, since it somewhat resembles the heel of a shoe, there is no doubt that the probability of it being the heel of a shoe (thrown into the air, of course) is greater than the probability of it being something from "out there" (wherever that is) so we can forget it... and resume hunting for pelicans.

(Rhoads has maintained the veracity of this sighting report ever since 1947. Seems to me I read that someone had interviewed him in the last 10 years or so. I am quite certain that Bill Spaulding interviewed Rhoads, as well as analyzing his photos, some 25 years ago.)

Rhoads turned over his negatives to the FBI with the understanding that they would be turned over to the Air Force and then returned.

According to Rhoads, they never were returned.

Gone into the black hole of intel, I guess.....

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://ufoupdateslist.com) > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

The Watchdog - 03-23-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:26:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:27:28 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-23-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM
"Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

Greetings! Don't worry, we're still here. The flu season has unfortunately reared its very ugly head here and I'm just getting over it. More news items to follow and another hoax to soon be buried and done with. Thanks to everyone who has made the website a success and I hope to continue to bring you more and more UFO news and exclusives, good and bad. Be sure to avoid that flu if you can and enjoy the weekend!

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III
UFOWATCHDOG.COM

NEWS
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com/news.html>

~ Reptoid Sighted In California?
~ The 1997 Phoenix Lights - 4 Years Later
~ FOIA Request Nets UFO Documents From NSA
~ UFO Video Locked In Bank

Your Ad Here
Contact ufowatchdog@earthlink.net

OF INTEREST

~ UFOWATCHDOG.COM is still accepting nominations for the UFO Hall of Frauds, Dirtbags, Dupes, Morons

COMING SOON

~ April's UFO Dirtbag of the Month
There's no fool like an April fool, or a UFO fool for that matter. Hint: A dead alien, a freezer and Art Bell...of course, its a hoax! UFOWATCHDOG.COM exposes yet another fraud!

~ Richard C. Doty
UFOWATCHDOG.COM interviews former AFOSI agent Richard C. Doty. What he says may surprise you...

~ The Morton Files
The demand for information on UFO fraud Sean David Morton has been so overwhelming that UFOWATCHDOG.COM will be dedicating a section exclusively for storing information on Morton. The information and testimonials from people on Morton keep rolling in as well. Look for updates on author Piers Anthony's response to Morton's movie reportedly ripping off Anthony's work - to be posted soon!

~ Caveat Emptor
UFOWATCHDOG.COM investigates the claims of alleged Remote Viewer Ed Dames. Was Ed Dames really a remote viewer for the military? Are his team remote viewing sessions 100% accurate as he claims? Is Ed Dames exploiting missing and murdered teens in Oregon for

his own self promotion? Stay tuned...

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise

From: **Karoline Louise** <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 12:30:18 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:31:07 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 15:42:50 -0000

>In my investigator/researcher role I have observed this
>phenomenon repeatedly and watched the schisms develop. I have
>some ideas on why it happens, but basically all are looking for
>some combination of answers and psychological support (or
>solace). Their forced "belief system" about their experiences is
>an important psychological defense, and they don't like to hear
>others disagree with it.

I think this is desperately true. The thing we humans hate most is uncertainty. We'd far rather have false certitudes than endless empty eternities of possibilities we can never prove or disprove. The worst part of anything is not being able to understand it.

If I have a strange dream about talking to people in a big house from long ago, and wake up 'knowing this was real somehow' and with great scratches all over my body that were not there when I went to sleep - I am all alone with a weird and inexplicable event.

But if I decide that house was a screen memory for an alien space ship - then I have somewhere to go with my pain and confusion. I don't have to be alone any more.

In other words it's all too easy for anyone - particularly someone in an extreme of confusion and stress - to put their need to belong to some kind of identifiable group (abductees, reincarnationists, even skeptics, whatever) before everything else, even the reality of their own weird 'happening'. Because living all alone with a totally impossible reality, without even the comfort of a label is maybe the most difficult thing of all.

I wonder how often this happens, and how much of the abduction phenomenon is a man-made construction imposed on a psychological or temporal, or dimensional anomaly that is much stranger, deeper, multifarious and inexplicable than the apparent conformity of greys, space ships and all the rest.

Could the whole abduction/ET thing be travelling further and further along the wrong road, getting further and further away from the phenomenon it is trying to explore?

Karoline Louise

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 23](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:39:45 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:31:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Maccabee

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 03:46:28 -0000

>Regarding:

>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Wendy wrote:

>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>formation of any kind?

>Wendy,

>Yes, there are many accounts, although you'll have to look out
>some ornithological reports! And therein, we can find thoroughly
>documented observations which are remarkably and distinctly
>comparable.

>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports.

>>Please enlighten me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly
>>why his sightings may have been unique.

Everyone seems to have forgotten the Rhoads photo case from
Phoenix, AZ.

Recall that it showed a semicircular dark (against the sky)
object with a crescent indentation at the trailing edge, sort of
like the heel of a shoe. Resemblance to a pelican is minimal and
so ornithologists have not spoken out on this case.

The Air Force and the FBI investigated. I guess the official
explanation of this is hoax because it had to be either a hoax
or the real thing. And "real thing" does not equal pelican,
meteor, mote in the eye, water drops on the windshield, mirage,
snow blowing, ice meteors, or round discs dragged by aircraft
until released to whirl their way to the ground (this latter
Candidate Explanatory Phenomenon... CEP... was offered to the
FBI by AF intel when AF intel asked the FBI to investigate
sighting... see 'UFO-FBI Connection').

You would think, based on "eastonian reasoning" that if Rhoads
had decided to create hoax photos he would have made the object
agree with the popularized version of Arnold's sighting: round,
dislike, discus (Russian ambassador) or "frisbee" like.
Certainly the hoax objects that were found (several were found)
were round, even the saw blades(!) in Chicago(?).

Air Force intelligence did not reject the Rhoads photos as a

hoax. Instead, they included it in a Top Secret document written in 1948. The best prints of these photos I have seen are in the master copy of that document in the National Archives. Unfortunately the prints are severely cropped, showing only the object.

Of course, since it somewhat resembles the heel of a shoe, there is no doubt that the probability of it being the heel of a shoe (thrown into the air, of course) is greater than the probability of it being something from "out there" (wherever that is) so we can forget it... and resume hunting for pelicans.

(Rhoads has maintained the veracity of this sighting report ever since 1947. Seems to me I read that someone had interviewed him in the last 10 years or so. I am quite certain that Bill Spaulding interviewed Rhoads, as well as analyzing his photos, some 25 years ago.)

Rhoads turned over his negatives to the FBI with the understanding that they would be turned over to the Air Force and then returned.

According to Rhoads, they never were returned.

Gone into the black hole of intel, I guess.....

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Filer's Files #12 - Filer

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:05:48 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 00:08:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12 - Filer

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:08:18 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12 & 'Dust Bunny Hunt'

>>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:38:12 EST
>>Subject: Filer's Files #12 -- 2001
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Filer's Files #12 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>>March 21, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>>Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

><snip>

>>"PSEUDO CRYSTALS" FOUND IN ABDUCTEE HOUSE DUST

>>M. J. Ruben writes: "One year ago, Dr. William Levengood of
>>Pinelandia Biophysics Laboratory announced his exciting
>>discovery of unidentified microscopic particles which were found
>>in house dust of abductees." This research has steadily
>>continued and new types of particles or "pseudo crystals" have
>>been discovered. More unusual "pseudo crystals" have been found
>>in household dust of individuals claiming alien abduction. The
>>research continues through the work of biophysicist Dr. William
>>C. Levengood of Michigan. The "glassy particles" were first
>>discovered in 1997, when an experiencer (abductee) recalled her
>>nighttime encounter with aliens and a beam of light that shined
>>on the floor next to her bed. The woman was awakened by the beam
>>of light. She thrust her arm into the sparkling beam of white
>>light and watched it shimmer on her arm. In the morning, she
>>contacted Dr. Levengood and told him what happened. He went to
>>her home and collected dust samples from the whitish dust
>>residue on her furniture where she had reported seeing the
>>sparkling beam of light during the night. This dust contained
>>unexplainable "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" which
>>were unidentifiable. This discovery led Dr. Levengood to search
>>for other clues in household dust. Our readers may be interested
>>in seeing the latest photographic evidence of new "pseudo
>>crystals." There are five pages of photos at the Alien Abduction
>>Experience and Research web site
>>[<http://www.abduct.com/aaer2/r10.htm>]." Thanks to Marilyn Ruben
>>and Dr. Levengood.

>Hiya George, List and especially participants in the 'Dust Bunny
>Hunt',

>I received the following from Nick Balaskas regarding the status
>of the dust bunny experiment:

>-----

>Hi John!

>I checked out the web site for the article below and saw some
>examples of the "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" found
>in the dust from the homes of UFO abductees. I was not very much

>impressed with what I saw, especially since such objects were
>extremely common in the 'Dust Bunny' samples and in nearly
>everything else I have had a chance to examine with a light
>microscope. (personal-deleted) To me they were nothing more than
>contamination from poor prior handling of the specimens. For
>example, if a specimen was carried for a while in someone's coat
>pocket, one would not be surprised to find many small segments
>of transparent colourless or colored glassy looking cloth
>fibers.

>As for the latest items I got from you, in consideration of the
>comments in your most recent e-mail, I will use the video
>projector we have in our labs instead of the VCR. The photos I
>take of the microscope images projected onto a screen should be
>easier for you to readily copy and share with others than images
>in a video cassette.

>Nick Balaskas

>-----

>Nick, I hope you don't mind that I'm doing this 'on List' as I
>think it's important to include everyone concerned in our dialog
>from this point forward. We're "in public" dude!

>First:

>After I receive the images from Nick I will need to convert them
>into a format that will lend itself to high resolution repro's that
>I can burn to disc/CD. Please, -only- if you have legitimate research
>interest (you -are- a researcher) should anyone request a CD.
>They will cost me time and money to make and I don't plan on
>"selling them" to anybody. That's not what this was all about.
>If you are doing research that this data will have some relevance
>to, I will be happy to make you a CD of the images that Nick
>captured through the microscope at my expense. (You pay mailing,
>especially if it's International. I'm not Daddy Deep Pockets! I'll
>pony up for the CD and invest the time to burn and ship. But again,
>please, - serious and relevant inquiries only.-)

>For everyone else: I will be posting as many photos as I can and
>a copy of Nick's final report on a few webpages. You will be able
>to access them via the AIC website. Any comments or questions
>can be posted to UFO UpDates and we'll deal with them on the List.

<snip>

Thank you for your offer. I personally don't need the photos, or
CDs of the various psuedo crystals. Alathough, I could possibly
pass them on to MUFON consultants.

With several medical doctor friends I have examined the scars
and seen the emotional trama of the abductees. The scars were
unlike those the Doctors had ever encountered. At the very least
something very unusual is going on and Dr. Levengood has found
some new data that may also be helpful. I personally wish to
thank him for his efforts.

I would suggest contacting Dr. Levengood and Marilyn Rueben
directly. I understand that some abductees have seen crystal
like objects that appear to be growing in their rooms. They feel
these crystals are associated with a genuine abduction process.
These crystals may not have characteristics available in the
average household.

The crystal like structures may be carried into a household by a
visitor from another part of the country. I hoped the crystals
would only be found where genuine abductions may have ocured,
since we are looking for any type of viable evidence for proof
of an abduction.

I have encouraged all people who feel they are abductees to
obtain complete blood tests and carefully search their homes for
evidence. Apparently a great deal can be learned by them with
competent scientific analysis of blood. For example, analysis
can determine if they have been flying at high altitudes in the
recent past. If they have not been aboard a plane then it would
appear they have been aboard a UFO? The over all health of the
body, the state of the immune system, etc. I was hoping the
analysis of the dust by a bona fide abductee would provide
further evidence. However, we have discovered that in many

abductees homes we have visited, strong electrical energy also is present. The strong electrical currents, moving lights, etc., may be the cause of the pseudo crystals. Dr. Persinger's studies also seem related to the over all situation.

Hopefully, some kind of pattern may develop that can give us insight into the exact nature of abductions. For example, many cattle mutilation sites have an accumulation of micro meteorite dust not present outside the site.

I may be able to get MUFON consultants to analyze the various findings, if this would be helpful.

Regards,

George Filer.

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 23 Mar 2001 12:02:22 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 00:11:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:03:14 EST
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Date: 22 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>In 1959 Ray and Rex Stanford, then teenagers, visited the
>>California desert near Giant Rock and took with them a Bell &
>>Howell camera with color film.

>>Prompted by inner urges, Ray (a professed psychic) jumped up and
>>>walked more than a mile over the desert hills to the east when
>>they looked up to see a crescent-shaped UFO with two arc cuts
>>from the trailing edge pass overhead. The UFO had a glow around
>>it visible against the daylight blue sky.

><snip>

>>Ray filmed what happened next.

>>As the jet closed on this crescent, the crescent just jumped a
>>considerable distance ahead of the plane like a rabbit jumping
>>away from a turtle closing on it.

>Hi, Bill, Don, Wendy, List:

>Sounds like lens flare from the Sun in the camera lens. Of
>course, there is the matter of the witness saying that he saw
>the thing before he filmed it.

>>You can see this amazing display in Ray's footage.

>I wonder if the jumping rabbit happened as the camera was moved
>to follow the aircraft.

>This would be a neat piece of film for somebody to have a look
>at. Even a still might throw evidence on the lens flare notion.

Bob,

I can pretty much assure you that it is not a lens flare on that film. It is definitely a craft in the atmosphere. There would be little doubt of this once you see it. The jump occurred, as I remember it, when the camera was still trained on both the jet and the UFO. The original film is pretty old by now. I believe I have a poor video copy of this segment and will see if I can find it and view it. If so, it might be worth uploading frames onto my computer and doing a little analysis, and sharing it. However, Ray Stanford should be contacted to get the whole story though I may find part of it in his early book "Look Up".

Bill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 23 Mar 2001 12:05:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 00:16:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Hamilton

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:06:05 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Date: 22 Mar 2001 08:32:45 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:57:20 -0400
>>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>>>>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>>>>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>>>>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>>>>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>>>>formation of any kind?

><snip>

>>>>I don't remember any other Arnold-like reports. Please enlighten
>>>>me if I am mistaken. Or theorize as to exactly why his sightings
>>>>may have been unique.

>>>>I've got one from 1938. A librarian returning home from Acadia
>>>>University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It was in October at 6:00
>>>>pm just before dusk. Clear sky with the object moving across the
>>>>sky and over the horizon. It was iridescent and half moon shaped
>>>>with two arc cuts from the trailing edge.

>>In 1959 Ray and Rex Stanford, then teenagers, visited the
>>California desert near Giant Rock and took with them a Bell &
>>Howell camera with color film.

>>Prompted by inner urges, Ray (a professed psychic) jumped up and
>>walked more than a mile over the desert hills to the east when
>>they looked up to see a crescent-shaped UFO with two arc cuts
>>from the trailing edge pass overhead. The UFO had a glow around
>>it visible against the daylight blue sky.

>>Stunned by this, Ray held camera in hand when he realized that
>>he needed to film this event.

>>Soon, they heard a jet approaching from the west. At that point
>>the UFO rose to a higher altitude and the jet started to
>>converge on its position. The jet was high enough to form
>>contrails.

>>Ray filmed what happened next.

>>As the jet closed on this crescent, the crescent just jumped a
>>considerable distance ahead of the plane like a rabbit jumping
>>away from a turtle closing on it.

>>You can see this amazing display in Ray's footage.

>>I am sure that if anyone knows how to get in touch with Ray (now
>>about 60-61 yrs old), he could verify this. It was one of the
>>more amazing pieces of footage I saw in the late 1950s - taken
>>in July 1959.

>Did you see this film? Certainly would be worth tracking down if
>it's still around. Sounds very interesting.

Don,

I watched this film many times years ago and may even have a
poor video-taped copy of it which I would have to look for among
thousands of feet of recorded footage I have stored in crates in
my garage. I will see what I can do.

Bill H.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 15:24:08 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:03:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 09:30:33 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:00:27 -0400
>>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>I wonder why the fields of astrophysics or astronomy are
>>>considered to be the enlightened and most qualified to speak on
>>>the subject of UFOs? What have they got to do with it? What
>>>expertise do they bring to the table? Without serious study of
>>>the phenomenon first they are no more valuable to the quest than
>>>welders or proctologists>>

>>Astronomical objects are one of, or the largest category of IFOs,
>>so it's natural. Plus, nearly all astronomers nowadays are trained
>>in physics.

>Hi Bob,

>First I'm not convinced that your first point is the case, but
>what I'm getting at is that trained in physics or not, if you
>don't read the material or get deeply into the subject no
>astronomers opinion is worth zip coming at it cold. Which quite
>often they do, expounding upon something they have no knowledge
>of. Its like passing judgement on the merits of a movie you've
>never seen because you've heard that the director embraces a
>political party you despise.

>Keep 'em flying.

>Don Ledger

Bob and Don,

You're reading too much significance into this comment by thesis writer Diana Hoy. The explanation is much simpler: She was confused. She overextended a point she quotes from Sturrock that the methods of astronomy and astrophysics in looking for patterns of data are more appropriate for UFO research than physics which supposedly tests hypotheses with crucial experiments. That's where she gets this "astronomy and astrophysics" stuff -- it's out of the blue insofar as the way she uses it here. It has nothing to do with weeding out astronomical IFO's but ways to investigate real UFO's. Somehow she seems to have gotten the idea in her head that the scientific community understands Sturrock's point about

methodology and expects all UFO investigators to have astronomy-astrophysics credentials. Of course that's complete nonsense, there is no evidence that the scientific community realizes any such thing or has some expectation about what training a UFO investigator should have.

By the way, Easton as usual has quoted one of the few anti-UFO passages out of about 100 pages of criticism of Condon and the AF in Hoyt's thesis without giving a single clue that the pro-UFO material is even there. I have a longer posting on this I will make soon, although you'll just have to download and it read it yourselves to see the criticism of Condon and the AF.

Brad

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:06:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 12:58:39 -0000

>>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:06:59 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 19:46:05 -0000

>Although I continue to have a philosophical problem with basing
>this exercise on cases "suggestive or supportive of the ETH"
>rather than of an unexplained phenomenon, I am very supportive
>of Jenny's initiative and will not quibble about the details.

Hi,

As noted I do - too - in the sense that I would never, on principle, argue towards any specific theory such as the ETH when I personally consider that the most we can establish is that there are unsolved cases with potentially unexplained phenomena behind them.

However, this started as a debate of the ETH and has developed into an attempt to justify the support for that theory based on available evidence. What this is, is an exercise to see whether the data exists to merit the hypothesis being taken seriously by science. And the outcome of this experiment will reveal the answer.

So - in a sense - it is only like any scientist setting up an experiment to test a theory, even if they themselves do not personally support it. Remember, for instance, that Einstein (who was not a fan of the usual interpretation of quantum mechanics) part created the EPR paradox thought experiment (which has since become a real world experiment in physics) in expectation it would likely disprove the very thing that in the end it helped establish as true!

So, there is no reason not to operate a specifically directed experiment even when it is opposed to ones own instinctive expectation of what ought to be done. Sometimes you can learn more from seeking to prove/disprove a very clear cut argument than by working on a more fuzzy premise whose outcome is likely to not be sharply delineated.

Here we will ask - and in some way answer - a very clear question. And getting clear answers to clear questions is I

think something Ufology needs to strive for more often.

My main question is, who among the "doubters" or
>"skeptics" (by whatever definitions they choose) are
>volunteering to participate? Is that not a vital element of what
>we are hoping to accomplish?

Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
all silent right now?

It is important to hear what they have to say. Are any of you
willing to participate in this experiment - and, if not, why
not?

The other thing we can do is to post details of this plan to
lists such as UFO Skeptics - and get a broader consensus.

I am happy to do that over the next few days - if you like - and
report back what responses come in.

Unless this is a broadly supported experiment with all facets of
Ufology willing to take part its a dead exercise before we even
try.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Thor Heyerdahl's UFO?

From: Manuel Borraz <maboay@teleline.es>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 00:24:16 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:10:33 -0500
Subject: Thor Heyerdahl's UFO?

I read at Larry Hatch's web page on identified cases:

<http://www.jps.net/larryhat/DISCREd.html>

the following entry:

--

1970/06/11 Thor Heyerdahl on raft at sea.
Fooled by Poseidon missile test.

--

All I've been able to find in Heyerdahl's book on the Ra expeditions is a strange sighting that took place on June 30th, 1970, from the Atlantic. The raft (Ra II expedition) reached Barbados 12 days later. Is it the same sighting referred to above? Is there any error of date?

By the way, W. R. Corliss ("Lightning, Auroras, Nocturnal Lights, and related Luminous Phenomena", p. 38) mentions the following possibly related item (description consistent with Heyerdahl's testimony):

--

June 30, 1970. Six locations in the Caribbean and Atlantic. Semicircle of milk-white light appeared on horizon and grew rapidly in size. Correlated with a spacecraft launch from Florida.

--

(original source: Kissane, D. M., et al; "Unidentified Phenomenon", MARINE OBSERVER, 41:63, 1971.)

And here comes my second question:

Does anyone know of any "spacecraft launch from Florida" on that June 30, 1970? I didn't find anything.

Manuel

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

From: **Josh Goldstein** <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:38:48 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:13:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Goldstein

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:44:52 -0600

>>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 07:10:55 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 18:47:01 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 04:08:26 +0000
>>>>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>>Remove all witness testimony to UFO sightings!

>>>>Problem solved...
>>>Not exactly, but without anything else there will never be
>>>acceptable evidence for much of anything, beyond the human mind.

>>And if the same thing is done with scientific instrumentation on
>>non-UFO topics, the same thing would happen because it all
>>depends on human beings to conduct experiments, operate
>>equipment, etc.

>In the end just about everything is anecdotal testimony,
>including scientific reports -- written by human beings with all
>the biases, failings, and misceptions to which the species is
>heir -- from the laboratory. Anybody who says that all
>anecdotal human testimony is uniformly worthless is nobody to be
>taken seriously.

Jerry, and all Listerions,

That is why no real investigator would take such a biased and
closed minded position. Instead, if an investigator decides to
look into a case based on an anecdotal account, the
investigator will see if the anecdotal story contains links
(clues) to further levels of evidence that may direct toward
confirming the anecdotal position. If not, it was a nice story.

Time to move on,

Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:20:37 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:15:40 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 12:37:36 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Bobbie Felder <jilain@ebicom.net>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

<snip>

>Hi Nick. Where can we find the results of your testing? I am
>sure I'm not the only one who would really like a chance to
>review your material.

Hi Bobbie!

This material, most of it still unpublished, has not been sorted through and catalogued in a data base and is thus difficult to readily share with others.

Although copies were kept for myself, the results of our testing were sent only to the many individuals who provided us with the objects they suspected were of UFO/ET origin.

Of the total number of alleged UFO/ET physical artifact cases known, we have examined objects from just a very few of these. Never-the-less, our own findings in the form of notes, photos, printouts, etc. fill one filing cabinet drawer.

You or other UFO researchers would be most welcome to review our material in person. If you have specific questions or I can be of any assistance in some way, please contact me directly.

Nick Balaskas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:00:15 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:17:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Fleming

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 09:44:24 -0500
>Fwd Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 18:18:41 -0500
>Subject: Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Aldrich

>>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 00:24:36 -0800
>>Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:31:12 -0500
>>Subject: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars

>EXTRAORDINARY ROOT COMPLEXES ON MARS

>There are probably more unusual features on Mars than can be
>catalogued in a life time. Doesn't mean that the features are
>indication of life or even intelligence life.

It doesn't mean that some of these features are not
indications of life, either. This argument is little different
from claiming that because the majority of UFO reports are
hoaxes or misidentifications, all UFO reports are likely to be
in those categories. The less one knows about a subject, the
more plausible such superficial arguments always seem. That's
what I've learned from history.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans

From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:45:02 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:19:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices - Evans

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 02:17:28 -0500
>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:53:12 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

Previously, Michel wrote:

>>>Having been a witness to 18 separate sightings of true UFOs (in
>>>this case, UFO meaning an unusual light or object whose
>>>behaviour, color patterns, performance, brilliance, shape,
>>>speed, maneuverability, etc. clearly falls outside of the
>>>brackets of Natural Phenomena or man-made devices), I am
>>>pretty confident that I can distinguish between something that
>>>is unknown and something that isn't.

<snip>

>>>I would like to know where I could get information on the
>>>following:

>>>Natural Phenomena:

>>>Sprites, Jets, Aurora Borealis, bolides, meteors, comets,
>>>shooting stars, ball lightning, sundogs, moondogs, etc.

>>>Man-made devices:

>>>Helicopter, jet aircraft, rocket, missile, flare, satellite,
>>>weather balloon, remote control model airplanes/helicopters,
>>>etc.

>>>If you think I missed anything, please include them in the list.

I replied:

>>Now, let me get this straight:

>>On the one hand, you have enough knowledge to know the
>>difference between a "true" UFO and natural phenomena such as

<snip>

>>On the other hand, you have no idea where to get information on
>>these subjects?

>>I'm just waiting for you to share these images with
>>the rest of us.

Michel replied:

>My request for the information is not for my own benefit, but
>for the benefit of others in this city, who may not be sure what
>to look for when faced with something which they can't readily
>explain in conventional terms.

<snip>

Hi, Michel!

I think you miss the point entirely. Actually, I think you get the point and are simply avoiding it. Why go through all the trouble of setting up this data base when you have claimed on this list that you know flying saucers are 100% real and that your proof of such has already been captured on video tape by you. You even claim to have two video tapes!

Why take the long way around about this? Either you have the proof that these things exist as you claim or you do not. This whole data base nonsense is just a smoke screen to avoid dealing with what was a pretty bold claim that you can not substantiate. If you could, then presenting such concrete evidence would be a whole lot easier than setting up a data base designed to prove something that you not only know to be true, but also claim to already have proof of.

Why waste everyone's time with such nonsense when you already have the proof that is so desired? Or is the simple truth that what you feel is "proof" of flying saucers is simply smearable, obscure lights that no one, except you, would see any significance in? You chose the words "flying saucers". You are the one that claimed they are 100% real. You are the one that chastises anyone that doesn't believe in ET craft or ET life.

Either you are depriving the larger group of vital information or you simply don't have the cards you claim to be playing with. I'm calling your bluff. I'm tired of people claiming to have information or photos or documents and then falling back to a position of "in due time, in due time".

Regarding such, you wrote:

>All in due time, Roger. Patience is a virtue.

No, truthfulness is a virtue, Michel, and I see little of it here. Patience is a commodity that is in short supply, having been exhausted due to nonsense like yours. Your proposed data base would be unnecessary if you had the proof you claim.

Roger Evans

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Council Proposal - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:48:09 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:21:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Council Proposal - Easton

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:22:38 -0800

Serge wrote:

>Let's take the balloon explanation for the Socorro case. The UFO
>escaped SW at high speed. Yet, Hynek states that, the day of the
>sighting, there was a strong wind from the SW. Provided the
>Hynek report is verified, end of discussion... on the balloon.

>Bye bye, next. Anything else? Shoot. Hey, you got something
>there... Bye bye Socorro. Next.

For information, some UpDates subscribers might be interested in the following, related, extract from current correspondence on 'UFO Skeptics':

Incidentally, regarding the question of any recorded 'local' wind direction that day, obviously the only relevant data was any measurement of the wind direction, taken at the altitude, when and where our 'object' departed from the arroyo.

That wasn't, and could never have been, known.

Where and when was Hynek's often cited 'wind direction' evidence actually recorded (and where was this published)?

As any experienced hot-air balloonist will confirm, flying such a balloon is an exercise in finding the altitude where prevailing winds will carry their balloon in a bearing which comes nearest to the desired heading. For example, as one article comments:

"How do you steer the balloon?

A balloon cannot be steered left or right. The direction a balloon flies depends entirely on which way the wind is blowing. Winds blow in different directions at different altitudes, so a pilot can steer the balloon by going higher or lower and finding a wind that will take it in a good direction. Even though people think that the balloon is just carried off by the wind, a good pilot knows fairly well where he is going to land before ever leaving the ground!"

Also, concerning hot-air balloon flights, it's noted elsewhere that, "wind directions are apt to change markedly within 10 to 15 minutes".

If, however, a hot-air balloon, we wouldn't expect that it could return from the same direction as it had come from. So far as I'm aware, the Socorro object continued on the same heading it was travelling in the first place, consistent with a balloon. See, for example:

<http://www.cufon.org/contributors/chrisl/roadmap.htm>

A central feature is how loud the 'roar' was, to an extent that when Zamora first heard it, he thought the nearby dynamite shack had exploded.

Would such a loud, intermittent, roar be consistent with a hot air balloon's burner?

Even allowing for how far the sound might travel, we might have doubted it could be that thunderous.

However, it seems this would be entirely consistent, especially concerning early burner technology, as the following confirms:

"The hot air balloon burner generates a level of noise between that of a freight train (88 decibels) and a circular saw (107 decibels). Noise at levels of 155 decibels has been known to burn the skin without heat, and sounds reaching 180 decibels can even kill. However, the decibel is a logarithmic rating system that accounts for large differences in audible sound intensities. So, modern hot air balloon burners, which generate a noise level of around 97 decibels, or older balloon burners, which operate at around 105 decibels, produce significantly less noise than those deadly levels of sound".

This is an extract from a highly informative 'Balloon Life' article entitled, 'The Dangers of Burner Noise', which is online at:

http://www.balloonlife.com/publications/balloon_life/9801/9902/noise.htm
[END]

James Easton.
E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:34:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:34:30 -0500
Subject: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project

Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club, Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001. The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

Thanks for listening & stay tuned,

Alfred Webre
Vancouver, BC

-Caveat Lector-

From: ParadigmRG@aol.com
To: undisclosed-recipients;
Subject: PRG FYI for Washington, DC metro area
Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 02:01:33 EST

PRG
Paradigm Research Group

Stephen Bassett, director of PRG and executive director of X-PPAC, will be at the National Press Club, 14th and F Streets, NW, 13th floor on Wednesday evening, March 21 from 7:30 to 9:00 pm.

Addressing the McClendon Study Group, he will be taking questions and giving an overview and status report for the ongoing process leading toward formal disclosure by the U.S. government of an extraterrestrial presence. The public is welcome and there is no charge.

Dinner off the menu in the "Reliable Source" restaurant with the group and speaker starts at 6:30 pm.

Paradigm Research Group
URL: www.paradigmclock.com
E-mail: ParadigmRG@aol.com
Phone: 301-564-1820
Fax: 301-564-4066
4938 Hampden Lane, #161
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Spread the word about X-PPAC & the politics of disclosure.
Contribute online at: www.x-ppac.org/Contribute.html
or mail to: 4938 Hampden Lane, 161 Bethesda, MD 20814

"There is almost no limit to what you can accomplish,
if you are willing to give away the credit."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:35:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:35:11 -0500
Subject: C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs

Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 09:03:46 -0500
From: Jan Aldrich <jan@CYBERZONE.NET>
Subject: Whistling Down UFOs
To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

Interestingly we are going to have a media event where some people are going to come and tell us some "war stories" about when they were in the Service or worked for the government.

That some of these tales are far out and without support doesn't seem to bother the organizers.

One radar operator tells us that he tracked a UFO in one swept across his radar screen. How did he know that? Please tell us? A pip appears on one side of the screen and in the next swept a pip appears on the other side of the screen. How does one determine that the two pips are one in the same?

Now if you can arrange for UFOs to be at your beck and call, why do we need a press conference at all? In fact, why don't we have incontrovertible proof of UFOs? All that you have to do is wave your high powered, over priced, special alien attracting flashlights towards the skies and the dang things will come, just like calling dogs. See:

<http://www.cseti.org/overview/sumrr.htm>

Now I am sure the first time you vectored in a UFO, it might have been a shock, so you might have left the cameras, videos and scientific junk in the car. However, now that you can do it almost at will and you can get "students" (read: marks) to come to training camps to do the same, we should have a broad spectrum of scientific data about UFOs from all the times they were whistled down. Enough data that even the greatest "Doubting Thomases" would be convinced.

We don't. We have pictures of happy faces with high powered lights and pictures of indistinct lights in the sky.

I don't consider myself old yet, but I have been through these "political action" cycles a number of time. Each time someone like Greer comes along to make us all appear silly.

1957, Major Donald E. Keyhoe trying to convince Congress to look at the Air Force program. Who arrives on the scene, but Richard Kehoe with weird tales. Keyhoe/Kehoe

Late 50s and early 60s, again Keyhoe is dogged by Major Wayne Aho and the saucer builder Otis T. Carr. Carr swindled well over a hundred thousand dollars from the marks that invested in his company which was going to build a flying saucer and go to the moon. It was hinted that he may have got his plans from alien contact, but generally it was because Carr was a genius inventor. Ego and all that. Can't have the alien hogging the scene, they might want a cut of the company. \$100,000 is the

official figure, unofficially it was probably several hundred thousand, and that is in 1960 dollars which would be millions today. The Oklahoma City newspapers have a great collection of stories on Carr trial and his attempts to get out jail early. My favorite picture is him peeling mounds spuds in the prison kitchen. Major Donald E. Keyhoe/Major Wayne Aho.

Now when the UFO research coalition produced "The Best Available Evidence" who comes along and tries to publish as his own? It took legal action to end that.

Let's see, we have the UFO Research Coalition, and, then we have the "Starlight Coalition." Interesting choice of names. Again, the repeating cycle.

If Greer wants to do something useful, get rid of the tall tale tellers from his witness list. He has taken his list down from the website. Why is that? If the press takes any notice of these guys, it will seize on weird, impossible stories. What a field day! We will all be tarred with the ridicule brush yet again. However, Greer's agenda is somewhere else and we can't expect much but waving flashlights and tall tales.

Jan Aldrich

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Body Marks - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:12:54 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:38:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Velez

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>John, and everyone --

>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots
>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>length. Or at least an isosceles triangle, with two sides the
>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>means you have three marks.

Hiya Greg,

In my own case I'm talking about a 3/4 to 1 inch on a side,
crimson red patch with tiny darker red 'flecks' inside of it.
It is a 'perfect' triangle. Sharp definition from the surrounding
skin. If you can imagine what a 'burn' from a scaled down (tiny)
clothes iron would look like, that's it. Only it isn't 'rounded'
like the shape of an iron. This thing is a clear triangle.

It looks weird. It's a scary thing to find on your body. When it
appears it's always sudden. I'll be taking a shower or putting
my socks on in the morning and bingo there it is. It fades very
slowly. Takes a couple of months. I can remember finding it at
least three times throughout my life. I was in my 30's the first
time I found it. The last time it manifested was about eleven
years ago. I happened to be going for my annual check-up to my
family MD and I asked him about it. He'd never seen anything
like it and he said that he didn't think it was an
infection/fungus whatever.

I have seen 'photos' of triangle shapes on the body's of others.
They are composed of many red flecks (tiny red pimples/bumps)
and they can be surrounded by normal colored skin, or as in my
case, redness of varying intensity. In my case the skin turns a
bright (almost fake looking) red. There is no "impression" on
the skin as if something was "pressed" there. The mark is flush
with the surrounding surface/skin.

It looks like a professional tattoo when it's at its peak. Nice
clear definition.

And no, I haven't the foggiest notion in hell what it is, what causes it, or why. What I do know is, the only other people who know what I'm talking about when I mention this weird body mark are abductees.

Warm regards,

John Velez

Bearer of the "Mark." <LOL>(Maybe it allows me to leave the saucer and return during an abduction. You know, like a night club! <Hee-Haw>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Rudiak

From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:16:03 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:06:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question - Rudiak

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 19:40:22 -0500
>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Arnold's Fleet - A Question

>Not to ruffle anyone's feathers, but I have a nagging question,
>re the Arnold sighting.

>Has anyone since Arnold (except Arnold himself) had a similar
>sighting: that is, several similar objects, of the shape Arnold
>drew and described (not a "saucer," but what he said he actually
>saw), flying in smallish numbers (under 10, say) in a similar
>formation of any kind?

Here are some similar sightings reported from Arnold's period:

1) For pictures of an object that looks almost exactly the same as what Kenneth Arnold drew for AAF intelligence on July 12, 1947, go to the FBI UFO files at:

foia.fbi.gov/ufo/ufo7.pdf

and download this rather lengthy pdf file. [5.59MB --ebk]
Go to pages 29-33 for pictures from the Louisville (KY) Times of June 28, 1950. These are frames from a movie taken by staff photographer Alfred Hixenbaugh of an object over Louisville on June 27, 1950.

2) William Rhoads' photographs taken July 7, 1947 over Phoenix showing an object rounded in front and concave in back. See e.g.

<http://user.cs.tu-berlin.de/~thomasg/ufodb.htm>

3) Photo by Coast Guardsman Frank Ryman over Seattle July 4, 1947. The best photo I have of this (in Seattle Post Intelligencer next day) shows a roundish object with a concave "bite" out of one side. Ryman described the object as whitish.

4) The Associated Press on June 26, 1947 reported the story of W. I. Davenport of Kansas City who said he saw nine shiny objects flying at high speed, "flying in a group, with one a little to one side." Davenport said he saw vapor trails but couldn't make out the shape of the objects.

5) A mass sighting in Portland on July 4, 1947 of 3 to 6 objects flying at high speed produced this description from one of the witnesses, Harbor Pilot A. T. Austed (reported in Portland Oregon Journal, July 5, 1947): "'The disks would oscillate and sometimes we would see a full disk, then a half-moon shape, then nothing at all,' he reported. The objects looked more like a shiny chromium hum cap off a car which wobbled, disappeared, and reappeared."

6) Famous sighting by United Airlines pilot E. J. Smith and crew July 4, 1947 of five to nine objects in loose formation over western Idaho or eastern Washington, which Smith said they followed 10-15 minutes until they suddenly disappeared. Smith described them as "thin and smooth on the bottom and rough appearing on top." In another quote he described them as "thin

and round." He also said they were definitely aircraft of some sort but bigger than our planes. This sighting actually got a lot more press than Kenneth Arnold's and resulted in the front page, headline reporting of the flying discs and saucers in nearly all the nation's newspapers for the next few days.

7) This tiny news item in the Tacoma News Tribune from June 30, 1947 is possibly a corroborative sighting of Kenneth Arnold's objects: "Mrs. Mary Hartwell...[of] Spanaway [suburb of Tacoma] said Friday [June 27] she had seen 'nine' planes very high in the air 'two or three days ago.' She said they had the appearance of geese, but definitely were silver colored planes."

8) For a famous linear, echelon formation case (like what Arnold reported), there was the Nash and Fortenberry Pan Am sighting of July 14, 1952 near Norfolk, VA. Six objects approached the airliner at high speed, later joined by others. The following quotes are from "The UFO Evidence," pp. 38-39. Nash stated that "their shape was clearly outlined and evidently circular... we could observe they were holding a narrow echelon formation - stepped-up line tilted slightly to our right, with the leader at the lowest point and each following craft slightly higher." The pilots estimated their size at 100 feet across and 15 feet thick. "In shape and proportion, they seemed much like coins." The six objects were then joined by two more, and the eight objects then sped off in a line and blinked out one by one. This is another rare case like Arnold's where the pilots also tried to estimate speed using landmarks and a reconstruction of sighting time using panel stopwatch clocks. "Each time we came up amazingly close to 15 seconds. To be conservative, we increased it to 15 seconds... 50 miles in 15 seconds equals 12,000 miles per hour."

9) Another linear formation case from astronomer James Bartlett, (who reported three other sightings), Sept. 6, 1954, Baltimore, Maryland. He saw four glowing objects in line formation. When an airliner approached, they changed formation and climbed, then reformed in line. "It was a precise and highly controlled performance."

David Rudiak

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Cuthbertson

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <bdc@fc.net>
Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 22:26:35 -0600 (CST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:08:56 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Cuthbertson

>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 12:30:18 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I wonder how often this happens, and how much of the abduction
>phenomenon is a man-made construction imposed on a psychological
>or temporal, or dimensional anomaly that is much stranger,
>deeper, multifarious and inexplicable than the apparent
>conformity of greys, space ships and all the rest.

>Could the whole abduction/ET thing be travelling further and
>further along the wrong road, getting further and further away
>from the phenomenon it is trying to explore?

This reminds me of reading a comment by an abductee, who recalled a comment by a "grey" that it was just as well we thought they were ETs, since we wouldn't be able to handle the truth. Sorry I can't cite the source.

-Brian C.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Filer's Files #12 - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:27:16 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:11:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12 - Sparks

>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 13:05:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 16:08:18 -0500
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #12 & 'Dust Bunny Hunt'

>>>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 17:38:12 EST
>>>Subject: Filer's Files #12 -- 2001
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>Filer's Files #12 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>>>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>>>March 21, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>>>Webmaster Chuck Warren -- <http://www.filersfiles.com>.

>><snip>

>>>"PSEUDO CRYSTALS" FOUND IN ABDUCTEE HOUSE DUST

>>>M. J. Ruben writes: "One year ago, Dr. William Levengood of
>>>Pinelandia Biophysics Laboratory announced his exciting
>>>discovery of unidentified microscopic particles which were found
>>>in house dust of abductees." This research has steadily
>>>continued and new types of particles or "pseudo crystals" have
>>>been discovered. More unusual "pseudo crystals" have been found
>>>in household dust of individuals claiming alien abduction. The
>>>research continues through the work of biophysicist Dr. William
>>>C. Levengood of Michigan. The "glassy particles" were first
>>>discovered in 1997, when an experiencer (abductee) recalled her
>>>nighttime encounter with aliens and a beam of light that shined
>>>on the floor next to her bed. The woman was awakened by the beam
>>>of light. She thrust her arm into the sparkling beam of white
>>>light and watched it shimmer on her arm. In the morning, she
>>>contacted Dr. Levengood and told him what happened. He went to
>>>her home and collected dust samples from the whitish dust
>>>residue on her furniture where she had reported seeing the
>>>sparkling beam of light during the night. This dust contained
>>>unexplainable "glassy particles" and "pseudo crystals" which
>>>were unidentifiable. This discovery led Dr. Levengood to search
>>>for other clues in household dust. Our readers may be interested
>>>in seeing the latest photographic evidence of new "pseudo
>>>crystals." There are five pages of photos at the Alien Abduction
>>>Experience and Research web site
>>>[<http://www.abduct.com/aaer2/r10.htm>]." Thanks to Marilyn Ruben
>>>and Dr. Levengood.

><snip>

>Thank you for your offer. I personally don't need the photos, or
>CDs of the various psuedo crystals. Alalthough, I could possibly
>pass them on to MUFON consultants.

>With several medical doctor friends I have examined the scars
>and seen the emotional trama of the abductees. The scars were
>unlike those the Doctors had ever encountered. At the very least
>something very unusual is going on and Dr. Levengood has found
>some new data that may also be helpful. I personally wish to
>thank him for his efforts.

>I would suggest contacting Dr. Levengood and Marilyn Rueben
>directly. I understand that some abductees have seen crystal
>like objects that appear to be growing in their rooms. They feel
>these crystals are associated with a genuine abduction process.
>These crystals may not have characteristics available in the
>average household.

>The crystal like structures may be carried into a household by a
>visitor from another part of the country. I hoped the crystals
>would only be found where genuine abductions may have occurred,
>since we are looking for any type of viable evidence for proof
>of an abduction.

>I have encouraged all people who feel they are abductees to
>obtain complete blood tests and carefully search their homes for
>evidence. Apparently a great deal can be learned by them with
>competent scientific analysis of blood. For example, analysis
>can determine if they have been flying at high altitudes in the
>recent past. If they have not been aboard a plane then it would
>appear they have been aboard a UFO? The over all health of the
>body, the state of the immune system, etc. I was hoping the
>analysis of the dust by a bona fide abductee would provide
>further evidence. However, we have discovered that in many
>abductees homes we have visited, strong electrical energy also
>is present. The strong electrical currents, moving lights, etc.,
>may be the cause of the pseudo crystals. Dr. Persinger's studies
>also seem related to the over all situation.

>Hopefully, some kind of pattern may develop that can give us
>insight into the exact nature of abductions. For example, many
>cattle mutilation sites have an accumulation of micro meteroite
>dust not present outside the site.

>I may be able to get MUFON consultants to analyze the various
>findings, if this would be helpful.

I agree that photos are not very helpful. And I think we don't
need analysis of these meager "findings." We need some actual
lab analyses of chemical composition. Have these been done?

Why are these called "pseudo crystals"? Was that supposed to
make them sound mysterious? Normally "pseudo" would mean either
they are not really crystals or that they are fake in some way.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:46:35 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:14:21 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 12:30:18 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 15:42:50 -0000

>>In my investigator/researcher role I have observed this
>>phenomenon repeatedly and watched the schisms develop. I have
>>some ideas on why it happens, but basically all are looking for
>>some combination of answers and psychological support (or
>>solace). Their forced "belief system" about their experiences is
>>an important psychological defense, and they don't like to hear
>>others disagree with it.

>I think this is desperately true. The thing we humans hate most
>is uncertainty. We'd far rather have false certitudes than
>endless empty eternities of possibilities we can never prove or
>disprove. The worst part of anything is not being able to
>understand it.

>If I have a strange dream about talking to people in a big house
>from long ago, and wake up 'knowing this was real somehow' and
>with great scratches all over my body that were not there when I
>went to sleep - I am all alone with a weird and inexplicable
>event.

>But if i decide that house was a screen memory for an alien
>space ship - then I have somewhere to go with my pain and
>confusion. I don't have to be alone any more.

>In other words it's all too easy for anyone - particularly
>someone in an extreme of confusion and stress - to put their
>need to belong to some kind of identifiable group (abductees,
>reincarnationists, even skeptics, whatever) before everything
>else, even the reality of their own weird 'happening'. Because
>living all alone with a totally impossible reality, without
>even the comfort of a label is maybe the most difficult thing of
>all.

>I wonder how often this happens, and how much of the abduction
>phenomenon is a man-made construction imposed on a psychological
>or temporal, or dimensional anomaly that is much stranger,
>deeper, multifarious and inexplicable than the apparent
>conformity of greys, space ships and all the rest.

>Could the whole abduction/ET thing be travelling further and
>further along the wrong road, getting further and further away
>from the phenomenon it is trying to explore?

Hi Karoline, hi All,

I don't pretend to know what's really going on. I can only speak
for myself and say that my conclusions regarding UFOs and
"aliens" are based on (first person) Life experiences with them.

_I_have_no_other_choice_.

I was quite innocently walking home one fine summer evening when I saw (close-up no more than 50/60 feet away) a glowing, silent, football shaped, UFO hovering over a building on the corner of the street that I lived on.

I got scared, (to quote Budd Hopkins,) "I ran like Hell," and when I got about 15 feet from my front door I suddenly found myself sitting up in bed, with the room filled with morning light, my right eye swollen shut, my nose bleeding, and with absolutely -no idea- where twelve hours had gone. One second I am in a full out pumping run, it's night, and I'm scared half to death, and the very next nanosecond I am sitting up in bed and it's morning.

I went to the emergency room for treatment. The doctor(s) said:

The swollen eye was not from 'trauma' (Ihadn't been hit) or from infection.

When the ER physician looked up my nose he asked me what the "surgery" had been for. (I've never had surgery in my head ever) He went and got an ENT specialist and the ENT asked me the same question.

Let's recap.

1. Very close-up encounter with a "UFO" followed by,...
2. Twelve plus hours of "missing time."
3. Two physicians (an attending ER doctor and an ENT specialist) both see evidence of recent "surgery" deep inside my sinuses. And, the swelling of the eye was not due to "trauma." (I wasn't knocked out and then couldn't remember.)

In my world $1+1=2$

Maybe it is "psychological" for some. I have suspected it in many of the contacts from 'abductees' that I have received over the years. And also 'some' of the folks I met or heard about while I was working with Budd. I'm sure that there are instances of just about any reasonable explanation that you can come up with.

All I can say is, I know what -happened- to me. I remember it in minute almost painful detail. And I remember it as clearly as if it had happened yesterday. I saw a UFO up close. I ran. "Something" happened. And,... it left behind physical evidence. I'll take that memory and others to the grave with me.

"What's a poor boy to think!" ;)

John Velez
UFO Abductee

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Body Marks - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:30:07 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hatch

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>John, and everyone --

>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots
>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>length. Or at least an isosceles triangle, with two sides the
>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>means you have three marks.

Hello Greg!

I agree completely of course.

When some witness describes a "perfect triangle", in a UFO
report, rather than bodily markings, I more or less presume its
equilateral or equiangular.

But, then again the witness could be saying that the three
nite-lites were of equal brightness, or all the same color. Its
up to the investigator to nail these details down, and sometimes
they just don't.

One might argue that any three point (not on a straight line of
course) define a circle as well. The circle people could argue
with the triangle people, but lets not get into that.

In certain uh, uncritical circles, any three nite lites
constitute a UFO. I whopped up a pseudo-weekly (one issue only)
newsletter in which any single nite-lite is a UFO. It was
variously received I suppose, but those who wrote seemed to have
enjoyed it.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes?

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 06:36:40 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:18:53 -0500
Subject: Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes?

Dear Friends,

During the Chupacabras wave of 1995-96 in Puerto Rico, one of the perpetrator's "trademarks" was the lining up of exsanguinated animal carcasses in single file. In fact, a photo of a police officer examining a number of heifers thus aligned remains one of the most powerful images of that carnage. Now, researchers Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman draw our attention to a new case involving similiarly aligned chickens in western Puerto Rico.

Scott Corrales
Institute of Hispanic Ufology

+++++

SOURCE: PRIMERA HORA (newspaper)
DATE: Friday, March 23, 2001

CHUPACABRAS EXSANGUINATES CHICKENS
by Maelo Vargas Saavedra--Primera Hora

Mayaguez: Has the Chupacabras returned, or are apes involved?

Felix Rodriguez and Noris Lozada complained to the police that in the early morning hours of Wednesday they heard a noise coming from the chickens they keep in the backyard of their residence located in the Bonet sector of Barrio Miradero. 26 dead birds were found in the dawn hours.

Police officer Wilson Montes of the Mayaguez police district reported to the scene where the dead chickens were found while Carlos Diaz and Ferdinand Avila, of the Recinto Universitario de Mayaguez (RUM) examined the animals carefully and even took one of them to perform a necropsy and establish a cause of death.

Diaz told PRIMERA HORA that it could be the handiwork of an ape weighing between 12 and 15 pounds, given that primate hair was found near the chicken cages. Furthermore, prints of a two-legged, hooved animal (sic) were found in the backyard, and one of the chickens displayed a bite mark from a rounded tooth in its breast. The residence's backyard is near the Mayaguez Zoological Gardens.

The RUM functionary explained that the scenario was not compatible with the attack of a wild dog, but rather with the presence of a primate, since the dead chickens were aligned next to each other, single file, and were not eaten. Apes feed largely on fruit.

Several weeks ago, another resident of Mayaguez's Barrio Miradero, identified as Iris Rodriguez Lozada, complained to Agent Montes, who has become a "Chupacabras" researcher since dozens of his specialty hens turned up dead in their cage in a manner similar to the attack which ocured in the Bonet sector.

Last year, another resident of Barrio Miradero complained to law

enforcement personnel that an ape had entered her house, eaten all of the bananas on her kitchen counter before wandering off unmolested. It was later known that some of the apes had managed to escape the zoo and were roaming the neighborhood.

#####

Translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology
Special Thanks to Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies

From: John W. Auchettl <Praufu@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:47:54 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:31:51 -0500
Subject: PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies

Hi EBK and All,

I hope you find it interesting!

CHARLES JOHNSON
LEADER OF FLAT EARTH SOCIETY
DIES AT 76

The president of the nonconformist International Flat Earth Society has died in Lancaster, California. Charles Johnson -- who headed the organization for nearly 30 years -- was 76.

The Flat Earth Society believes the Earth is actually shaped like a platter with a magnetic North Pole in the middle. Believers reject science, and satellite photos, as part of an elaborate hoax.

Johnson also believed the nation's space program was an elaborate fraud perpetrated by the government.

The Flat Earth Society -- which claims a membership of about 35-hundred -- was as founded in Illinios at the turn of the last century.

Its headquarters was relocated to Johnson's Hi Vista home when he became the organization's president in 1972.

Lancaster, California

Best Regards,

John
Director
Phenomena Research Australia

HOME:
<http://hometown.aol.com/praufo/PRA1/Pral.htm>

Phenomena Research Australia [PRA]
P.O. Box 523, Mulgrave, Victoria, Australia, 3170
Australian & Asia UFO
1961-2001 - 40 YEARS OF RESEARCH SERVICE

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:51:41 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:34:13 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Kaeser

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000

Just a couple of comments (FWIW)-

<snip>

>However, this started as a debate of the ETH and has developed
>into an attempt to justify the support for that theory based on
>available evidence. What this is, is an exercise to see whether
>the data exists to merit the hypothesis being taken seriously by
>science. And the outcome of this experiment will reveal the
>answer.

To which I would have to ask, "Who's science?"

While this exercise would be a learning experience for many of us, I think that in the end you would find that "science" isn't a unified view of the physical universe, but rather a collection of theories supported by evidence developed through research. I view science as a process, and I think the question is whether or not the evidence that is being gathered is being analyzed in a scientific manner. Of course that requires peer review, and in most ways that is severely lacking in Ufology.

One would also have to strictly define the terms being used. If one accepts evidence that has been gathered without question, I would suspect that an ETH hypothesis would certainly be valid, though certainly not proven. The issue then becomes whether or not you accept the evidence, and that often gets back to the veracity of the researcher or witness involved. I think you'll find that beliefs and faith will ultimately define for many the evidence that they are willing to accept and/or reject, and that would include most of the scientists that I've come into contact with (on both sides of this debate).

<snip>

>Unless this is a broadly supported experiment with all facets of
>Ufology willing to take part its a dead exercise before we even
>try.

Unfortunately, that a pretty tall order to fill. Ufology has become a very large tent, and has expanded far beyond that of the study of "unknown" objects in the sky. This would be similar to bringing all Washington politicians into a room and asking them to reach agreement. I hate to say it, but this sounds like an impossible goal. Defining Ufology and establishing "rules of evidence" have been goals under discussion on this and other lists for years. IMO, Ufology needs to better define itself and begin the serious process of weeding the garden (so to speak).

I would note that UFO Magazine (US) is now touted as "The Science and Phenomena Magazine" and only one of the articles mentioned on the cover of the latest issue related directly to UFOs. HMMMMMMMM.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Socorro 'Balloon' [was: Council Proposal]

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:55:41 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:40:41 -0500
Subject: Socorro 'Balloon' [was: Council Proposal]

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:48:09 -0000

>>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:22:38 -0800

>>Let's take the balloon explanation for the Socorro case. The UFO
>>escaped SW at high speed. Yet, Hynek states that, the day of the
>>sighting, there was a strong wind _from_ the SW. Provided the
>>Hynek report is verified, end of discussion... on the balloon.

>>Bye bye, next. Anything else? Shoot. Hey, you got something
>>there... Bye bye Socorro. Next.

>For information, some UpDates subscribers might be interested in
>the following, related, extract from current correspondence on
>'UFO Skeptics':

<snip>

>This is an extract from a highly informative 'Balloon Life'
>article entitled, 'The Dangers of Burner Noise', which is online
>at:

>http://www.balloonlife.com/publications/balloon_life/9801/9902/noise.htm
>[END]

Come on James, your balloon theory has been shot down in flames.

The winds were out of the southwest and are prevailing from that direction in that area but secondly and most importantly the description of the object being the size of a car positively precludes it being a balloon able to lift anything real weight-maybe 25 pounds-off the ground.

How then could your two tiny airforce/test pilots - lets say they weighed 130 pounds apiece - and the "basket" plus fuel load even get aloft? You would need several hund thousand cubic feet of volume to get the two men and the gondola and the fuel off the ground.

The noise doesn't even enter into it. Who cares?

Solve the first two _but_, make sure you address the lift to size issue otherwise stop wasting our time and bandwidth with this nonsense.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:42:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club,
>Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See
>below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will
>be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001.
>The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not
>yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling
>press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in
>Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

>Thanks for listening & stay tuned,

<snip>

Alfred,

The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus operandi? Caveat Emptor!

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Body Marks - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:07:18 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:44:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hall

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:12:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Body Marks
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>In my own case I'm talking about a 3/4 to 1 inch on a side,
>crimson red patch with tiny darker red 'flecks' inside of it.
>It is a 'perfect' triangle. Sharp definition from the surrounding
>skin. If you can imagine what a 'burn' from a scaled down (tiny)
>clothes iron would look like, that's it. Only it isn't 'rounded'
>like the shape of an iron. This thing is a clear triangle.

>It looks weird. It's a scary thing to find on your body. When it
>appears it's always sudden. I'll be taking a shower or putting
>my socks on in the morning and bingo there it is. It fades very
>slowly. Takes a couple of months. I can remember finding it at
>least three times throughout my life. I was in my 30's the first
>time I found it. The last time it manifested was about eleven
>years ago. I happened to be going for my annual check-up to my
>family MD and I asked him about it. He'd never seen anything
>like it and he said that he didn't think it was an
>infection/fungus whatever.

>I have seen 'photos' of triangle shapes on the body's of others.
>They are composed of many red flecks (tiny red pimples/bumps)
>and they can be surrounded by normal colored skin, or as in my
>case, redness of varying intensity. In my case the skin turns a
>bright (almost fake looking) red. There is no "impression" on
>the skin as if something was "pressed" there. The mark is flush
>with the surrounding surface/skin.

>It looks like a professional tattoo when it's at its peak. Nice
>clear definition.

>And no, I haven't the foggiest notion in hell what it is, what
>causes it, or why. What I do know is, the only other people who
>know what I'm talking about when I mention this weird body mark
>are abductees.

John,

Also investigators like me who have seen them on their
"clients." I have seen at least two.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 14:35:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>> My main question is, who among the "doubters" or
>>"skeptics" (by whatever definitions they choose) are
>>volunteering to participate? Is that not a vital element of what
>>we are hoping to accomplish?

>Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
>on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
>all silent right now?

>It is important to hear what they have to say. Are any of you
>willing to participate in this experiment - and, if not, why
>not?

>The other thing we can do is to post details of this plan to
>lists such as UFO Skeptics - and get a broader consensus.

>I am happy to do that over the next few days - if you like - and
>report back what responses come in.

Jenny, Dick, Brad, List:

I have added some comments to this discussion as it has developed. I'm still not certain how this idea of a council compares with methods of peer review used in scientific disciplines, particularly with the ubiquitous nature of the internet. I know that things are changing rapidly in the way science is being reported and reviewed.

I think that Jenny's proposal to float something to the UFO Skeptics List for more idead is a good one. I'd like to see what is suggested.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:22:23 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 14:38:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:38:48 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:44:52 -0600

>>In the end just about everything is anecdotal testimony,
>>including scientific reports -- written by human beings with all
>>the biases, failings, and miscriptions to which the species is
>>heir -- from the laboratory. Anybody who says that all
>>anecdotal human testimony is uniformly worthless is nobody to be
>>taken seriously.

>That is why no real investigator would take such a biased and
>closed minded position. Instead, if an investigator decides to
>look into a case based on an anecdotal account, the
>investigator will see if the anecdotal story contains links
>(clues) to further levels of evidence that may direct toward
>confirming the anecdotal position. If not, it was a nice story>>

Hi, Josh, Jerry, anybody:

Of course, Josh is right.

I never made the claim that all human testimony is uniformly worthless. What I said was that unless there is something else to substantiate this testimony, proof of the reality of UFOs, beyond the human mind, will never be accepted by the wider world.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Arnold's Fleet - Christensen

From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:22:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 14:42:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - Christensen

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:16:03 EST
>Subject: Re: Arnold's Fleet - A Question
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Here are some similar sightings reported
>from Arnold's period:

<snip>

Thank you David, and thank you everyone who provided such enlightening answers to my "nagging Arnold question". These other stories clearly put Arnold's sighting into a much broader and clearer context. As many UFO tales as I have read, I don't remember seeing these before.

I am beginning to suspect that if mainstream scientists or journalists really looked at the patterns and groups of stories and sightings with such remarkable similarities, they might be inspired to take a closer look. But all that ever makes it into print or TV are the really "sensationalistic" tales - not the "everyday sightings" that just mount up year after year.

It's the patterns of these things, I think, in which at least some of the elusive answers lie. I do hope the new "review panel" will look at patterns and groupings like this.

Purrrrrs...

wac

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies - Young

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:35:12 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 14:45:24 -0500
Subject: Re: PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies - Young

>From: John W. Auchettl <Praufu@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 09:47:54 EST
>Subject: PRA: Leader Of Flat Earth Society Dies
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

John, List:

Thanks for this. Obviously he was a visionary. Probably why Greer's witness list was taken down, I'm guessing that his name had to be removed.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:45:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars - Maccabee

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 09:44:24 -0500

>>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 00:24:36 -0800
>>Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 13:31:12 -0500
>>Subject: Extraordinary Root Complexes on Mars

>EXTRAORDINARY ROOT COMPLEXES ON MARS

>What we learn from history is we don't learn anything from
>history.

>Most are probably too young to remember the Martian canals.
>People drew elaborate maps of these things. Stories abounded, as
>the polar cap melted in Mars' northern hemisphere, the water
>was collected and directed through the canals southward, there
>are seasonal changes of color indicating farming of some type.
>Etc., etc., etc.

>It was simple, logical, and wrong. Most scientists didn't
>believe it, but it was a popular myth in newspapers and books.

Don't forget that it was scientists (famous astronomers) who
generated this popular "myth" of "canali" (lines) on Mars (and
then canali got modified to what we call "canals"... with
water). This was in the late 1800's.

H. G. Well incorporated the idea of Martians (an idea that
predated astronomical detections of "canali") into the famous
War of the Worlds (and this was many years before the 1938 radio
broadcast). In the late 1800's it seemd that some famous
astronomers were in a contest to see who could spot the most
"canali."

Even Tesla got into the act when he reported detecting triplets
of pulses on his receiving apparatus at Colorado Spings in
1899(?) He speculated that it was the Martians signaling. (A
more mundane explanation was offered that Marconi was
transmitting the morse code letter S - dit dit dit - while
testing a transmission system over a thousand miles away on the
east coast.

If this is true then it is more of a testament to the
sensitivity of Tesla's receivers than to Marconi's ability to
transmit powerful signals. Tesla rejected this explanation by
claiming that his receiver was tuned to a frequency that Marconi
did not use.

Oddly enough, if I recall correctly, Marconi made a similar
claim to have detected signals from an unknown source twenty or
so years after Tesla.)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes? - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 07:58:23 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:35:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes? - Hatch

>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl@juno.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 06:36:40 -0500
>Subject: Puerto Rico: Chupacabras or Apes?

>During the Chupacabras wave of 1995-96 in Puerto Rico, one of
>the perpetrator's "trademarks" was the lining up of
>exsanguinated animal carcasses in single file. In fact, a photo
>of a police officer examining a number of heifers thus aligned
>remains one of the most powerful images of that carnage. Now,
>researchers Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman draw our attention to a
>new case involving similiarly aligned chickens in western Puerto
>Rico.

>Scott Corrales
>Institute of Hispanic Ufology

>+++++

>SOURCE: PRIMERA HORA (newspaper)
>DATE: Friday, March 23, 2001

>CHUPACABRAS EXSANGUINATES CHICKENS
>by Maelo Vargas Saavedra--Primera Hora

>Mayaguez: Has the Chupacabras returned, or are apes involved?

>Felix Rodriguez and Noris Lozada complained to the police that
>in the early morning hours of Wednesday they heard a noise
>coming from the chickens they keep in the backyard of their
>residence located in the Bonet sector of Barrio Miradero. 26
>dead birds were found in the dawn hours.

>Police officer Wilson Montes of the Mayaguez police district
>reported to the scene where the dead chickens were found while
>Carlos Diaz and Ferdinand Avila, of the Recinto Universitario de
>Mayaguez (RUM) examined the animals carefully and even took one
>of them to perform a necropsy and establish a cause of death.

>Diaz told PRIMERA HORA that it could be the handiwork of an ape
>weighing between 12 and 15 pounds, given that primate hair was
>found near the chicken cages. Furthermore, prints of a
>two-legged, hooved animal (sic) were found in the backyard, and
>one of the chickens displayed a bite mark from a rounded tooth
>in its breast. The residence's backyard is near the Mayaguez
>Zoological Gardens.

>The RUM functionary explained that the scenario was not
>compatible with the attack of a wild dog, but rather with the
>presence of a primate, since the dead chickens were aligned next
>to each other, single file, and were not eaten. Apes feed
>largely on fruit.

>Several weeks ago, another resident of Mayaguez's Barrio
>Miradero, identified as Iris Rodriguez Lozada, complained to
>Agent Montes, who has become a "Chupacabras" researcher since
>dozens of his specialty hens turned up dead in their cage in a
>manner similar to the attack which occurred in the Bonet sector.

>Last year, another resident of Barrio Miradero complained to law
>enforcement personnel that an ape had entered her house, eaten
>all of the bananas on her kitchen counter before wandering off
>unmolested. It was later known that some of the apes had managed
>to escape the zoo and were roaming the neighborhood.

>#####

>Translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology
>Special Thanks to Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman

= = = = =

Dear Mr. Corrales et. al.

The account above reminded me of something, so I dug down deep
into a certain database and found the following:

#3219: 1954/4/27 105:1:0W 39:35:0N 3331 NAM USA CLR 12 1
S/LITTLETON,CO:3 OBS:SCARY GREEN-FACED APE-MAN PLAYS CATCH with
DEAD CHICKEN. R# 210: APRO BULLETIN. Vol 2 Issue 6

The numbers 12 - 1 on the first line indicate extremely high
strangeness, and equally low credibility. These ratings are mine
of course, and those of others may differ.

Nevertheless, having seen it again, I went ahead and pulled out
APRO Bulletin, Volume #2, Issue #6 (many thanks to Dominique
Weinstein and Ed Stewart) where I read as follows from an
apparent photocopy of what appears to be an old mimeographed
circular from 15 May 1954:

"May 3, 1954, Littleton, Colorado. Three Littleton men
reported seeing 'nightmarish' green-faced ape man/men playing
catch with a dead chicken on preceding Tuesday morning about
seven miles South of Littleton. Men described the creature as
sickening looking green with a mouth about four inches across.
"

[The mimeo is a bit hard to read.]

In any case, my database listing seems to have covered the
essentials.

Outside of playing catch, I see no evident purpose for lining up
dead chickens in a row. If I had several dead chickens, I would
arrange them in a poultry circle like everyone else.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs - Goldstein

From: **Josh Goldstein** <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 17:13:35 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:37:47 -0500
Subject: Re: C.E.: Whistling Down UFOs - Goldstein

>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 09:03:46 -0500
>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@CYBERZONE.NET>
>Subject: Whistling Down UFOs
>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>Interestingly we are going to have a media event where some
>people are going to come and tell us some "war stories" about
>when they were in the Service or worked for the government.

>That some of these tales are far out and without support doesn't
>seem to bother the organizers.

<snip>

>If Greer wants to do something useful, get rid of the tall tale
>tellers from his witness list. He has taken his list down from
>the website. Why is that? If the press takes any notice of these
>guys, it will seize on weird, impossible stories. What a field
>day! We will all be tarred with the ridicule brush yet again.
>However, Greer's agenda is somewhere else and we can't expect
>much but waving flashlights and tall tales.

Hello Jan,

You spelled out the worries I've had about this disclosure
project and Greer's interface with the government. I still have
a wait and see attitude but all we need is another embarrassing
spectacle like Hoagland tried to pull off at the National Press
Club.

Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 11:30:41 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:42:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:45:02 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

<snip>

>Hi, Michel!

>I think you miss the point entirely. Actually, I think you get
>the point and are simply avoiding it. Why go through all the
>trouble of setting up this data base when you have claimed on
>this list that you know flying saucers are 100% real and that
>your proof of such has already been captured on video tape by
>you. You even claim to have two video tapes!
>Hi, Michel!

Two video tapes?

Roger,

Open your eyes and read carefully!

I have only one video tape that contains two clips of objects in the sky, one daytime and one night time.

Must I repeat myself once again? The first object I captured on the tape (May 2, 1996) is cigar-shaped, bright white, and as it goes in and out of a cloud bank at 6,000 feet altitude, it takes the shape of a round, white ball moving away, from S to NE to N. The other clip (much shorter) is that of an orange oval with an orange halo, which resembled the comet Hale-Bopp in shape only...Hale-Bopp was blue; I got that on tape also, but not as big or bright as the orange object which flew between the moon and Jupiter, moving from NW to SE.

What I called a "flying saucer" was an object I saw on October 9, 1990, as it came straight down from the sky; it was about twice the brightness of Jupiter, at that time. It then proceeded to park itself next to the abandoned Falconbridge Radar Station. It hovered there for at least 5 minutes..maybe more. It looked like a big, pinkish-white oval shape. Seen through binoculars, at that distance (4 miles), it looked as big as one of the buildings at the base, seen in daytime. The hairs on the back of my neck stood straight up. My knees buckled, so I leaned on my car to stabilize my binoculars. Went on the base (been there many times) and measured building in front of which I had placed this thing. Measurements: 40 x 40 feet. So, the estimated size of the object was about 40 feet wide.

To me, it seemed to indicate either intelligence or intent because why else would something like that come so close to an abandoned radar base, which was known to have tracked UFOs on radar in the past? I may be speculating here, but I guess they felt it was safe to come closer and check out the old place!

I get the impression that no matter what people showed you... or told you what they saw, you still would not be convinced that something else is going on, here. Something completely different

than some unknown form of atmospheric weather condition _that somehow has managed to elude meteorologists for the past 60 years or so._ Or some new type of secret testing vehicle being flown over populated areas, far away from the testing range.

I may be wrong but I also get the feeling that you have never seen anything strange enough that has caused you to scratch your head, years after the event. Until you experience that, you'll probably always believe that UFO and/or Flying Saucer eyewitnesses were mistaken about what they see.

Well, here's a reality check. I, for one, don't make those kinds of mistakes. I take a really hard look at what I see before coming on here and reporting on what I and others are seeing. I've got an astronomy program, _skyglobe_, which gives me the position of the planets, constellations and stars at any given time.

Misidentifying something in the sky, then talking about it publicly, online and offline, as if it were a UFO or flying saucer is a big no-no. I'm sure some first-time eyewitness might do that...but I don't. No one wants to look like a fool, whether you're standing in front of people, or discussing the topic with them online.

You want to believe that I made mistakes about the sightings I witnessed and those I caught on tape? Be my guest!

What I saw (16 sightings + 2 on video tape) may not be enough for someone of your apparent position on this subject. But to me, I know what I saw; I know what I have...and I know what I know. And these things are not from around here, period.

Other people have much better proof (video tapes or otherwise) than I. But I'm equally convinced that even their _personal convictions_ along with their _personal proof_ wouldn't even convince you of anything.

You want to stay in the dark? Fine!

I've seen the light(s) and I know better. Good luck!

Signing off,

Michel M. Deschamps

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Body Marks - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 12:10:27 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:48:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Mortellaro

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:30:07 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>>John, and everyone --

>>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>>especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots
>>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>>length. Or at least an isocetes triangle, with two sides the
>>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>>means you have three marks.

>Hello Greg!

>I agree completely of course.

Dear Larry and All, and of course, EBK;

I always believed you were easy, Larry.

>When some witness describes a "perfect triangle", in a UFO
>report, rather than bodily markings, I more or less presume its
>equilateral or equiangular.

My triangular marks are equal, too. On my arm, there are three
circles, each about 1/4 inch diameter near perfect circles
(because nothing is perfect, Larry). The three circles form a
more perfect union which in turn forms an equilateral triangle.
That is if the hanging gardens of flesh are placed in just the
right positions. Seriously, when I was younger and sans excess
of avoir du poir, the triangle was indeed, near perfect. Because
nothing is perfect, Larry. There you have it. And someplace else
too. On my leg. Arm and leg.

>But, then again the witness could be saying that the three
>nite-lites were of equal brightness, or all the same color. Its
>up to the investigator to nail these details down, and sometimes

>they just don't.

Investigators usually get it right. Researchers then take the right and make it... never mind, Larry.

>One might argue that any three point (not on a straight line of >course) define a circle as well. The circle people could argue >with the triangle people, but lets not get into that.

If you take a pin and stick it in the center of my equilateral triangle, then attach a piece of string (very thin because the entire thingy takes up only about an inch plus a little diameter) and then, whilst sticking me with the pin to keep it in the center then run the string around each of the three circles, you form a near perfect circle.

There you have it. Three near perfect circle forming a near perfect triangle which, in turn, forms a near perfect circle yet again. Are we having fun yet?

>In certain uh, uncritical circles, any three nite lites >constitute a UFO. I whomped up a pseudo-weekly (one issue only) >newsletter in which any single nite-lite is a UFO. It was >variously received I suppose, but those who wrote seemed to have >enjoyed it.

When I went to the dermatologist I was told that this could not have been caused by anything known to his medicine... bugs, insects, spiders (yah, I know... these are all insects, so sue me) and animals.

So he concluded that whilst these were visible manifestations of a series of two, three, circular wounds each forming a triangle which in turn, could define a circle and one was on my arm, the other on my leg.... he determined that because nothing could cause such a festering thingy... it did not exist.

Cogito, ergo. The man thinks just like a skeptibunker.

Jim Mortellaro

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder

From: **Bobbie Felder** <jilain@ebicom.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 13:08:27 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:52:34 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Felder

>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:20:37 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

<snip>

>This material, most of it still unpublished, has not been sorted
>through and catalogued in a data base and is thus difficult to
>readily share with others.

Hi again, Nick. Thanks for the reply. There are a couple of things I have to ask, however. If the material in question is still unpublished and not readily available for review, then I feel compelled to ask the obvious: What good is it?

>Although copies were kept for myself, the results of our testing
>were sent only to the many individuals who provided us with the
>objects they suspected were of UFO/ET origin.

If you have copies, why not publish them to the internet? I would suggest removing the names of the patients involved if that is their desire. But publication of the results in a publicly accessible forum would, I think, help tremendously toward lending credence to the many claims made by the people involved here.

>Of the total number of alleged UFO/ET physical artifact cases
>known, we have examined objects from just a very few of these.
>Never-the-less, our own findings in the form of notes, photos,
>printouts, etc. fill one filing cabinet drawer.

I understand the volume of work involved, and if you don't have time, send it this way. I will scan each document into whatever file format you want...gif, jpeg, pdf...I'll even burn it all to CD for you. And I'll post it to an internet website for all to see and review.

>You or other UFO researchers would be most welcome to review our
>material in person. If you have specific questions or I can be
>of any assistance in some way, please contact me directly.

That's a wonderful offer and I thank you for it. However, it is highly impractical. I certainly don't have the financial means to afford to go jumping on a plane anytime soon, nor the freedom to go jetting around the world to look at file cabinets full of documents. And I know you don't want my very active 18 month old son digging through your house while I have my nose buried in pathology reports :)

The internet is a powerful tool for the dissemination of large quantities of information to an unlimited number of people on a daily basis. Why not make use of it?

What is the ultimate goal of this research into alleged alien implants... which would substantiate alien abduction if these artifacts were proven to be alien in origin... what is the goal of this research if not proving the reality of the abduction phenomenon? If that is what Dr. Lier, you, Derrel Simms or

anyone else is hoping to do, then I don't understand why the results of this testing have not been brought to the public domain.

If the ultimate goal is to make money off book sales, video sales, and lecture fees on the subject, then I can understand why one would not make the findings public knowledge. Perpetuating the mystery can translate into more books, more videos, and more lecture dates. I'm not implying that this is what you or Dr. Lier or Mr. Simms have as your ultimate goal. I'm simply stating what, from my laymen's point of view, seems to be a logical supposition based on the information currently at hand to us John Q. Public types out here.

Publishing the results of these analyses could prevent articles like the "Alien Baloney" missive in the future, ya know...provided the information in the analysis substantiates Dr. Lier's claims. I don't think it is fair of Dr. Lier or anyone else to get bent out of shape over someone publishing an article calling his claims into question if there is evidence to support those claims, but said evidence is sitting..useless..in a file cabinet somewhere.

Just seems to me that if one has the means to prevent articles like "Alien Baloney", it doesn't make a lot of sense to let it sit in a file cabinet gathering dust.....

My two cents....

Bobbie

=====
Bobbie "Jilain" Felder
---> backwoods of Mississippi
---> USA
---> planet Earth
---> somewhere in the Cosmos
www.jilain.com
Point of View Webcast
www.dragoncrest.net
Online publishing
=====

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

One Of Arnold's Fleet, Film By Stanford

From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 24 Mar 2001 11:10:34 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:55:25 -0500
Subject: One Of Arnold's Fleet, Film By Stanford

I have now found the details on the Ray Stanford filming of a crescent craft. Some of what I reported earlier was incorrect as I only recalled some of the primary features of this sighting.

The actual date that Ray filmed the craft was September 18, 1956. There were two jet interceptors seen and videotaped converging on the crescent craft.

There were at least 3 witnesses.

I have recounted the details of the story on my website along with images scanned from his 1958 book "Look Up". The book is old and the images are far from the hi-res stuff we are use to, nevertheless you can see something. In addition, a page was scanned showing a drawing depicting the shape of the object and its visible surround field.

On my mainsite:

<http://home.earthlink.net/~skywatcher22>

scroll down to the icon NEW and click on the image of the drawing on Arnold's sighting provided by Bruce Macabee and it will take you to the story and images.

Sincerely,

Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 24](#)

Re: Body Marks - Cuthbertson

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <bdc@fc.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 13:49:29 -0600 (CST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:57:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Cuthbertson

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:12:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Body Marks
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>In my own case I'm talking about a 3/4 to 1 inch on a side,
>crimson red patch with tiny darker red 'flecks' inside of it.
>It is a 'perfect' triangle. Sharp definition from the surrounding
>skin. If you can imagine what a 'burn' from a scaled down (tiny)
>clothes iron would look like, that's it. Only it isn't 'rounded'
>like the shape of an iron. This thing is a clear triangle.

>It looks weird. It's a scary thing to find on your body. When it
>appears it's always sudden. I'll be taking a shower or putting
>my socks on in the morning and bingo there it is. It fades very
>slowly. Takes a couple of months. I can remember finding it at
>least three times throughout my life. I was in my 30's the first
>time I found it. The last time it manifested was about eleven
>years ago. I happened to be going for my annual check-up to my
>family MD and I asked him about it. He'd never seen anything
>like it and he said that he didn't think it was an
>infection/fungus whatever.

>I have seen 'photos' of triangle shapes on the body's of others.
>They are composed of many red flecks (tiny red pimples/bumps)
>and they can be surrounded by normal colored skin, or as in my
>case, redness of varying intensity. In my case the skin turns a
>bright (almost fake looking) red. There is no "impression" on
>the skin as if something was "pressed" there. The mark is flush
>with the surrounding surface/skin.

>It looks like a professional tattoo when it's at its peak. Nice
>clear definition.

>And no, I haven't the foggiest notion in hell what it is, what
>causes it, or why. What I do know is, the only other people who
>know what I'm talking about when I mention this weird body mark
>are abductees.

John,

Pardon a few questions from the peanut gallery about these marks, which would seem to be one of the few "hard" pieces of evidence that abductees commonly have of their experiences.

Have you ever investigated these marks beyond noting that they exist? For example, have you had the location of the mark X-rayed? Has any abductee you know of ever (even by coincidence) had an MRI of the area around a mark that turned up anything? Has a skin sample from inside one of these marks ever been analyzed? Has anyone ever investigated how deep the mark goes? Has anyone ever tried to have one removed? Has anyone ever even just played with one, for instance by passing a powerful magnet over it to see what if anything happens? Has anyone ever passed a sensitive magnetic field detector over the mark to see if there is any response? There must be all sorts of things that can be checked. It just seems it would be worthwhile to try some

of these things, since the mark is the only hard souvenir you seem to be allowed to keep of your experiences.

For what little its worth,

-Brian C.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Chupacabras Or What?

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:31:10 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:23:24 -0500
Subject: Chupacabras Or What?

Back in the late forties, my father used to use a term which I recall was "Chupawaysa," which I spell phonetically. Dad tells me it meant "goat sucker." Now, dad's really gettin on in years, he'll be 89 in August, and his memory ain't what it used to be. Which for me, is really neat in one respect, becuase he forgets how much of a handfull I was for poor dad. On the one hand.

On the other hand, it is making it really hard to use my family as fountains of research knowledge, because they can't remember nuttin, honey's.

Now this term Chupacabras is close to that other word. Anyone out there familiar with Chupawaysas? As I recall this was used as a derogative phrase against one's fellow person. And as I further recall, the word was Cuban Spanish, as that and Italian was all which pop spoke in those days in Ybor City in Tampa, Fla.

The reason I bring it up is to show that at least conceptually, this word has been around since long before UFOs. Dad and his brothers (they were 11) spoke this word often whenever my relatives came to NY to visit us. I would hear, "Yjo, ke passa ---" and something about one of 'em sucking a goat or something or other. Again I spell phonetically, as Gesundt cannot speeka da esSpanish too good.

Jim

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Serious Research - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:33:19 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:25:36 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Easton

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>To: <02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers :>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Serious Research - Randles
>Date: 24 March 2001 14:06

Jenny wrote:

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>>My main question is, who among the "doubters" or "skeptics" (by
>>whatever definitions they choose) are volunteering to
>>participate? Is that not a vital element of what we are hoping
>>to accomplish?

>Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
>on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
>all silent right now?

Jenny,

Does the Sun now revolve around the Earth, or was there some
other recent cataclysm which went unnoticed and has resulted in
a 'new dawn'!?

Since when were "'doubters' or 'skeptics'" ever embraced as a
'vital element' by believers that ET is here?

Which knowledgeable 'skeptics' were being considered as
'welcome' participants - Philip Klass, James Oberg, Robert
Sheaffer and such-like?

I'm reminded it wasn't so long ago that the following sentiments
were articulated, as mentioned in 'Voyager Newsletter No. 15':

Even Jerome Clark was almost positive -

"I hold no particular brief for Rendlesham, and I commend Mr.
Easton.

[...]

As we wait, I plan not to join the rush to judgement, which is
not to say that I fail to appreciate and admire your efforts in
trying to untangle the knot that is Rendlesham".

Although , he did add a note of warning:

"Incidentally, I was amused to read, in an earlier posting, of
the sudden interest of the Bloviation Squad -- Klass, Oberg, and
their ilk -- in your efforts. If you were making a positive
case, you can be sure these clowns would have no interest
whatever, except possibly in making you look like an idiot or
worse. I hope you're not under the mistaken impression that
you've made some new friends".

[END]

You wouldn't expect anyone which the 'pro' camp denigrates as 'clowns' to participate and doubtless no-one would be so hypocritical as to ask them.

>It is important to hear what they have to say. Are any of you
>willing to participate in this experiment - and, if not, why
>not?

What leads you to believe there would suddenly be any difference from the norm, when evidence demonstrating that 'UFO' cases have terrestrial explanations has to be faced by those with a religious conviction otherwise?

>The other thing we can do is to post details of this plan to
>lists such as UFO Skeptics - and get a broader consensus.

Something along these lines would seem to be a prerequisite.

>Unless this is a broadly supported experiment with all facets of
>Ufology willing to take part its a dead exercise before we even
>try.

Your endeavours to find that proverbial middle ground are, as always, commendable.

Still, it's not really a new undertaking and you know I've previously expressed how, in recent years, it's become evident that 'middle ground' effectively no longer exists.

The 'serious research' premise presupposes, as it has done all along, that 'ufology' and all encompassed therein, has demonstrated it merits being worthy of such a renewed 'scientific' focus in the first place.

For various and palpable reasons, there might be fundamental objections to any such presumption.

For a more wide-ranging opinion, why not 'ask the skeptics!'?

'UFO Skeptics', whilst proven to be an objective forum, has a different subscriber base and I'm sure opinions expressed therein would be both worthwhile and revealing.

Perhaps even significantly so.

Oh, and of course 'welcome'. ;)

James Easton

E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Kelly

From: Kelly <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:52:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:27:56 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Kelly

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 23:43:16 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>>From: Kelly <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin

>>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>>Alien Baloney

>>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyynn Campbell

><snip>

>Hi everyone!

>Being very interested in any UFO physical evidence, my research
>has brought me in personal contact with the very few people
>actively involved in this area of ufology, including Dr. Roger
>Leir.

>Roger has kindly provided me with a few of his suspected alien
>implants and UFO artifacts in the past (including alleged UFO
>crash debris and even Alien Autopsy film fragments with assorted
>images on them from Ray Santilli) for independent tests here.
>Although I did not find strong evidence that pointed towards an
>extraterrestrial origin for any of the specimens we examined,
>prosaic explanations could not be found for all and a few
>remained unidentified. Although it has been a long while since
>the last time I got something from Roger, I have agreed to
>examine another object that originated from within someone's
>body.

>After I read the 'Alien Baloney' article which I found to be
>very unfair in its criticism of Roger and his research, I
>contacted Roger for his comments.

>For the UFO UpDates subscribers who may be interested, I got
>permission from Roger to share with you his reply - I crossed
>out Roger's private e-mail address.

>Although I can understand Roger's opinions about people who
>would promote unfair articles such as 'Alien Baloney', I think
>any form of selective self-imposed censorship in ufology would
>be wrong. We may argue and disagree a lot over many things in
>ufology but I would like to believe that we are all really good
>friends.

>Nick Balaskas

Hi Nick,

I am by no means an expert in UFOs and when I post an article here I do so for information purposes. Just because I post an article doesn't mean I agree or disagree with it - and many times I do because I want to learn more about the subject and hope that an article will lead to a discussion.

>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:50:49 EST
>From: Leirxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx
>To: nikolaos@yorku.ca
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: 'Alien Baloney' (fwd)

><snip>

>Nick,

>I will be sending the specimen along shortly. In reference to
>the article titled 'Alien Baloney'.

>This was an article printed in a local, small rag newspaper here
>in Santa Monica. My attorney sued both the reporter and the
>paper and they did print a retraction apologizing for their
>inaccuracies.

It would be interesting to see the retraction.

>I don't know who sent this to you but let me tell you that
>person should not be considered a friend of either one of us. I
>am sure they knew the circumstances and the truth behind the
>whole thing.

Wrong. Maybe I should sue him.

Kelly

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:30:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow

>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>From: Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>Astronomical objects are one of, or the largest category of IFOs,
>>so it's natural. Plus, nearly all astronomers nowadays are trained
>>in physics.

>Hi Bob,

>First I'm not convinced that your first point is the case, but
>what I'm getting at is that trained in physics or not, if you
>don't read the material or get deeply into the subject no
>astronomers opinion is worth zip coming at it cold. Which quite
>often they do, expounding upon something they have no knowledge
>of. Its like passing judgement on the merits of a movie you've
>never seen because you've heard that the director embraces a
>political party you despise.

This is exactly right. Astronomers are qualified to say that somebody's sighting sounds like it might have been Venus. But if they talk about UFO sightings in general, they have no more authority than anybody else. Unless, of course, they've studied the subject. And even then they have no special authority, except on sightings that might have astronomical causes. They certainly - just for instance - have no qualifications to say anything about reported close encounters.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Socorro 'Balloon' - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 14:34:36 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:38:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Socorro 'Balloon' - McCoy

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:55:41 -0400
>From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Socorro 'Balloon' [was: Council Proposal]

>>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:48:09 -0000

>>>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Council Proposal
>>>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 01:22:38 -0800

>>>Let's take the balloon explanation for the Socorro case. The UFO
>>>escaped SW at high speed. Yet, Hynek states that, the day of the
>>>sighting, there was a strong wind from the SW. Provided the
>>>Hynek report is verified, end of discussion... on the balloon.

Why is it so hard to understand, one would have to be suicidal,
nuts, bats in belfry, half-a-bubble off pulmb, to attempt a
Balloon flight in April in that part of New Mexico!

Warning! Personal experience time. For those of us who do count
personal observations read on, for those armchair dilletantes,
who don't, well it's like explaining golf to a Neanderthal.

First, it is hard keeping a DC-6/7 four-engine Douglas airtanker
right side up in those parts at that time of year. This is
during the transition from cold to warm winter to summer (spring
in that part of the southwest is just a chimera, fleeting for a
few days and the wind still blows. Anyone remember the fires at
Los Alamos last year? That is what it is like, and I've helped
fight (more than my share) "controlled burns" there too. Any one
who has 'been there" for any reason knows.

>>>Bye bye, next. Anything else? Shoot. Hey, you got something
>>>there... Bye bye Socorro. Next.

>>For information, some UpDates subscribers might be interested in
>>the following, related, extract from current correspondence on
>>'UFO Skeptics':

><snip>

Anybody ready to "prove" it was a balloon here is a challenge;
fly a hot air balloon from the Zamora site, at the time of day
and of course, the day of the month that the sighting occurred,
in the conditions described by Hynek and Zamora. It would make
great fodder for "America's funniest home videos" if that is
still on, not being much of a T.V. watcher.

>>This is an extract from a highly informative 'Balloon Life'
>>article entitled, 'The Dangers of Burner Noise', which is online
>>at:

>>http://www.balloonlife.com/publications/balloon_life/9801/9902/noise.htm

>>[END]

>Come on James, your balloon theory has been shot down in flames.

>The winds were out of the southwest and are prevailing from that
>direction in that area but secondly and most importantly the
>description of the object being the size of a car positively
>precludes it being a balloon able to lift anything real
>weight-maybe 25 pounds-off the ground.

Also in windy conditions you need ground handlers, period.
Wrestling a friend's hot-air balloon in a 5 mph wind was a real
bear. Oops, personal experience again, sorry.

>How then could your two tiny airforce/test pilots - lets say
>they weighed 130 pounds apiece - and the "basket" plus fuel load
>even get aloft? You would need several hundred thousand cubic feet
>of volume to get the two men and the gondola and the fuel off
>the ground.

>The noise doesn't even enter into it. Who cares?

>Solve the first two but, make sure you address the lift to
>size issue otherwise stop wasting our time and bandwidth with
>this nonsense.

Well, Don it's like this, when you have not been to, done, or
even did any proper homework, it's easy to make a proclamation
about something that on the outset appears as a "reason-able" (as
opposed to reasonable) excuse for something that might even be as
prosaic as a Air force test vehicle that wandered off-range at
White Sands for whatever, fouled plug in the flathead V-8
running the transwarp, the crew drank too much coffee, who knows?
But for those who know the terrain and weather balloon? Propane
heater? Not!

GT McCoy

Documentor of nesting Pelicans and Snow Geese.
New Mexican weather (April, May, June,) experiencer.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Green Fireballs - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:32:29 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:39:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Green Fireballs - Hart

>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 15:32:27 -0500
>From: Greg Salyards <d-choma@att.net>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Green Fireballs

>I kept that as "my" UFO story but I did not attach much
>significance to it. In later years when they were searching in
>northwestern Canada for a nuclear reactor that had re-entered
>from space I decided that maybe that where I was is just on the
>reentry trajectory from some Soviet launch complex. Could this
>be an explanation for GFBs?

>What do you think?

>Greg Salyards

The GFB I saw was a brilliant emerald green with an intense
ribbon-like orange tail trailing behind it and was travelling
horizontally under cloud cover. I observed it for perhaps three
seconds. It sure didn't look or act like a rocket...

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Body Marks - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 17:37:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:41:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Sandow

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:12:54 -0500
>Subject: Re: Body Marks
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Hiya Greg,

>In my own case I'm talking about a 3/4 to 1 inch on a side,
>crimson red patch with tiny darker red 'flecks' inside of it.
>It is a 'perfect' triangle. Sharp definition from the surrounding
>skin. If you can imagine what a 'burn' from a scaled down (tiny)
>clothes iron would look like, that's it. Only it isn't 'rounded'
>like the shape of an iron. This thing is a clear triangle.

OK, I get it - "perfect triangle" means that it has straight sides. If they're truly ruler-straight (or close to that), that really is remarkable. Thanks for clarifying! But I do think we need to be very precise in specifying these things.

I've seen other cases where people described three simple marks as forming a triangle - which, as I said in my last post, is obvious, since any three marks make a triangle. What they meant is that the triangle was equilateral or isocetes, which really would be remarkable.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

From: William Sawers <syntax@i4free.co.nz>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 10:55:29 +1200
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:45:21 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Film Redux - Sawers

Giddy Listees

Greetings from downunder....

As I studied the Alien Autopsy CDs from Ed Gehman and Neil Morris I'd like to offer up some observations, even if a little far out.

The more I've looked the more I've "_seen_" It's like when an artist looks at his paintings. He can immerse himself in them. Not to say I have this talent but it certainly felt like it as I found myself looking deeper and trying to grasp the feelings of the surgeons and others involved. The more I did this the more "real" the footage became.

I was "seeing" the sinews, bone-outlines and shadows of a _real_ being. No way is this a rubber or silicon model/dummy.

The actions of the surgeons whilst composed and relaxed, a sense of dignified incredibility pervades his demeanour. The way he looked at something then went back to it and looked and looked again. It was as if he couldn't quite believe _himself_ what he was seeing. IMHO

These are the sorts of things I come up with by looking at the footage in detail. I understand where you're coming from Ed when you say we all need to be looking at the _same_ thing!

Looking again at Neils "06 reel62_00259" gif,... the "clipboard" the surgeon is writing on took on the appearance of a "Checklist" Look at the "ticks(?)" Could this be possible? Would a "Surgeon" perhaps not a "Pathologist" as has been postulated by others, have a checklist of things to "look for and do", especially if "Pathology" was not his speciality?

I must also consider what the skeptics will say about this.... "if it's a checklist, it's a checklist of Film Shots required."

Now for my bombshell! (g)

Has anyone considered the Alien, being female... could she be _Pregnant_!?

With all the talk of gene manipulation and abductions etc, my wife (especially), and I, haven't been able to get this thought out of our heads.

Add to this (maybe) a "round" almost "hatbox" looking organ(?) in the abdomen area. I haven't the reel No noted but will get it if you think it's worth following up..

Could this be some kind of weird alien womb?

In "Reel2 un-numbered" the surgeon does spend quite a bit of time with his hands on the abdomen area and checking the genitalia, then seems to summon the other "surgeon(?)" around to show him something. You can see where his hands are as the camera moves into a position to better see this procedure.

I know this is a little far-out, but I would value opinions.

Regards,

William

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Lehmberg

From: Alfred Lehmberg <Lehmberg@snowhill.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 18:00:32 -0600
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:54:50 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Lehmberg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:07:34 -0000

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 20 Mar 2001 20:05:21 EST
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2001 20:00:22 -0500
>>>From: Wendy Christensen <christensen@catlas.mv.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?

<snip>

>I have found some of your previous wisecracks offputting, but I
>identify with what you are saying here.

And if I may interject that an honest exploration of that
perception preceding your "but" might find something other than
Dr. Mortellero as the cause.

>Having dealt with more than 100 "victims" I have perceived that
>even among themselves, there is "no pity." Each is trying as
>best they can to deal with their experiences and they often lash
>out at fellow experiencers who don't see things quite the same
>way.

Eric Hoffer explored that "lashing out" in depth in his book
"The True Believer" (if they are swept up in the personal fables
of the misinformed, misinforming, or mentally ill), forgetting
for a moment that the psychological baggage of the truly
effected will color each response to this assumed "reality of
the highly strange" in a way unique to each individual. There's
that mechanism for lashing out, then. Few things seem to work to
the reverse of that philosophical enmity, point it out, or in
any way identify it. Almost like the reduction of visibility
caused by the 'struggle' is preferable to the clarity of a
cooperation alternatively used in its investigation, no?
There's no "pity" because there is no respect, compassion, or
empathy. There is only ridicule, lack of concern, and smirking
contempt. The former three are not cultivated, the latter three
are busily encouraged.

>To some, writing a book or going public is cathartic, to others
>not so.

>Therefore, I suggest that you stop "trashing" each other and
>learn to be more tolerant.

But this is the reason I wrote, sir. The eight letters of your
use of the word "tolerant" in the preceding lines signifies an
irony that is stunning in implication, intimation, and
inclination. Squabbling experiencers should find an informative
consensus, but no consensus should be sought with a faction
that might extend the ufological investigation outside the
auspices of mean, jealous, and hypocritical science. You would

toss the tot with the bathwater. _Who_ needs to learn to be more tolerant!

>How else can you expect outside, non-experiencers to have any
>toleration for you at all?

Or how will the haughty titans of mean science quantify _their_ toleration. It's not just the experiencers that eat their young as you suggest here; all of ufology is in a _frenzy_ of discontinuity and self consumption. What's up with _that_?

>Who can legitimately claim to have the "one truth" when none of
>us really knows what is going on?

What's the value of any truth that is extended as the "one truth" when most truth is relative, misconstrued, or _largely_ unpursued as a matter of contrived dark design? The villigers are lighting torches and getting their farm implements, hoss. The "Charlies Angels" reruns are giving way to "UFOs Over Illinois" on TDC. You *scientists* better start looking for ways to make them understand the *monster*.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

~~Ö~~

EXPLORE Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/witches/237/lehmborg.html>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail.
\$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 19:13:05 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:58:28 -0500
Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices -

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 11:30:41 -0500

>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 20:45:02 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <raka@swbell.net>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Known Phenomena And Man-Made Devices

><snip>

>>Hi, Michel!

>>I think you miss the point entirely. Actually, I think you get
>>the point and are simply avoiding it. Why go through all the
>>trouble of setting up this data base when you have claimed on
>>this list that you know flying saucers are 100% real and that
>>your proof of such has already been captured on video tape by
>>you. You even claim to have two video tapes!
>>Hi, Michel!

>Two video tapes?

>Roger,

>Open your eyes and read carefully!

>I have only one video tape that contains two clips of objects in the
>sky, one daytime and one night time.

>Must I repeat myself once again? The first object I captured on
>the tape (May 2, 1996) is cigar-shaped, bright white, and as it
>goes in and out of a cloud bank at 6,000 feet altitude, it takes
>the shape of a round, white ball moving away, from S to NE to N.
>The other clip (much shorter) is that of an orange oval with an
>orange halo, which resembled the comet Hale-Bopp in shape
>only...Hale-Bopp was blue; I got that on tape also, but not as
>big or bright as the orange object which flew between the moon
>and Jupiter, moving from NW to SE.

>What I called a "flying saucer" was an object I saw on October
>9, 1990, as it came straight down from the sky; it was about
>twice the brightness of Jupiter, at that time. It then proceeded
>to park itself next to the abandoned Falconbridge Radar
>Station. It hovered there for at least 5 minutes..maybe more. It
>looked like a big, pinkish-white oval shape. Seen through
>binoculars, at that distance (4 miles), it looked as big as one
>of the buildings at the base, seen in daytime. The hairs on the
>back of my neck stood straight up. My knees buckled, so I leaned
>on my car to stabilize my binoculars. Went on the base (been
>there many times) and measured building in front of which I had
>placed this thing. Measurements: 40 x 40 feet. So, the
>estimated size of the object was about 40 feet wide.

>To me, it seemed to indicate either intelligence or intent
>because why else would something like that come so close to an
>abandoned radar base, which was known to have tracked UFOs on
>radar in the past? I may be speculating here, but I guess they

>felt it was safe to come closer and check out the old place!

>I get the impression that no matter what people showed you... or
>told you what they saw, you still would not be convinced that
>something else is going on, here. Something completely different
>than some unknown form of atmospheric weather condition _that
>somehow has managed to elude meteorologists for the past 60
>years or so._ Or some new type of secret testing vehicle being
>flown over populated areas, far away from the testing range.

>I may be wrong but I also get the feeling that you have never
>seen anything strange enough that has caused you to scratch your
>head, years after the event. Until you experience that, you'll
>probably always believe that UFO and/or Flying Saucer
>eyewitnesses were mistaken about what they see.

>Well, here's a reality check. I, for one, don't make those kinds
>of mistakes. I take a really hard look at what I see before
>coming on here and reporting on what I and others are seeing.
>I've got an astronomy program, _skyglobe_, which gives me the
>position of the planets, constellations and stars at any given
>time.

>Misidentifying something in the sky, then talking about it
>publicly, online and offline, as if it were a UFO or flying
>saucer is a big no-no. I'm sure some first-time eyewitness might
>do that...but I don't. No one wants to look like a fool, whether
>you're standing in front of people, or discussing the topic with
>them online.

>You want to believe that I made mistakes about the sightings I
>witnessed and those I caught on tape? Be my guest!

>What I saw (16 sightings + 2 on video tape) may not be enough
>for someone of your apparent position on this subject. But to
>me, I know what I saw; I know what I have...and I know what I
>know. And these things are not from around here, period.

>Other people have much better proof (video tapes or otherwise)
>than I. But I'm equally convinced that even their _personal
>convictions_ along with their _personal proof_ wouldn't even
>convince you of anything.

>You want to stay in the dark? Fine!

>I've seen the light(s) and I know better. Good luck!

>Signing off,

>Michel M. Deschamps

Dear Michael, bListers and EBK,

Please forgive me my intrusion in this battle royal. For me, it ain't just your battle. It's mine too. And it's everyone's battle, who has seen something anomalous and wondered long and hard about their own sanity, because what was seen was impossible to see in the paradigms of our present reality. And what of the man or woman who has had a lifetime of these events? It ain't easy to hear some guy tell me I saw a pelican when I know damned well that the chances of my having done that are about as good as my getting pregnant.

And it really gets my dandruff all in a clump. There is such a vast dichotomy between those of us who've experienced this phenom in one way or another, and those of us who "research" the phenom. Leave out the damned skeptibunker for this tome. The hell with them if they can't take a joke! Anyway, let's instead, talk about this researcher person. Oh, and before I forget, also leave out people like, oh, Budd Hopkins and Dr. Dave Jacobs and, well, some others. At least these men (and a few women) understand that there is at least the possibility of truth in what the witness experiences.

And it is this kernel of truth that such people investigate, rather than focus on those pieces of the puzzle which reflect the possibility that the witness saw something else.

Both sets focus on the event. But each set focuses on a different perspective. One is out to prove what it probably was other than what the witness says it was. One set is out to prove

nothing, except to that the phenom and was as described and work from there to prove either pro _OR_ con, what the phenom really is. Does that make sense? Both do the same job but the mindset is all askew. Kind of an internal oxymoron ain't it?

So help me Dr. Grolsch, I ain't touched a drop today! And not even a pill (except for my ulcer med and BP stuff)...

I said it before umpteen times, and I shall again repeat it here. If you ain't had the pleasure of see'in it, you ain't got the faintest idea about the effect it has on you. Here lies the nuance which confuses. People have accused me of saying, "Unless you experience a sighting, you just don't understand!" And say the same about a perceived abduction. Well, this is true to an extent. But more to the point, one's perspective is completely reversed. Even people with significant common sense and significant education (self taught or formall and even more significant intellect, will look at the problem and approach it completely differently.

And there's the point. I still maintain that the _best_ researcher can be the offendee himself (or herself). So you people out there who call yourselves researchers can go away and do something else. Maybe you can look into this high altitude Pelican species or something. I think this will contribute to the flora and fauna of this planet more so than your efforts at telling me what I didn't see. I can't handle hearing that guys. So sorry.

I plan on opening a restaurant, a French one. I plan on calling it "Les Auberge Des Deux Pelicans." As opposed to "Signas." Damned lying bastard Signas can't even reach three thousand feet.... Liar! Liar, beaks on fire.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Body Marks - Anthony

From: Gary Anthony <garyant@mithrand.karoo.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 00:59:43 -0000
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:01:10 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Anthony

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 02:30:07 -0800
>Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:45 -0500
>Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hatch

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>>John, and everyone --

>>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>>especially from photos I've seen - that John means the dots
>>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>>length. Or at least an isosceles triangle, with two sides the
>>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>>means you have three marks.

>I agree completely of course.

>When some witness describes a "perfect triangle", in a UFO
>report, rather than bodily markings, I more or less presume its
>equilateral or equiangular.

>But, then again the witness could be saying that the three
>nite-lites were of equal brightness, or all the same color. Its
>up to the investigator to nail these details down, and sometimes
>they just don't.

>One might argue that any three point (not on a straight line of
>course) define a circle as well. The circle people could argue
>with the triangle people, but lets not get into that.

>In certain uh, uncritical circles, any three nite lites
>constitute a UFO. I whopped up a pseudo-weekly (one issue only)
>newsletter in which any single nite-lite is a UFO. It was
>variously received I suppose, but those who wrote seemed to have
>enjoyed it.

Hi All,

Certainly this is an interesting aspect and one which I cover in my current researches into alleged alien semiotics, in many cases I have asked specifically about body marks and any associated or obvious symbolism's. All the points raised in this topic discussion are relevant - especially about determining geometrical representations and what these may mean.

A study of esoteric samples and their relationship with nested geometrical symbolism's makes obvious to the observer, the mathematical nature and functions, often involved with such patterns and the nature of geometry itself.

Some of which, man has recognised from ancient eras, as being evident in nature - like the 'golden rule' for example or in a modern sense with common algorithms connected with fractal generation in computer software, or those which frequent mathematical analyses connected with chaos theory. Of course there are some who may use the above argument in defence of certain crop circles and other cereal patterns as being evidence of alien communications - but it is noted man can duplicate many such examples with a basic knowledge of math and the right equipment. Marks on a body are a different ball-game. I can vouchsafe a few strange samples which have been sent to me, which are identical and are also found in some examples of alleged alien writing. Interestingly, these come from separate parts of the world and are only just beginning to filter out into ufological media.

However symbols apply to the question of abductee body marks is curious and requires further in-depth research with input from experts in various fields... Comparative studies with other alleged anomalous body marks like 'stigmata' may also be interesting?

Larry's point is valid - that interpretation sometimes depends upon mind-set; (how true of so many things in life!) and it is true that some patterns are certainly not viewed the same way by two or more persons. That's where 'science' can help to a fairly proficient degree, if data can be collected and analysed properly.

I wouldn't like to visit the same night club as John Velez - (no offence John) if that's what the mark represents - perhaps other abductees on Updates may care to comment about body marks and any speculated or otherwise determined meaning connected with them?

Best regards

Gary Anthony

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre

From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:05:22 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>>Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club,
>>Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See
>>below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will
>>be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001.
>>The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not
>>yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling
>>press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in
>>Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

><snip>

>Alfred,

>The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a
>serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you
>support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus
>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

Dick - I am sorry but I do not remember meeting you and I have
no idea of who you are. There is a quality of "when did you stop
beating your UFO researcher" to your post which I find
non-professional. Nevertheless I shall answer straight-forwardly
why I am devoting my time to the Disclosure process - which
includes both the CSETI events May 8-12, 2001 and the follow on
UFO/ET political caucuses planned for the rest of 2001.

If you knew me as you claim, you would know that in 1977, a
group of us was able, with the help of the Black Caucus, to get
the HCSA (House Select Committee on assassinations started to
investigate the JFK and King assassinations.

That same public interest advocacy spurs me now to seek open
congressional hearings on the UFO/ET issue, for US Government
witnesses - waiving secrecy rules and allowing functional
disclosure to take place.

The CSETI Disclosure project approached me in August 2000, and I
am one of 90 witnesses whose testimony has been videotaped. I
also submitted a sworn affidavit on the 1977 Carter White House
extraterrestrial study. In all my dealings with this project I
have experienced professionalism and thoroughness. I have also
watched other credible high-level witnesses, military and CIA
witnesses, being examined and videotaped in August 2000.

This is the first time I have worked with Dr. Greer and his wife
Emily, and I find both to be professional, and committed to
positive UFO/ET change. For 5 years until 1998 I administered a
federally-qualified community health center in the Rio Grande

Valley of Texas, and I have a certificate from Harvard School of Public Health in administering physicians. I have a basis for evaluating the conduct of physicians, even in public interest advocacy. Dr. Greer's support has been exemplary and professional. I am now gladly helping set up Congressional appointments for the witnesses that will be coming to Washington. GOAL; Congressional hearings on UFO/ET issues.

Not only that, I will continue to work for open hearings in the political UFO/ET caucuses that are forming for the duration of 2001.

Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd
Vancouver, BC
<http://www.ecologynews.com>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:13:50 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:10:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Gates

>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 13:05:11 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Velez Question On John Carpenter

>>Date: Sat, 24 Feb 2001 15:43:17 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #8 -- 2001

>>George (Filer), you're a MUFON director, have you heard _anything_
>>at all about the headquarters investigation into the John
>>Carpenter (sale of abductee files) business? I'm both curious
>>and trying to do a follow up. It's been awhile since we've
>>heard anything new about their "internal investigation."

>>"Love All,"..... trust _few!_

>It may interest you to know that my own investigation of John
>Carpenter's activities has continued since last July when John
>Schuessler messaged other board members and said an ethics
>committee would look at the evidence I had presented and make a
>decision in two weeks... Since I made it clear that any MUFON
>decision should be communicated to me using a certified letter -
>if the so-called ethics committee had reached a decision, I
>would know of it.

One would surmise that the ethics committee has not done anything. It was suggested last year in a private communication that because of the Bigelow/MUFON connection (i.e. money) that probably nothing will in fact be done. Supposedly file sharing is/was a common practise and is done by other abduction investigators besides JC.

>My evidence package has grown from 231 pages to well over
>four hundred pages as I have followed every lead to it's logical
>end and contacted every person on John's case file list that
>could be reasonably contacted. Every person contacted was
>appreciative of my effort to contact them and supply printed
>materials to prove what had happened to their case files.

The story last year was this was some sort of evil plot hatched by JC's ex wife in an attempt to discredit him. Supposedly we were told that no files with no identification ever got sent to NIDS. Did the abductees actually get copies of their case files from NIDS? What in fact actually happened to the case files?

>In addition to other materials, I provided each person with a
>message John wrote to the UpDates mail list where he didn't
>contest: his selling of files, the number of files sold or the
>resulting need to contact the abductees. John expressed his
>(supposed) willingness to make these contacts, difficult as they
>are. The people _I_ have been able to contact are, of course,
>the easiest to contact considering name changes, etc. To a
>person, no one had been contacted by Carpenter for any reason.

Not surprising.

>Based on my own investigative efforts I can now draw these

>several conclusions: no investigation by MUFON's ethics
>committee ever took place. They would _have_ to contact me as
>chief investigator. They would _have_ to contact the available
>witnesses. They would _have_ to corroborate my evidence sources
>just as I have done and there has been _no_ word back to me of
>any effort to do this.

Apparently the bottom line is they have chosen to do nothing.

>When these facts became clear a few days ago, I called MUFON
>Midwest Region Director John Kasher and asked several questions
>about his knowledge of the Carpenter case. His responses told me
>he knew essentially nothing about the substance of the case. He
>_had_ been contacted by Carpenter and assured the charges Kasher
>might have heard about were false, so no proper investigation has
>taken place unless you call talking to a defendant an
>investigation - I don't.

>My attention is focused solely on MUFON's board of directors and
>not on MUFON's general membership as they have been kept in the
>dark like the rest of us and cannot be held accountable for the
>actions of a few. My conversation with Kasher confirmed that
>most of the board directors were also purposefully kept in the
>dark about this exceptionally important case.

One wonders if the light ever comes on, will they get off their
collective butts and chose to do something?

>I immediately messaged the board with a copy of my July 2000
>Formal Complaint and a detailed case time line to show there was
>indeed a series of events, a complete and detailed story of
>misconduct that could impact MUFON and the reputations of all
>members of MUFON's Board because it could now be seen that the
>MUFON Board had failed to act on a situation that may include
>criminal conduct.

By failing to act they also open the organization up to civil
liability law suits and so forth.

>I received back several messages from Board members stating they
>were unaware of my specific allegations of misconduct. By the
You realize that they can now milk another year or two under the
story of "well we have got to look into this...."

Not saying that they would do that.

>way, I do recognize, respect, appreciate and encourage the
>efforts of some Board members to communicate with me. This is an
>essential step to start repairing a situation that now has
>inevitable consequences.

>Attention focuses on the three people who are paid for their
>services by MUFON: John Schuessler, Thomas Whitmore and Tom
>Dueley, International Director, Treasurer And Secretary
>respectively. Chief investigator Dan Wright apparently was aware
>of case details and quit MUFON in December. Two other Directors
>have quit in recent months, also.

Besides Dan who all quit of late?

>I hereby call for the resignation of these three persons, their
>ouster by MUFON's Board or an immediate public statement
>regarding MUFON's position on the Carpenter case. Take your
>pick.

>MUFON's effort last year to vote in new by-laws failed by a wide
>margin through lack of interest. Only 15% of all the membership
>voted, well short of the 25% voting level needed to make the
>vote valid. Did any of you MUFON members know this? Anyone
>bother to tell you?

I understand MUFON's membership is down to 2000 or thereabouts.
Interest seems to swell with membership, and decrease when
membership in any organization goes down.

Who knows, perhaps some angel will come along buy all the assets
case files and data bases. Naturally all those in power at the
time of the xfer will then be on the board of whomever said
person or organization will be.

Cheers ,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:29:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:25:32 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Velez

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>>Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club,
>>Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See
>>below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will
>>be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001.
>>The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not
>>yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling
>>press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in
>>Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

>>Thanks for listening & stay tuned,

><snip>

>Alfred,

>The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a
>serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you
>support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus
>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

Hello Dick,

Ahhh, once again Dr.Greer the self-appointed representative of
the People (before our elected officials) in Washington DC,
rears his head. Try as I might, I still cannot recall the
election where Dr. Greer was chosen to represent ufology in
Washington. Before, on this List, I have stated that I would
rather have you or Jerry Clark in there doing a job like that,
but then, I don't recall the election that granted the job to
Greer.

First of all; CAUS (pre-Gersten) was the organization whose
stated purpose was a grass roots movement to get our public
officials to pay some attention to the UFO issue. It was almost
contrived/concerted, the way Gersten appears and destroys CAUS,
and all of a sudden Dr.Greer turns up in DC contacting
government officials on "our" behalf as if he had a mandate to
do so. The 'timing' of it all did not escape me either. CAUS was
in the middle of securing thousands of signatures for the
Roswell petition. Do the math.

The only real grass roots movement we ever had was CAUS. When
Gersten systematically castrated it, representation of the
People in DC ended. In fact, Dick Hall (excuse me for talking
around you Dick, I know this post is addressed to you) who was
still actively running FUFOR at the time, was right there in the
Maryland/DC area and was in a much better position than Greer
(not to mention several orders higher in competency) to launch

such an effort.

Greer should have contacted as many of the larger UFO groups, organizations as he could and sought out a consensus. Then, truly he would be able to "represent" the rest of us. That's not the way it went down though. He 'ripped it off'. Just like he rips-off every poor sap that plunks down 3 or 4 hundred dollars to join CSETI and enjoy the privilege of standing in cow pastures waving flashlights at any and all nightlights.

Wake up people. This guy is a sham. If we really want representation in Washington among our elected officials, we better get ourselves together and 'elect' somebody ourselves. Otherwise, any "Greer's" that come along and "assume" the position, are going to be what we'll have to settle for. And believe me, accepting Greer is "settling." The only reason he is still down there is because of our apathy.

I miss CAUS. It had a shining potential at one time. It was the only grass roots UFO organization we've ever had. Now you know why I hate lawyers so much!!! ;)

Regards,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 22:17:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:30:30 -0500
Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers - Velez

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 23:02:58 -0500 (EST)
>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 23:53:08 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 11:04:05 -0500 (EST)
>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:46:17 EST
>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 07:13:52 -0500 (EST)
>>>>>From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
>>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>>Subject: Re: Strieber Knocks & Folklore Answers

><snip>

>>>>List, interested parties,

>>>>>What interests me right now is whether it can be
>>>>>demonstrated that reports of the 'nine sounds'
>>>>>phenomenon were published in the UFO literature
>>>>>prior to 1985. Can you help? (If not, I will be
>>>>>forced to ask the question "_Why_ can't you find
>>>>>evidence of it?".)

><snip>

>>>Willingly or unconsciously experiencers and witnesses absorb
>>>published material and regurgitate it in their stories or
>>>hypnosis.

>>Geez, is this what this is all about for you? To revert back
>>to expressions of my youth, "What a bring down and a stone cold
>>bummer man!"

>Actually, it was me who wrote that.

Yeah, I know. "Gary" was a slip. I had just responded to a post
from Gary Hart and I still had his name on my brain. It was
you I was talking to however and why I responded in this
thread.

>In fact, you inspired me to write it when you said

>"I have tried(to no avail)to keep myself as "unpolluted" by the
>reports of others as I could. Because of the nature of my
>involvement that has been impossible." (March 14th)

You conveniently twist the meaning/context of my statement and call it "inspiration".

"Imagination" is more like it. And if you are attempting to paint any of my own (conscious) recollections as "polluted" or the result of "contamination" boy did you dial a wrong number. Prior to reading Budd Hopkins' "Missing Time" I had no knowledge of anything UFO related (literature etc.) much less about the details associated with abduction reports. I was a ufological 'virgin'. ;)

Just to clarify my statement for you, (that you have so tortuously twisted) I meant after I began to investigate my own experiences. Budd was the first (and only) investigator I have ever contacted and he was very careful to keep me isolated from other abductees for about three months or more. It was because of my 'public' stand and my long association with Budd that so many people write to me sharing their own experiences. I would have preferred to keep all that from myself. I did not "invite it" at first. Once it started it developed a momentum that has continued to this day. I have an archive of letters from people that choke a horse.

That is what I was referring to. Not what you twisted it into. And BTW, I went to Budd with a lifetime of fully conscious memories of waking experiences. It wasn't recalled under hypnosis as you imply. Take the time to get your facts straight before jumping to conclusions or making self-serving assumptions as to "meaning".

>But let's not fight, life's too long.

"Sensei" taught me not to fight with anybody. To avoid 'fights' at all cost.

But... that if I ever found myself in a situation where I had to fight, to make sure I focus, concentrate, and do my best to win.

>Chris, the Bringer of Stone Cold Downy Bums

I'll say! ;)

John Velez

I have had my words twisted more than Dorothy's braids in the Wizard of Oz. ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 22:17:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:43:11 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez

>From: Stephen G. Bassett <SGBList2@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 18 Mar 2001 13:23:41 EST
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 11:25:43 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 00:52:15 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>>>Date: Thu, 15 Mar 2001 10:26:48 -0500
>>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>>Subject: 'Alien Baloney'

>>>>Source: Alex Constantine's Political Conspiracy Bin
>>>>http://alexconstantine.50megs.com/alien_baloney.html

>>>>Alien Baloney

>>>>A local podiatrist says he's been surgically removing strange
>>>>objects from people who think they were implanted by space
>>>>aliens. But there are a few holes in his story.

>>>>By Skylaire Alfvegren & Kalyynn Campbell

>>>><snip>

>>>>I agree with the bulk of what was said here. I am completely
>>>>outraged to learn that in spite of the fact that none of the
>>>>surgical procedures performed thus far has turned up any hard
>>>>evidence, Doc Lier has over 100 surgeries scheduled.

>>>>Isn't there a medical review board in the State of California?
>>>>Are they -all- on vacation? Maybe the whole review Board died!
>>>>Somebody ought to tell em.

>>>>I hope it all gets stopped before another person is cut. I've
>>>>been pissed at both Sims and Leir since 1995.

>>Hello John V:

>>I'm sure there is some sort of review board or whatever for foot
>>doctors, but they are probably overloaded with infected toenail
>>cases and such.

>>Leir and company don't quite fit this regulatory model, and
>>may have 'slipped between the cracks' so to speak.

>>I'm only armchair guessing at this point, having no expertise in
>>such matters. But, I would posit that there are so many horny
>>hot-tub head-doctors under review in this balmy state, that
>>regulators have little time for foot doctors claiming removal of

>>metallic space alien shards and splinters from the feet of our
>>august, forthright and sober population.

>>If people have certain doubts about abduction matters, you might
>>at least credit the likes of Leir and Sims for clouding matters
>>beyond recognition.

>Gentlemen,

>An article was just forwarded to UpDates regarding an incident
>of feces dropping from the sky in Sevier County, UT. I think we
>now know whence the dung comes.

I believe it was the sky Steven. I haven't flown in awhile so I
cannot be held culpable. ;)

>Neither one of you have foggiest idea as to merit of Roger
>Leir's work, the implant removals, what they may or may not have
>demonstrated, and what he has gone through because he dared to
>stick his neck out and address a known and reported aspect of
>the experienter/abductee phenomena.

That's not true Steven. EBK will bear witness that back in 1995
I was one of the few that were supporting Dr.Lier's efforts to
recover some of these 'alleged' implants. I had developed a
friendship with two of the people who were the first candidates
to undergo the surgical procedure. I was closer to the issue
than you give me credit for. I don't know if you were involved
at the time, but there was fierce opposition and ridicule being
aimed at Dr. Lier and anyone who supported his efforts. I
fought hammer and tong over the issue right here on this List.
(and with some heavyweight people too. There were a lot more
well known ufologists and sceptics active on the List back
then.)

I have earned the right to express an opinion about Dr.Lier.
He promised that the recovered objects would be analyzed by an
independent lab and that the results would be published in peer
review journals. That my friend, is what I was in support of.

*And not out of idle curiosity either. Myself, my wife, and my
children are involved in this. 'Things' don't touch any closer
to home, or inspire a stronger sense of urgency in me than that.

You've known me awhile Steven, I'm not out here promoting
myself, selling books, pitching belief systems, or playing word
games as some do. This isn't a personality or a popularity
contest for me.

I do not bring any psychological or emotional baggage ("needs")
to be fulfilled here on the List. (again, unlike some others, I
have a very rich and deeply rewarding family and social life
away from this dreaded arena.)

I am a sound, experienced and 'whole' person. A 'serious' 52
year old man who is only here to work and to contribute in
any meaningful way that I can.

A few who take up bandwidth here on the List cannot honestly say
that about themselves. "They" are usually the ones that get
'back of the hand' treatment from me. I have said it countless
times, I have little patience for fools and fakers. I'm here to
work not play. I'm as thoughtful, real, and "straight-arrow"
about my contributions and my involvement as I can be.

I'm not 'coming down' on Dr. Lier (or anybody else for that
matter) for any frivolous reasons. I have good reason for it in
Dr. Liers case.

I can justify it.

That goes for any of the few others I have 'trimmed at the
ankles' on this List.

Steven,

Because I like you, I'm going to sit here and hammer this out on

the keyboard one more time. For you, and any Listerions who weren't members in July/August 1995 when all this first transpired.

You tell me if I'm being unreasonable Steven. I'll listen to what you have to say. You have earned that much respect from me.

I backed Lier because I thought he was going to do all the things he promised he would. (Independent analysis, publication of results in peer review journals, and that it would all be handled and executed according to very strict scientific standards, etc. etc. etc.) For a brief time, I thought the sun shone out of Dr.Lier's a**. What a sorry disappointment he turned out to be.

Instead of what was 'advertised' on the front end, what he 'delivered' was;

1. Gross mis-handling of the materials. (chain of custody) It was handled so incompetently in fact that he almost literally invalidated the results -before- he had them in hand.

One of the people I have communicated with over the years was a police detective for 25 years. He was so outraged at how the materials were handled, that he was moved to write me a long letter outlining what he called, "evidence procedures that an academy rookie would know." He was so outraged that he speculated that Lier had to have done it on purpose, (intentionally invalidate the evidence by not maintaining a clear chain of custody.) That's strong stuff coming from an experienced pro! Not being as experienced myself, I give a lot of weight to such 'educated opinions.'

His handling of the foreign objects left way to many holes for serious scientists to do pirouettes through, and to call into question the integrity of both the materials, and the data.

2. Instead of at a 'neutral' and independant laboratory, hospital or academic institution, the 'foreign objects' ended up at NIDS!

Enter Bob Bigelow, ...-again!- Bob Bigelow's NIDS is not I repeat, NOT a "neutral, or academically accredited" laboratory or research institution. It is Mr. Bigelow's private lab (guys with his kind of \$ can afford to have bigger and better toys than the rest of us. In Bigelows case he bought himself a whole GD lab and a staff.)

The only legitimate lab that Dr.Lier claims to have used, denies any knowledge of the business, (vehemently!) And the scientist whose name he mentioned in connection to the "meteorite content" of the "implants", has become exasperated trying to explain what he 'really meant,' and how he rues the day he ever got involved with Sims and Lier.

Those two pained denials are the sum total of Dr. Liers academic 'credentials' for his findings.

3. The only "publication" where any "results" have been published is guess where? That's right! Dr. Lier's book! Not the Journal of Medicine, or ANY other peer review journals, but in a privately written book that profits, guess who again,...that's right, the good doctor!

4. After three years had passed (1998) and -still- neither Leir or Sims had published anything. Although both of them had been working the lecture circuit to death the whole time. Oh, and guess what the subject of the lectures was,...that's right, "Recovered Alien Implants.") I offered Dr. Lier a 'possibility' to have his 'foreign objects' studied by some doctors at Columbia University Hospital here in New York. One of the finest institutions in the world with an impeccable reputation in the medical and the academic community. He didn't respond. The conversation between us just dropped suddenly. I wrote him two more times offering to try to get the Columbia people to look at them. No response. Then, or since.

Tell you what Steven, if the day ever comes when the good doctor lives up to his (original promises,) I'll back him 100%. It's

not going to happen though. Know why? It's already been six years since the first surgery and he hasn't lived up to his word yet. I don't expect him to change colors overnight. As you are well aware, Johnny can be as powerful an advocate as he can be a thorn in the side. ;)

>Anyone who enters the fray, particularly those whose careers
>require any type of certification are easy targets for the
>debunkers and "offended" mainstreamers scared silly by what the
>research is unfolding. Nothing works better to knock someone
>out of the game like taking away a person's livelihood short of
>taking away their life.

Steven, I'm expressing honest and informed opinions about Dr. Lier and how he conducts his business. It's just an expression of opinion though. I'm not trying to steal the bread out of any man's mouth. Much less 'kill' anyone. ;)

>John, over the years I have developed a growing appreciation for
>the contribution you have brought to the table. You have a
>fierceness and determination which is activist in style, and you
>refuse to back down. If something doesn't work out, you try
>something else.

Combination of being a "cause activist" all of my adult life, and way too many years of playing chess to win! <LOL> Steven, I worked for ten+ years with drug addicts on the street, and in the prisons. I protested the war at Columbia back in the 60's, I have attended every anti-nuke rally ever stages in the New York area. It's a Habit bro. Been doing it all my life with things I believe in.

My abduction experiences are no different. ;)

>But for some reason, you are unable to lose your tendency to
>piss on others who are trying to find the answers to this
>complex new reality within a context that has been subverted and
>propagandized by their own government.

Please refer to above. (regarding 'who' and 'why' I will "piss" on someone.) It is not a tool I pull from the bag often or easily. But I'm not afraid to use it either. As my Canadian buddies taught me, "some people need to be slapped upside-down their head!" <LOL>

Only when I really think it's the kind of response that the person deserves (or has earned from me) will you see me 'doing that.' I do it for a _reason_ not out of a 'need' or 'lack of control.'

Also, I'm a New Yorker Steven. I'm not kidding man, I grew up on some tough streets in uptown Manhattan. I learned both to defend myself, and not to take sh*t from anybody at very tender age. There's some of that mixed in there too I'm afraid. I can't help that. It's a part of 'who' I am. Many find the frankness and directness of New Yorkers to be pushy or offensive. It isn't. It's just cut to the chase, no nonsense, straight from the hip, shooting. ;)

I'm not a "bad guy." ;)

>When you launch yourself into the mode represented by the above
>exchange, you engage in hubris.

It's not, Steven, honest. I'm speaking the truth and expressing my disappointment and frustration as an abductee who has waited for some 'hard evidence' to materialize in support of our claims. That, is where I'm coming from amigo, I swear to that.

>Some thrive on that kind of
>indulgence, but you are better than that and the people you
>occasionally target deserve better than that. Many of those same
>people would unhesitatingly rise to defend you, if circumstance

Oh, I 'think' I know 'who' you heard that from. He tells that to all the boys Steven! ;)

Sometimes my friend, what some people 'say' is not necessarily what they actually 'do.' ;) Don't believe everything you read! <LOL>

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Velez

Warm regards,

John Velez

Used to was 'long haired', Pinko, hippie freak. ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Body Marks - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 22:17:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:47:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Velez

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 13:49:29 -0600 (CST)
>From: Brian Cuthbertson <bdc@fc.net>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:12:54 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Body Marks
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

><snip>

>>In my own case I'm talking about a 3/4 to 1 inch on a side,
>>crimson red patch with tiny darker red 'flecks' inside of it.
>>It is a 'perfect' triangle. Sharp definition from the surrounding
>>skin. If you can imagine what a 'burn' from a scaled down (tiny)
>>clothes iron would look like, that's it. Only it isn't 'rounded'
>>like the shape of an iron. This thing is a clear triangle.

>>It looks weird. It's a scary thing to find on your body. When it
>>appears it's always sudden. I'll be taking a shower or putting
>>my socks on in the morning and bingo there it is. It fades very
>>slowly. Takes a couple of months. I can remember finding it at
>>least three times throughout my life. I was in my 30's the first
>>time I found it. The last time it manifested was about eleven
>>years ago. I happened to be going for my annual check-up to my
>>family MD and I asked him about it. He'd never seen anything
>>like it and he said that he didn't think it was an
>>infection/fungus whatever.

>>I have seen 'photos' of triangle shapes on the body's of others.
>>They are composed of many red flecks (tiny red pimples/bumps)
>>and they can be surrounded by normal colored skin, or as in my
>>case, redness of varying intensity. In my case the skin turns a
>>bright (almost fake looking) red. There is no "impression" on
>>the skin as if something was "pressed" there. The mark is flush
>>with the surrounding surface/skin.

>>It looks like a professional tattoo when it's at its peak. Nice
>>clear definition.

>>And no, I haven't the foggiest notion in hell what it is, what
>>causes it, or why. What I do know is, the only other people who
>>know what I'm talking about when I mention this weird body mark
>>are abductees.

>John,

>Pardon a few questions from the peanut gallery about these
>marks, which would seem to be one of the few "hard" pieces of
>evidence that abductees commonly have of their experiences.

Hiya Brain,

Although this is more like the SAT's than a 'few' questions,
I'll do my best. ;)

>Have you ever investigated these marks beyond noting that they
>exist?

Yes. I mentioned that the last appearance of the mark coincided with a regularly scheduled doctor visit. He didn't know what to make of it. He said that he'd "never seen anything like it." I believe Mr. Mortellaro mentioned in his response that his physician could not identify the mark either. You also have to bear in mind that at the time, I was not entertaining "aliens and UFOs" as possible sources. It would have been (and was) the farthest thing from my mind.

>For example, have you had the location of the mark
>X-rayed?

Nope. Unless my doctor orders it, (which means he would have to have 'just cause' for doing so) they do not like to expose people to radiation unnecessarily. "X-rays" are not granted "on request" unless there is some medical consideration. Doctors carry a heap of very expensive insurance in case anybody sues them for mal-practice. Most doctors won't grant 'elective' procedures unless they have sound reasons to justify subjecting the patient to any kind of 'testing.'

>Has any abductee you know of ever (even by coincidence)
>had an MRI of the area around a mark that turned up anything?

Not that I am aware of. Although, MRIs have turned up "foreign objects" inside the bodies of abductees.

>Has a skin sample from inside one of these marks ever been
>analyzed?

Not that I am aware of. But, ... I have communicated with physicians who have seen some of the photos of the scoop marks at the AIC website and been told that they resemble "punch biopsys." Punch biopsys are performed on suspect tissue where cancer may be a possibility. In fact, that's why three of the physicians contacted me to begin with. They could not understand why the 'scoop marks' appeared over -healthy tissue- in the abductees. A doctor would only order such a test if he found something on or in the skin that he didn't like the looks of. Two of the doctors I spoke with suggested the tissue may have taken for genetic testing. I can tell you that none of the scoop marks were created by any 'earthly' physicians. None of those people, (my family members included) have ever had a "punch biopsy."

>Has anyone ever investigated how deep the mark goes?

I don't know.

>Has anyone ever tried to have one removed?

Not that I am aware of.

>Has anyone ever even just played with one, for instance by passing
>a powerful magnet over it to see what if anything happens?

I don't know.

>Has anyone ever passed a sensitive magnetic field detector over the
>mark to see if there is any response?

Ditto my last response. ;)

>There must be all sorts of things that can be checked.

Yes, there are! Problem is, ...no one is 'doing' it. Shame.

>It just seems it would be worthwhile to try some
>of these things,

They are Brian. It would be great if there was a place that abductees could contact or go to where they will be met by a multidisciplinary team of trained professionals. Ready to listen and to check the individual out carefully. All most folks have is the Internet. It's a crying shame that it is left up to 'volunteers' to pick up the slack and provide these folks what little their personal resources will allow. I do my best. But it isn't enough, and not what is -really- needed.

>since the mark is the only hard souvenir you

>seem to be allowed to keep of your experiences.

Would that it was so Brian. The problem is, some of us are awake now and again when a 'contact' happens. You have to find a way to live with that in your head. You can't tell anybody. They'll think you're crazy, or if they really care about you they will be concerned for your sanity and well being. It is not easy to deal with this stuff on any level. It's why I work so hard and give so many hours to the abductees that contact me and to the public via this List. I said it in a recent posting; people have no idea of the -Urgency- of the situation we are in. And by "we" I mean ALL of us, not just abductees. These things did not come down and introduce themselves.

They come in the night, and they try hard to cover their tracks. Any of that kind of behavior sound familiar to you? Only 'thieves' use that modus operandi.

Regards, hoping for a formal investiagtion of our claims soon,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 04:25:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:49:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hale

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000

<snip>

>Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
>on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
>all silent right now?

Jenny,

Would it be okay to assume from the above, that you no longer
consider yourself a skeptic?

Roy..

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Don's UFO Repair Shop

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:48:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:56:45 -0500
Subject: Don's UFO Repair Shop

Dear list:

Its a pity that the UFO repair shop (click on URL below) is not on the level. Somebody could go dumpster-diving for broken parts; i.e. physical evidence of ET technology.

<http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/>

The lack of street address and clear directions how to get there is a dead giveaway. Only the town (Crested Butte, CO) is given with a P.O. Box number instead.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

UFOs And People?

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 02:01:15 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:00:37 -0500
Subject: UFOs And People?

What Is It About UFOs And People, Anyway?

Pop, Mom and an aunt saw a UFO with me not terribly long ago. They don't like to speak about it because, well, frankly, they really don't believe that what they saw could possibly have been what they saw. Really!

It was real to them. They saw it. We discussed it afterwards. We each described what we saw. There weres no discrepancies among us. It was there. It flew off. It was huge. It was a triangular object more than a football field large apex to apex. It had lights all over it. It was hovering over our lake across the street. Westchester County. Just like Imbroglio and company described in their book about the Westchester Triangle.

But here is this dochotomy of which I spoke in another post. The one between the reality of one's paradigm and the reality of one's eyes and other senses. This dichotomy reveals something about us, as a species. We often cannot believe our senses. And we cannot believe the senses of others who describe similar experiences and DO believe their senses.

Crazy in'it?

Which is understandable, especially when what our senses sense is completely impossible to the rest of us. Intellect. Paradigm. Religion. The laws of Physics. Everything.

Cue the heavenly music now? Nope. Not yet.

Now take the other side. The researcher, the skeptibunker, even the just plain old skeptic. All cannot believe the witness, who often cannot believe his nown senses.

What have we left? A whole world just chock full of confused people. And your confusion is written all over your faces, your Internet and your news media.

Fascinating.

A few Sundays ago, I and my family were entertaining some friends at Docca Mortys' upstate. You know at least one of these people from UpDates posts, some you don't know. We were all consuming mass quantities of my dad's martinis. As one of our guests said, "Hey, these are so good, you just wanna slug 'em down!" But of course, you cannot. Mostly because if you do, you'll fall down a lot and would be unable to enjoy what was coming next... mass quantities of our famous Sicilian hospitality which included some of the best darned Itralian food this side of Palermo. What's the point?

There was not one person at the table (there were TEN of us at table) who had not had an experience of one sort or another. And the only people who could speak about them were me and my guests. The so-called average, humble, everyday people were completely unable to discuss the subject. Even discuss the subject. Let alone discuss their experiences.

Pop cannot believe his senses. Mom does, but does not wish to

upset pop. He is going to be 89 in August. My aunt is just too terribly shy to speak about it, as her religious intensity disallows any such discussion as even a possible reality. Another aunt and her son, also witnesses, cannot bring themselves to admit it, even in friendly counsel such as a family and friends super feast ... with martinis as mouth openers.

The problem is profoundly interesting and should be made part of the research of this phenom. For it points to what must be very large numbers of people who have seen a UFO or even had what they perceive to have been an abduction experience. I am pretty well convinced that a good deal more people have had the experience than will ever admit. Maybe the survey which was supported by Hopkins was not so far off base after all. And maybe Jacobs is not terribly far off the mark either. Especially if the above is true.

Maybe not.

In conclusion, there is as usual, no conclusion. Nothing else is revealed. Not in this post. So what? Why the hell should I be any different than the rest of you researchers?

Huh?

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Mars Roots - Images For Earthly Comparison

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 01:21:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:03:01 -0500
Subject: Mars Roots - Images For Earthly Comparison

MARS ROOTS - IMAGES FOR EARTHLY COMPARISON

The Electric Warrior : Mars Online March 25, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/>

MARS ROOTS - IMAGES FOR EARTHLY COMPARISON
by The Electric Warrior

Two image plates offer a side-by-side comparison of Earthly plant life with images from the Mars Global Surveyor which show examples of anomalous formations called Martian Tubes.

The image plates offer a further elucidation of the idea that the Mars Tubes may be similar to Earthly organisms known as rhizomes or rootstock.

The photographer who shot the known plant life acknowledges that the Martian images may bear only a superficial resemblance to their suggested Earthly similarities.

Rhizomes are horizontal, creeping underground stems that propagate by producing the shoot and root system of a new plant. Unlike true roots, rhizomes have nodes and buds, where new sprouts appear.

The idea is at variance with two other explanations for the anomalous Martian land forms. Two of the three competing ideas suggest a natural explanation; two of the three suggest life on Mars.

Richard C. Hoagland, of the Enterprise Mission (TEM), discovered a tube-like anomaly he descriptively labeled a "glass worm." Hoagland believes that the anomaly cannot be resolved by geological explanations, and has put forth the suggestion of artificially constructed tunnels.

Dr. David C. Pieri from the Earth and Space Sciences Division of JPL questioned Hoagland's analysis in an email message, which asserted that the object's apparent positive relief was an optical illusion. He offered a geological explanation involving dune-trains in a concave valley.

Bear in mind the Martian landforms are huge, and actually have no Earthly comparison. There are no known life-forms beyond Earth.

TUBEROUS ROOTS, BIFURCATION & CREEPING SHOOTS

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRootShoot.jpg>

The first image plate depicts both a creeping shoot and a tuberous root from the same plant.

The shoot has a well-formed, rounded tip. The plant appears green because photosynthetic pigments do not absorb green light.

The tuber, where plants store excess glucose in the form of carbohydrates, is from last season and is dried out. Only the sack-like outer skin remains.

<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/ewRootBifurcation.jpg>

The second image plate shows an example of intertwined, branching or bifurcated plant stems.

Notice how new shoots form at joints. The gray stems are old, the tan stem grew last season. New shoots have appeared from buds.

The idea of organic processes as an explanation for the Mars Tubes relies on facts that are commonly known to explain something unknown.

The Mars Tubes bear an interesting resemblance to root-like organisms on Earth. If the tubes are an optical illusion, then The Electric Warrior's image plates depict a fascinating trick of light and shadow.

EMAIL

TEM's Richard C. Hoagland writes:

Just read your piece on the possible "Martian root systems." While it's a novel and very intriguing idea, it faces the same problem that (Arthur C. Clarke's?) original description of this feature faces: namely,

WHAT DOES IT EAT??!!

No, I don't think we're seeing biology -- unless it's fossil biology, in which case it speaks to a VERY different ancient Mars ...

But I like the idea that you've injected this into the discussion. It'll keep everyone of their toes until we can find out exactly what Arthur means by "large life forms."

I believe the existing evidence from this example, as well as many others we're now analyzing, decidedly favor an artificial, engineering explanation, as opposed to some organic form. Time (and more evidence) will tell ...

I DON'T think this is the explanation, but good luck.

RCH

The Electric Warrior responds:

Ricard Hoagland poses an important question.

What does the proposed biological organism eat? In the case of the worm considered by TEM's consulting geologist this is problematic.

However, plants rely on the radiant energy of sunlight to convert carbon dioxide and water into food -- glucose -- in a process known as photosynthesis.

Humans and animals rely on this glucose, which they are unable to produce on their own, as a source of energy. Thus, photosynthesis is the basic source of energy for all known forms of life.

Complex biological entities need something to eat. Plants do not.

ABOUT THE IMAGES

The Earthly images are photographed by The Electric Warrior

The Martian images discussed herein can be viewed at the USGS

online PDS Mars Global Surveyor MOC Image Collection. The PDS images have been scaled to a normalized pixel aspect ratio.

<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m04002/m0400291.html>
<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m02012/m0201270.html>
<http://ida.wr.usgs.gov/html/m00015/m0001504.html>

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 25, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/mol/MarsOnline009.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

GrafikFX Website

From: Dave Bowden <grafikfx@lineone.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 12:32:38 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:04:25 -0500
Subject: GrafikFX Website

Hi all,

Just to let you know that GrafikFX has moved to:

<http://www.grafikfx.co.uk/>

All the best,

Dave Bowden

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Re: Body Marks - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 25 Mar 2001 08:45:40 -0800
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:08:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hamilton

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>John, and everyone --

>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots
>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>length. Or at least an isosceles triangle, with two sides the
>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>means you have three marks.

Greg,

As I said in my wife's case, the triangle was equilateral. I measured .9" separating the marks. I measured both with rule and protractor (60-deg angles). We also photographed these.

I once posted this and asked others to respond if they found others with the same measurements.

The hypothesis here was that perhaps the marks were made by an instrument with a fixed three-point penetrator and that if these could be found on a few abductees that it might advance us another half step forward.

I never received a response indicating that anyone else came up with the same measurements. I have seen photos that look similar, but it seems no one does the measuring.

Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 25](#)

Fugo Sampler

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 13:36:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:10:03 -0500
Subject: Fugo Sampler

Robert Gates found these references to Fugo balloons:

Mikesh, Robert C. Japan's World War II Balloon Bomb Attacks on North America. Smithsonian Annals of Flight no. 9. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C. 1973.

"Balloons Of War", by John McPhee, NEW YORKER, 29 January 1996, 52:60.

Mikesh's work contains a list of Japanese balloon bombs recovered up to 1945. A number of recoveries were made after that. There is probably still wreckage out there in inaccessible areas. Somewhere, I read an estimate that 1000 balloons made it to North America. I suspect that is estimate is off the top of someone's head.

As promised, some URLs for Fugos are:

5004th AISS Fugo Balloon Recovery (CUFON)

<http://www.cufon.org/cufon/5004fugo.htm>

Japanese Balloon Bombs:
Project FUGO by Philip H. Jacobsen

<http://amh.freehosting.net/japanese.html>

TEXAS HISTORY HIGHLIGHTS

The Bombing of Texas

<http://www.texasalmanac.com/texasbomb.html>

Savoir Faire: Bombs from Balloons
by Sandra Bell,
Research and Information Services

<http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/pubs/nl-news/1998/july98e/3007-11e.htm>

Wright Patterson Air Force Base Museum

<http://www.wpafb.af.mil/museum/history/wwii/jbb.htm>

Fugo In Medford, Oregon

<http://www.mailtribune.com/archive/98/mar98/31798n7.htm>

Oregon Picnicers Kill by Fugo

<http://www.avstop.com/news/jb.html>

Fugo, Japaness Balloon Bombs of WW II

<http://www.seanet.com/~johnco/fugo.htm>

Triple Nickles---555th Infantry Parachute Battalion

<http://www.triplenickle.com/>

In the early 1950s Dr. Lincoln LaPaz also wrote about Fugo's in a magazine article.

Drew Pearson using Fugos as an example wrote a magazine article suggesting that the west use the same techniques to "bomb" the Soviet Union with leaflets. Probably a trail balloon (pun intended) for Radio Free Europe and other leaflet balloon efforts later on. Maybe the propaganda balloon barrage in 1954 had something to do with the UFO flap of that year.

Jan Aldrich

Project 1947

<http://www.project1947.com/>

P. O. Box 391

Canterbury, CT 06331, USA

(860) 546-9135

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Greer's Disclosure Project - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:04:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 09:22:10 -0500
Subject: Greer's Disclosure Project - Aldrich

>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>Jan Aldrich

>>The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a
>>serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you
>>support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus
>>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

>Dick - I am sorry but I do not remember meeting you and I have
>no idea of who you are. There is a quality of "when did you stop
>beating your UFO researcher" to your post which I find
>non-professional. Nevertheless I shall answer straight-forwardly
>why I am devoting my time to the Disclosure process - which
>includes both the CSETI events May 8-12, 2001 and the follow on
>UFO/ET political caucuses planned for the rest of 2001.

>If you knew me as you claim, you would know that in 1977, a
>group of us was able, with the help of the Black Caucus, to get
>the HCSA (House Select Committee on assassinations started to
>investigate the JFK and King assassinations.

>That same public interest advocacy spurs me now to seek open
>congressional hearings on the UFO/ET issue, for US Government
>witnesses - waiving secrecy rules and allowing functional
>disclosure to take place.

>The CSETI Disclosure project approached me in August 2000, and I
>am one of 90 witnesses whose testimony has been videotaped. I
>also submitted a sworn affidavit on the 1977 Carter White House
>extraterrestrial study. In all my dealings with this project I
>have experienced professionalism and thoroughness. I have also
>watched other credible high-level witnesses, military and CIA
>witnesses, being examined and videotaped in August 2000.

>This is the first time I have worked with Dr. Greer and his wife
>Emily, and I find both to be professional, and committed to
>positive UFO/ET change. For 5 years until 1998 I administered a
>federally-qualified community health center in the Rio Grande
>Valley of Texas, and I have a certificate from Harvard School of
>Public Health in administering physicians. I have a basis for
>evaluating the conduct of physicians, even in public interest
>advocacy. Dr. Greer's support has been exemplary and
>professional. I am now gladly helping set up Congressional
>appointments for the witnesses that will be coming to

>Washington. GOAL; Congressional hearings on UFO/ET issues.

>Not only that, I will continue to work for open hearings in the
>political UFO/ET caucuses that are forming for the duration of
>2001.

Professional? Professional? I see, waving over priced lights at the sky in hopes of attracting alien spaceships. Does that sounds very professional? Claiming you vector UFOs to certain site, but having absolutely no technical data from this exercise. Does that sound professional? Taking someone else's work and using it for your own. Does that sound professional? The only way that stopped was legal action. Very professional.

Now we have witnesses that claim they have track UFOs on radar. Now if the professional (?) team on CSETI were to check the characteristics of the radar in question, they would find that the range claimed was impossible. Does ignoring data which is easy to confirm sound professional?

No, you have thrown your lot in with a number of very questionable characters.

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Dr. Leo And The New Age

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:01:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 09:43:34 -0500
Subject: Dr. Leo And The New Age

Hi All,

Oh_my_God!

Three weeks ago Errol told me that he had booked Dr. Leo Sprinkle for "Strange Days... Indeed" and he asked me if I would like to participate. I answered in the affirmative without giving it a second thought. I looked forward to meeting Dr. Sprinkle and having an opportunity to speak with him.

Well, dreams soon turned into nightmares as I sat there with my jaw on the floor listening to an experienced therapist mix reincarnation, spirituality, and abductions in to one big ball of psycho-philosophical crap. For me, it turned into two hours of sitting there holding my mud and reminding myself that this was an "Interview" and not a "debate" that I was participating in.

Errol, who knows me well, sensing me 'chomping at the bit' would give me the needle two or three times during the interview by commenting on "how quiet" John Velez is this evening. <LOL>

I kept silent (with the exception of a few pointed questions) because, if I had opened my mouth, Dr. Sprinkle would have started wondering if he had allowed a Trojan Horse through his gates by accepting EBK's invitation to appear on the program. In deference to Errol and to Dr. Sprinkle I held my mud. It was important for everyone to have an opportunity to hear Dr. Sprinkles' 'take' on all his years of research.

It wasn't easy for me to listen to though.

It was an ice cream sundae with all the wrong flavors. He went from talking about "good guy aliens" and "bad guy aliens" to "abductees receiving telepathic messages that 'something wonderful' (or terrible) was about to happen," to the warm and fuzzy affinity he feels towards New Age "Light workers" (in any outfit I ever worked for 'light workers' were always fired for not holding up their end) to recommending that people seeking help contact Richard Boylan. He skipped from one to the other like a gazelle pronging through the meadows. It was all I could do to keep myself from sticking a huge pin in his Pink Balloon.

I sat there wondering, my God, how could a man with his academic training go so far wrong? I thought to myself as I listened, this guy sounds more like a 'cultist' than a scientist. There was no trace of any truly critical, or logical thinking processes at all. I was literally left dumb struck at all that I was hearing.

"It's an interview not a debate" I kept telling myself. But alas, I could not make it through to the end. Dr. Sprinkle made the mistake of stumbling into one of the biggest buttons in my 'array' of buttons.

He recommended that people contact Richard Boylan if they wanted to become part of a network of counsellors and therapists that work with abductees. I cut the man off in mid sentence. "Hold it, stop right there" was how I said it. I just 'lost it' at the

mere mention of the "unmentionable" ones name.

It was painful to listen to him. Speaking as an abductee, and as a person who lived an almost aggressively "normal" life before discovering my own involvement in this UFO business/mess, it really hurts to see academics like John Mack and Leo Sprinkle sounding more like New Age priests than the educated scientists they are supposed to be. Men with the credentials to make a real difference. To get the attention of of the mainstream community by doing good 'science.'

Instead, they end up sounding like the worst of the extremists on the fringes of ufology. No different than I imagine Fa or Beas sounded to the Heaven's Gaters. They talk and sound like Priests, not scientists. Philosophers, not clinicians. It is a let down to me both personally and as an abductee to see the ones that could make a real difference squandering away the opportunity to indulge their own personal beliefs.

Errol _always_ manages to get the best from his guests. In spite of my own feelings and thoughts about it, it was a really good interview and interesting to listen to. If I wasn't so close to the subject myself, I might have been able to appreciate it on other levels. And I did to some extent. But it was all sitting under the dark cloud of my disappointment that these "men of medicine" scientists and healers, are really nothing more than a modern version of tribal "Medicine Men" and superstitious Shamans.

When Lord oh when, is someone one going to do the 'work' of conducting a "serious investigation." If just one more of these side show clowns tells me that everything is ok because I'm getting my paradigm shifted,...

I'm going to hurl my cookies.

Preachers should preach,...scientists should do science. Not pseudo-religion. (Pseudo-philosophy)

Regards to all,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Fleming

From: **Lan Fleming** <apollo18@swbell.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 10:34:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Fleming

I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they are sadly mistaken.

Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as "squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think these attacks are likely to achieve.

If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to 'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my opinion, counterproductive.

BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Aldrich

From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:52:05 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 10:44:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Aldrich

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:48:33 -0800
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Don's UFO Repair Shop

>Dear list:

>Its a pity that the UFO repair shop (click on URL below) is not
>on the level. Somebody could go dumpster-diving for broken
>parts; i.e. physical evidence of ET technology.

<http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/>

>The lack of street address and clear directions >how to get there
>is a dead giveaway. Only the town (Crested >Butte, CO) is given
>with a P.O. Box number instead.

Larry,

I always thought that everyone was part of the UFO cover up
except thee and me, and sometimes I wasn't too sure about thee.
Now I know you are the UFO Cover Up! These heroic lads at
Don's are on to something, and you make light of them.

<http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/earthbound.html>

Look at this. I told you about this years ago.

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/mar/m13-022.shtml>

Even now, UFO Cover Up Hit Squads are probably on their way to
Don's! They may destroy this important effort, but you are
exposed, I am reporting you to Richard Boylan!

Jan Aldrich
Conspiracy Theorist-in-Chief

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: UFOs And People? - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:49:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 10:49:43 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs And People? - Sandow

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 02:01:15 EST
>Subject: UFOs And People?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>What Is It About UFOs And People, Anyway?

>Pop, Mom and an aunt saw a UFO with me not terribly long ago.
>They don't like to speak about it because, well, frankly, they
>really don't believe that what they saw could possibly have been
>what they saw. Really!

>It was real to them. They saw it. We discussed it afterwards. We
>each described what we saw. There weres no discrepancies among
>us. It was there. It flew off. It was huge. It was a triangular
>object more than a football field large apex to apex. It had
>lights all over it. It was hovering over our lake across the
>street. Westchester County. Just like Imbroglio and company
>described in their book about the Westchester Triangle.

>But here is this dochotomy of which I spoke in another post. The
>one between the reality of one's paradigm and the reality of
>one's eyes and other senses. This dichotomy reveals something
>about us, as a species. We often cannot believe our senses. And
>we cannot believe the senses of others who describe similar
>experiences and DO believe their senses.

>Crazy in'it?

>Which is understandable, especially when what our senses sense
>is completely impossible to the rest of us. Intellect. Paradigm.
>Religion. The laws of Physics. Everything.

>Cue the heavenly music now? Nope. Not yet.

>Now take the other side. The researcher, the skeptibunker, even
>the just plain old skeptic. All cannot believe the witness, who
>often cannot believe his nown senses.

>What have we left? A whole world just chock full of confused
>people. And your confusion is written all over your faces, your
>Internet and your news media.

>Fascinating.

>A few Sundays ago, I and my family were entertaining some
>friends at Docca Mortys' upstate. You know at least one of these
>people from UpDates posts, some you don't know. We were all
>consuming mass quantities of my dad's martinis. As one of our
>guests said, "Hey, these are so good, you just wanna slug 'em
>down!" But of course, you cannot. Mostly because if you do,
>you'll fall down a lot and would be unable to enjoy what was
>coming next... mass quantities of our famous Sicilian
>hospitality which included some of the best darned Itralian food
>this side of Palermo. What's the point?

>There was not one person at the table (there were TEN of us at
>table) who had not had an experience of one sort or another. And

>the only people who could speak about them were me and my
>guests. The so-called average, humble, everyday people were
>completely _unable_ to discuss the subject. Even discuss the
>subject. Let alone discuss their experiences.

>Pop cannot believe his senses. Mom does, but does not wish to
>upset pop. He is going to be 89 in August. My aunt is just too
>terribly shy to speak about it, as her religious intensity
>disallows any such discussion as even a possible reality.
>Another aunt and her son, also witnesses, cannot bring
>themselves to admit it, even in friendly counsel such as a
>family and friends super feast ... with martinis as mouth
>openers.

>The problem is profoundly interesting and should be made part of
>the research of this phenom. For it points to what must be very
>large numbers of people who have seen a UFO or even had what
>they perceive to have been an abduction experience. I am pretty
>well convinced that a good deal more people have had the
>experience than will ever admit. Maybe the survey which was
>supported by Hopkins was not so far off base after all. And
>maybe Jacobs is not terribly far off the mark either. Especially
>if the above is true.

>Maybe not.

>In conclusion, there is as usual, no conclusion. Nothing else is
>revealed. Not in this post. So what? Why the hell should I be
>any different than the rest of you researchers?

>Huh?

This one was profound...an uncomfortable but inevitable truth...
I was glad to read it.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:34:07 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:15:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:29:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

<snip>

>>Have you looked into his activities and modus
>>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

Dear John V. and Dick H., Listers and New Age Wantabe Abductees:

Maybe Alfred W. and Steve B. don't need a boost from behind from any of us (abductees). They're probably getting a lot of flak from outside the UFO community for participating with Steve G., as it is. So, there must be another reason for their participation in Steve's on-going project. Eh?

Based on information I've received recently from a friend and UFO abductee acquaintance, Steve G. is not getting the response he expected from the professional/abductee community with whom he has been attempting to solicit support (both financial and verbal).

I hope Steve has stopped "calling in" UFOs with flashlights, etc. I think he realizes that those abductees from whom he was counting on support, became angry skeptibunkers of his motives and sincerity to help expose the Urgency and Seriousness of this phenom with such "off-the-wall" behavior. As to his self-appointed, UFO gov-rep status behavior, I have a lot to say.

IF Steve G. had contacted a few of us who are professionals and abductees, without also requesting a financial commitment, it would have lent a bit more sincerity to his project. But, that's not what happened. He tried to lure "new age" abductees to his project by asking for volunteers to help "call-in" UFOs. He charged a lot of money for the seminars, and the New Age "wantabe abductees" flocked. I questioned not only his sincerity, but his sanity. Obviously, Steve G. isn't an abductee. He wouldn't be "calling 'em in" if he were. One anal probe or memory of a needle implant would cure him (or anyone else) of any new-age, wantabe abductee" status. Eh?

BTW, I would avoid lumping Dr. Mack in with all the "New-Age" UFO believers (i.e., "they come in peace...to save us," etc.). He's had his own "hell" to live through trying to justify his non-abductee understanding of this phenomenon. I don't see any other non-abductee professionals standing up against the wall,

risking their livelihoods, reputations, marriages and professions to take such a stand. Unfortunately, I feel Dr. Jacobs has a realistic perception of this phenomena, and Dr. Mack better listen to him.

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 22:56:39 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:20:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>>>Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club,
>>>Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See
>>>below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will
>>>be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001.
>>>The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not
>>>yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling
>>>press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in
>>>Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

>><snip>

>>Alfred,

>>The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a
>>serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you
>>support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus
>>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

>Dick - I am sorry but I do not remember meeting you and I have
>no idea of who you are. There is a quality of "when did you stop
>beating your UFO researcher" to your post which I find
>non-professional. Nevertheless I shall answer straight-forwardly
>why I am devoting my time to the Disclosure process - which
>includes both the CSETI events May 8-12, 2001 and the follow on
>UFO/ET political caucuses planned for the rest of 2001.

Alfred,

How extremely interesting! And how quickly they forget. This
already tells me something about your knowledge of the UFO
field, but your message raised a gigantic red flag to me. It
just so happens that I have a file of correspondence with you
(unless you have an evil twin with the same name).

So I did an internet search on your rather unique name with
fascinating results.

>If you knew me as you claim, you would know that in 1977, a
>group of us was able, with the help of the Black Caucus, to get
>the HCSA (House Select Committee on assassinations started to
>investigate the JFK and King assassinations.

Yes, I met you in 1977 when you were pushing things in the
Carter White House. It seems your interests extend to just about

every "paranoid" topic that titillates the masses. More about that below.

>That same public interest advocacy spurs me now to seek open
>congressional hearings on the UFO/ET issue, for US Government
>witnesses - waiving secrecy rules and allowing functional
>disclosure to take place.

Greer's and your approach will succeed in killing off any Congressional interest. By the way, I was employed by Congressional Information Service for over 10 years, and that (unlike some of your claimed connections) can be documented.

>The CSETI Disclosure project approached me in August 2000, and I
>am one of 90 witnesses whose testimony has been videotaped. I
>also submitted a sworn affidavit on the 1977 Carter White House
>extraterrestrial study. In all my dealings with this project I
>have experienced professionalism and thoroughness. I have also
>watched other credible high-level witnesses, military and CIA
>witnesses, being examined and videotaped in August 2000.

>This is the first time I have worked with Dr. Greer and his wife
>Emily, and I find both to be professional, and committed to
>positive UFO/ET change. For 5 years until 1998 I administered a
>federally-qualified community health center in the Rio Grande
>Valley of Texas, and I have a certificate from Harvard School of
>Public Health in administering physicians.

Let's see, you also worked for SRI, the New York State Legislative Initiative, were a Fulbright Scholar and Yale Law School graduate who taught at Yale and the University of Texas. And your wife Geri is a "psychic." Have I got the right Alfred Webre, or is in only a coincidence that you have the same e-mail address?

>I have a basis for evaluating the conduct of physicians, even in
>public interest advocacy. Dr. Greer's support has been exemplary and
>professional. I am now gladly helping set up Congressional
>appointments for the witnesses that will be coming to
>Washington. GOAL; Congressional hearings on UFO/ET issues.

>Not only that, I will continue to work for open hearings in the
>political UFO/ET caucuses that are forming for the duration of
>2001.

>Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd
>Vancouver, BC
><http://www.ecologynews.com>

A few questions: Are you the Alfred Webre who co-wrote the book Age of Cataclysm about coming earth changes, etc, in 1974? Are those your posts on the Internet about alleged "mind control" experiments including the plot to elect G.W. Bush as a "destabilization" project? Did you really say those things about the Bilderberger conspiracy and the New World Order rantings? Are you the author of the E-book "Exopolitics"? How many other crazy ideas do you endorse?

Read John Velez's posting about Greer the same day as yours; I endorse it completely. I had thought that maybe you were a dupe, but that apparently was too kind of an interpretation.

Richard H. Hall

Whose public record can completely stand up to scrutiny.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 23:21:09 -0000
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:23:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

<snip>

>Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd
>Vancouver, BC
><http://www.ecologynews.com>

I might have responded more simply by asking List members to look at Alfred's web site (URL) where he confirms most of what I said, except for some of the more extreme elements posted elsewhere on the internet.

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

UFO Over Arica, Chile

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 17:04:46 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:27:31 -0500
Subject: UFO Over Arica, Chile

SOURCE: La Estrella de Arica, Vol. 25,
DATE: March 25, 2001

UFO SEEN OVER ARICA

The presence of a brilliant light which could be seen over the Morro Gordo sector from downtown Arica created great excitement. Morro Gordo features a number of television and radio station antennae.

The phenomenon made itself visible around 18:00 hours, when dozens of citizens raised their eyes skyward to look at it and wonder aloud what it could be; many of them rapidly reached the conclusion that they were in the presence of a UFO. At that time of day, the object had the appearance of a first magnitude star with a glow similar to that of the planet Venus, but whitish or metallic in color, and moved slowly toward the southwest (headed toward the sea). As the sun vanished below the horizon, the object's glow diminished and its color turned to red before disappearing only a few minutes after 19:00 hours.

The public gathered around a photographic and optical equipment shop located at the corner of 21 de Mayo and Patricio Lynch streets, where people stood in line to catch a glimpse of the object through a telescope. Those lucky enough to see the object thus aided described it as "a cup without a handle and a dangling thread" or "a cup without a base and a very narrow foot." A couple of youngsters who saw the object through the telescope said that it resembled "the temple of the Great Cayosama", a sort of floating city featured in the animated Dragonball Z series.

The fact that the object vanished almost simultaneously before the eyes of those seeing through telescopes and those seeing it unaided suggests that it disappeared because it stopped shining, rather than due to distance. Furthermore, the gradual manner in which this happened, and the time at which the incident occurred, leads to the conclusion that the object wasn't self luminous, but rather reflected the sun's light.

Given the witnesses' description and the object's slowness and deliberate movement, many thought that it could be a balloon. When personnel from the Chacalluta Airport were consulted about this possibility, they indicated that weather balloons are not launched from this region. Air traffic controllers explained that the object could not be clearly seen given the distance and the haze present at the sector. They further added that queries sent to the Iquique and Santiago airports prove that there were no radar contacts. Nor was the phenomenon seen by the crew of a LAN Chile flight that took off at exactly the same time that residents of Arica took notice of the glow in the skies.

#####

Translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Gloria Coluchi.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Serious Research - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:44:44 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:31:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Strickland

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

Hi Bob and Don,

Personally, I think you both miss the point!

I know a well-known professor of astronomy, who also happens to be an abductee. I have no idea whether his abduction experiences were of conscious value to him in discovering some of the astronomical anomalies for which he is famous. However, I doubt it.

He was in a state of catatonic depression for several hours (to several days) after being returned from an abduction; so, he would no more be able to make a scientific assessment of what he saw than a 2-year old would make if remarking upon viewing his first full moon. WOW!

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Body Marks - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 17:48:02 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:14:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Strickland

>Date: 25 Mar 2001 08:45:40 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

Dear Greg, Bill and John, EBK and other Listers,

My father had a constant red triangle on his upper right thigh, visible only when he wore shorts. I thought it was a birth mark. I think that's what he called it. I used to get 'em on my back, near my right shoulder blade, but I thought they were sun-burn rashes (or something).

Personally, I think they're getting better at leaving no marks or scars. I had x-rays of my lower back in 1992, which showed nasty looking bone spurs about 4" long growing on either side of my 3rd lumbar vertebrae.

Then, in June or July, 1996 I had a "dream" about the ETs asking me if I would allow them to do surgery on my back to fix it. I vehemently said, "NO!" I remember laying down sideways on their examining table, suddenly very sleepy. I closed my eyes and a nanosecond later woke up, sat up (with some help from them)...still arguing about not wanting them to do surgery. I was allowed to get down from the table, walk from our bathroom (their much larger examining room), climb into bed and go back to sleep. I remembered the "dream" the next morning, thinking it was another "check-up" visit. I even wrote John V. about it shortly after it happened.

Just last October, 2000, I had my back x-rayed again. The bone spurs are gone! I tried to get the 1992 back x-rays sent to my doctor here. They sent the mammogram x-rays instead, and said they couldn't find the other ones! There are no scars...just a couple of dimples on either side of my spine, where there apparently weren't any dimples before. My husband noticed the dimples. He also found the cancerous lump in my left breast. I attribute the dimples to old-age and over-weight. I don't see any scars. I may be in denial (again). It works great, sometimes.

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Body Marks - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:53:53 -0800
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:16:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hatch

>Date: 25 Mar 2001 08:45:40 -0800
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>>>I get em on the top part of my right foot from time to time.
>>>Years apart in occurrence, but repeated. I showed it to my family
>>>MD last time and asked him if it was a rash. He told me that
>>>fungus and the like do not grow in well defined triangles.

>>John, and everyone --

>>This is a very small but important point. We need to be more
>>specific about these triangles. By definition, any three marks
>>would form a triangle, so if the triangles abductees talk about
>>are significant, there has to be more going on. I suspect --
>>especially from photos I've seen -- that John means the dots
>>form an equilateral triangle, with all three sides of equal
>>length. Or at least an isocetes triangle, with two sides the
>>same length. A pattern like that seems remarkable, especially if
>>many people have it, or if it reoccurs. But a mere triangle just
>>means you have three marks.

>Greg,

>As I said in my wife's case, the triangle was equilateral. I
>measured .9" separating the marks. I measured both with rule and
>protractor (60-deg angles). We also phtographed these.

>I once posted this and asked others to respond if they found
>others with the same measurements.

>The hypothesis here was that perhaps the marks were made by an
>instrument with a fixed three-point penetrator and that if these
>could be found on a few abductees that it might advance us
>another half step forward.

>I never received a response indicating that anyone else came up
>with the same measurements. I have seen photos that look
>similar, but it seems no one does the measuring.

Hello Bill:

That's excellent really, at least you have some hard numbers.
Whatever the actual cause of such marks, they can at least be
compared in a numerical sense. I have no idea why some others
don't seem to this; its so easy and obvious

Re: Body Marks - Hatch

Better yet, its safe and non-intrusive... just get out a dime-store ruler and a cheap plastic protractor. Heck. Even the crop-circle types will reel out a tape measure and take the diameter of those formations.

Is there a sort of reluctance to take harmless measurements like these? Maybe its simple oversight.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 20:27:44 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:18:49 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney' - Balaskas

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:52:23 -0500
>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 23:43:16 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
>>From: Nick Balaskas <nikolaos@yorku.ca>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: 'Alien Baloney'

<snip>

>I am by no means an expert in UFOs and when I post an article
>here I do so for information purposes. Just because I post an
>article doesn't mean I agree or disagree with it - and many
>times I do because I want to learn more about the subject and
>hope that an article will lead to a discussion.

I am not an expert in UFOs either (who really is?) but being a very curious person like you who is looking for answers, I look forward to reading all the latest news, stories and comments on UFO UpDates. I especially like reading yours since they are thought provoking - and never malicious.

<snip>

>>>This was an article printed in a local, small rag newspaper here
>>>in Santa Monica. My attorney sued both the reporter and the
>>>paper and they did print a retraction apologizing for their
>>>inaccuracies.

> It would be interesting to see the retraction.

I too would like to see the published retraction and apology to Dr. Leir by this newspaper.

As can be expected, Dr. Leir's pioneering research activities into suspected alien implants will generate many skeptical and often negative news articles but if these articles are unfairly and inaccurately written, they should be exposed as such. Since none of us are perfect, it is only too easy to find things to damage someone's credibility and research. This is particularly sad when this happens to someone like Dr. Leir who I feel is just trying to find answers to our questions by doing something, but often ends up taking all the criticism.

Only by working together will be able to come to the truth about the still mysterious UFO phenomena.

Nick Balaskas

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Fugo Follow-Up

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 00:17:17 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:22:10 -0500
Subject: Fugo Follow-Up

I found reference to another book which is somewhat newer:
Webber, Burt 'Silent Siege III', Webb Research 1992

This comprehensive study documents all the Japanese attacks on North America by submarine, submarine launched aircraft and the "little known" balloon bomb project during WWII. Covers all attacks thus far discovered from Alaska to Mexico; ships sunk and damaged by torpedo, shelling of ships and shore targets by Japanese submarines, aircraft deployed by submarines to start forest fires, and the intercontinental balloon bombing incidents in 28 states identified.

Also covers the Japanese programs to use biological warfare and atomic bombs against U.S. troops if Japan was invaded.

A well researched and exhaustive survey of these little-known aspects of war history which were kept secret during WWII. Large 4to pictorial format, 8"x11", photos, maps, charts, diagrams, app., 301 pages.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: Serious Research - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 01:45:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:23:55 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Velez

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>>Astronomical objects are one of, or the largest category of IFOs,
>>>so it's natural. Plus, nearly all astronomers nowadays are trained
>>>in physics.

>>Hi Bob,

>>First I'm not convinced that your first point is the case, but
>>what I'm getting at is that trained in physics or not, if you
>>don't read the material or get deeply into the subject no
>>astronomers opinion is worth zip coming at it cold. Which quite
>>often they do, expounding upon something they have no knowledge
>>of. Its like passing judgement on the merits of a movie you've
>>never seen because you've heard that the director embraces a
>>political party you despise.

>This is exactly right. Astronomers are qualified to say that
>somebody's sighting sounds like it might have been Venus. But if
>they talk about UFO sightings in general, they have no more
>authority than anybody else. Unless, of course, they've studied
>the subject. And even then they have no special authority,
>except on sightings that might have astronomical causes. They
>certainly - just for instance - have no qualifications to say
>anything about reported close encounters.

>Greg Sandow

Or, to diagnose abductees as "hallucinating" their experiences.
Which is precisely what the famous psychologist Carl Sagan did
on NOVA. Oh, I'm sorry, did I say "psychologist?" My mistake. As
we all know, Carl Sagan was an astronomer. I just got a little
confused because he presented his psychological 'diagnosis'
regarding us, (abductees) on a program that was viewed worldwide
by many, many, thousands (maybe millions) worldwide.

If I can be 'psychologically diagnosed' by an astronomer, I
don't think there's very much that those guys believe is beyond
their ken. ;)

In another thread we have been discussing the abduction related
"marks" that abductees get on their bodies. Perhaps I should
have included mention of Carl Sagans' boot print on my ass.
<LOL>

Regards,

John Velez ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 26](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise

From: **Karoline Louise** <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 06:24:17 EST
Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:28:32 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louise

>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:46:35 -0500
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 12:30:18 EST
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Could the whole abduction/ET thing be travelling further and
>>further along the wrong road, getting further and further away
>>from the phenomenon it is trying to explore?

>Hi Karoline, hi All,

>I don't pretend to know what's really going on. I can only speak
>for myself and say that my conclusions regarding UFOs and
>"aliens" are based on (first person) Life experiences with them.

>_I_have_no_other_choice_.

>I was quite innocently walking home one fine summer evening when
>I saw (close-up no more than 50/60 feet away) a glowing, silent,
>football shaped, UFO hovering over a building on the corner of
>the street that I lived on.

>I got scared, (to quote Budd Hopkins,) "I ran like Hell," and
>when I got about 15 feet from my front door I suddenly found
>myself sitting up in bed, with the room filled with morning
>light, my right eye swollen shut, my nose bleeding, and with
>absolutely -no idea- where twelve hours had gone. One second I
>am in a full out pumping run, it's night, and I'm scared half to
>death, and the very next nanosecond I am sitting up in bed and
>it's morning.

>I went to the emergency room for treatment. The doctor(s) said:

>The swollen eye was not from 'trauma' (Ihadn't been hit) or from
>infection.

>When the ER physician looked up my nose he asked me what the
>"surgery" had been for. (I've never had surgery in my head ever)
>He went and got an ENT specialist and the ENT asked me the same
>question.
>In my world 1+1=2

Again, I agree. 'Something' obviously happened to you. Something
real enough to cause physical injury.

>Maybe it is "psychological" for some. I have suspected it in
>many of the contacts from 'abductees' that I have received over
>the years. And also 'some' of the folks I met or heard about
>while I was working with Budd. I'm sure that there are instances
>of just about any reasonable explanation that you can come up
>with.

I think you are right.

>All I can say is, I know what -happened- to me. I remember it in
>minute almost painful detail. And I remember it as clearly as if
>it had happened yesterday. I saw a UFO up close. I ran.
>"Something" happened. And,... it left behind physical evidence.
>I'll take that memory and others to the grave with me.

>"What's a poor boy to think!" ;)

I totally accept that.

I am not suggesting for a minute that nothing happened to you,
or that you just imagined it, or whatever.

But the simple facts of what you have here is your sighting of
some kind of weird glowing thing, followed by a huge chunk of
missing time and inexplicable physical injuries. We can make a
reasonable guess that these things all fit together in some way
- but how they fit together we just have no clue.

The assumption made by Budd Hopkins and many others in such
cases is that the glowing object was a craft of some kind and
the missing time and physical injuries were inflicted by beings
from another planet somewhere in our galaxy.

Okay that might be true.

But what tends to be forgotten is that equally well it might
not. The glowing object could be an ET craft, but it could be
almost anything else as well - from a portal into another
dimension to a strange kind of plasma ball which induces vivid
mind-experiences so intense they actually cause physical
injuries to occur (in a way similar to the creation of stigmata
and other mentally-induced physical damage).

It could be anything, and most of the things it could be are
probably too strange for us to even imagine.

All you have - all any of us have to whom the impossible seems
to occur - is the bare fact of the event. These things DID
happen to us. But no one on this earth can tell us what that
means, no matter how much we want them to.

We want to be told there is an answer, a label, a name. We want
to listen to someone telling us we are 'abductees' or 'ast life
experiencers', or 'remote viewers' or whatever. It's so
reassuring to be given an answer, even a scary one.

But the danger is the label becoming more important than the
reality; the man-made explanation obscuring or even re-shaping
the hard reality of the event.

As I mentioned last time, if I experience missing time and 'wake
up' remembering a strange house from long ago - with images of
an owl reaching through the window to get me, and of talking to
people in powdered 18th C wigs - and if I have scratches all
over my body that were not there before my 'absence', naturally
the first thing I want is someone to tell me what the hell is
going on.

I am vulnerable. My mental parameters have been smashed flat by
perceptions and physical experience I have always believed to be
impossible I am desperately in need of reassurance, for someone
to say 'it's okay, we know what this is'.

In the present climate the primary 'orthodox' explanation on
offer for my experience, would probably be - alien abduction.
The scratches, the missing time, the imagery of the owl
certainly seem to fit into that paradigm, don't they?

But what about my big old house? what about my images of talking
to human beings who are now dead? Is there anyone to offer any
kind of answer to that? So if I want to get myself an
explanation, feel a sense of identity with others who have
suffered like me, I might easily be persuaded that my big old
house was actually a misremembering for a big new space ship,
mightn't I? And the powdered people - a screen memory for greys.

So, in effect by imposing a probably false 'understanding' on my
experience, I (and everyone else) lose any chance of ever truly

understanding it.

Isn't there plenty of evidence to suggest this is actually happening? Aren't there dozens if not hundreds of 'non-typical' cases which while containing elements of 'abduction' experience (scars, missing time, whatever), also contain elements that suggest explanations very different from nuts and bolts space craft from another planet. Guys in stetsons for example, or people who seem to be from the past; or just plain wacky stuff that doesn't look like anything sensible at all?

Currently these tend to be either ignored or 'explained' as screen memories, which makes little sense when we have so little clue what is going on.

I mean - what if the whole ET idea is totally wrong? And what if my 18th C house is actually a rare but telling clue to the origin of this whole phenomenon, which if followed up might solve everything - and instead of investigating it we discard it - because it doesn't fit our current theory?

What then?

best wishes

KL

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 09:03:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>Jenny, Dick, Brad, List:

>I have added some comments to this discussion as it has
>developed. I'm still not certain how this idea of a council
>compares with methods of peer review used in scientific
>disciplines, particularly with the ubiquitous nature of the
>internet. I know that things are changing rapidly in the way
>science is being reported and reviewed.

Hi,

In reality this was not suggested as a scientific analysis of the UFO evidence, but a process whereby Ufology should determine the cases that it considered strongest in support of the ETH. After doing that it could 'then' submit them to science for their scrutiny - during which time science could follow whatever process it deemed appropriate.

The term 'council' wasn't my invention, as I recall - although I have used it since it was suggested by someone merely for convenience.

I only at first suggested creating a mini net list formed of those participants who were in some way given a mandate by their peers to agree upon cases that they considered most appropriate to submit to science. And that the list be comprised in equal numbers of: pro ETH Ufologists, uncommitted Ufologists, skeptics and outside scientists who were willing to take part in the debate but had no axe to grind on UFOs beyond an interest in seeing what evidence there was.

The point never was - so far as I was concerned - to create a panel that would produce a scientifically watertight bunch of cases which could be thrust in front of the world with the words 'see - we told ya' appended. Simply a selection process from within Ufology to find those cases that the community regards as most supportive of the ETH and submit them to science for their assessment.

So I am a little baffled as to where this need for the 'peer review' of science comes into things. No person - however experienced as a Ufologist - is going to know which cases support the ETH or those that will even give science cause to

think that they might. Ufologists, on the whole, are not experts in the ETH. We only gain that impression by default. So who peer reviews this data within Ufology given that its main aim is not to come up with the strongest, best investigated cases, per se, a topic with which, I agree, experienced investigators may have some say, but to come up with the cases most supportive of a specific theory about which Ufologists are - as a whole - no more qualified to judge than others.

This is one reason why I argued for a 'broad church' in the selection process, to even out the true experience, knowledge and self conviction about knowledge regarding the ETH which may be rife within Ufology.

So - what I suggested was simply a rounded and democratic way for Ufology to define which cases it felt it should submit as primary candidates to science. A process that would in of itself be a useful step regardless of whether science took any of them seriously, laughed them all out of court or - more likely - found them sufficiently inconclusive as to hedge their bets.

The latter part of the experiment is down to science and what they do with the data. I would expect peer review there. But what is down to Ufology is to try to fairly reach a consensus on those cases it regards - based on its understanding of Ufology - as the most supportive of a particular theory that still dominates most of this subjects thinking.

That was my motive. It seemed like a necessary step to take in the debate about the ETH - that's all.

It has been interesting - though - to see how some have read other motives into what I argued. Or how the concept is being misunderstood in ways that might suit individual interpretations of the phenomenon.

But that's okay. I am not accusing or blaming anyone for that. Its human nature and quite appropriate at this stage of the discussion anyhow. But I wanted to make clear (if I hadn't done already) that this was never my idea to turn Ufology into a science or to define evidence that will stand up to scrutiny . Of course, we have to bear these ideals in mind when deciding upon the cases to be referred. But in essence this is an exercise in clear thinking by the UFO community.

It comes down to one basic question - really - if a majority of people in the UFO world support the ETH as the most likely solution to the unsolved cases (and I think that they do) then it is proper to ask that we spell out the cases that most persuade the majority of that view. Then we can turn these over to science for their opinion on how well these do - in fact - support the ETH.

Seems a simple enough idea to me, and one that after we have done this experiment leaves us knowing more than we know right now - one way or the other.

>I think that Jenny's proposal to float something to the UFO
>Skeptics List for more idead is a good one. I'd like to see what
>is suggested.

Some already seem to have made up their mind - based on what I have seen on there. But I do intend to post something and try to 'win their support' as they probably do not understand what the point of all this is as yet.

As I have explained before owing to my mothers serious ill health my time is at a huge premium right now and its all I can do answering a couple of messages a day. So please bear with me.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 12:58:27 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 09:07:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:33:19 -0000

>Jenny wrote:

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>>>My main question is, who among the "doubters" or "skeptics" (by
>>>whatever definitions they choose) are volunteering to
>>>participate? Is that not a vital element of what we are hoping
>>>to accomplish?

>>Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
>>on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
>>all silent right now?

>Jenny,

>Does the Sun now revolve around the Earth, or was there some
>other recent cataclysm which went unnoticed and has resulted in
>a 'new dawn'!?

>Since when were "'doubters' or 'skeptics'" ever embraced as a
>'vital element' by believers that ET is here?

Hi,

I appreciate your concerns, but this was an idea that I -
personally - suggested two or three weeks ago and from the
outset of my proposing it - as you will see - I argued for it to
be a review panel that would be equally split between pro ETH
UFOlogists, uncommitted UFOlogists, external scientific
commentators 'and' skeptics.

So - frankly - what anyone else has said or done before needs to
be cast aside if we are truly to do this collectively. All that
matters is what we go forward to do.

In my ideas skeptics were specifically given an equal say in
this process to that of pro ETH UFOlogists by virtue of the make
up of the concept that I suggested.

Since then the debate has only been occurring on this list and
has largely only generated a response from pro UFOlogists. It is
my intention to take it beyond this list - as I indicated -
but, as you know, I have difficult domestic circumstances right
now and so I have had limited time to do more than keep up with
the messages on this list.

But skeptics do read this list - as we both know - and so could
easily have contributed to the idea. I appreciate your concerns
about why they wouldn't, but you should appreciate that this was
my idea, as a response to a post on this list a while back, and
you know that I am not anti skeptic and you know that I have

proposed from the get go equal involvement in the concept by skeptics.

So what others may or may not have said or done isnt critical to this proposal.

As such I dont think it was inappropriate to note that we needed to hear the views of skeptics, since - as I made clear - I dont think this project is worth doing if it does not have the involvement of a broad spread of opinion.

>Which knowledgeable 'skeptics' were being considered as
>'welcome' participants - Philip Klass, James Oberg, Robert
>Sheaffer and such-like?

As I made pretty clear in my earlier messages, the responsibility for the election of the equal participation by skeptics in this project was to be the province of the skeptics themselves. That has been my suggestion all along.

In other words, the skeptics could - and should - nominate whomsoever they chose as the people most appropriate. No restrictions have ever been hinted at by me as to names that could / could not be put forward.

Quite the contrary I recall saying something like - if any individual declined to take part after being nominated and did so because they did not want to work with any other nominated participant then that was their problem - they would have to pull out and be replaced by a new nominee who 'would' consider the evidence and work with anyone regardless of what they personally felt about that individual.

So I dont see how the way that I had suggested that this panel be created could in any sense be construed as being unfair to skeptics and certainly not in the least restrictive as to the participation of any individuals.

But by all means point out where any of the ideas that I mooted do create problems for the skeptic community, since that is not what I want to see happen.

>You wouldn't expect anyone which the 'pro' camp denigrates as
>'clowns' to participate and doubtless no-one would be so
>hypocritical as to ask them.

What I said was that 'all' the participants in this experiment should be there to review the evidence and should be willing to work with all other duly nominated representatives from the other areas of research that are involved.

If they were not willing to cast aside personal prejudice and work with others then they ought not to be welcome on the panel. That sentiment cuts both ways - for 'believers' and for 'skeptics' - as it is the only way to progress into a reasoned debate and not into personal in fighting.

Surely we can create a panel of well balanced and reasonable people who will put the debating of the evidence above personal point scoring?

If this experiment cannot get beyond name calling and personal dislike of all whose ideas are different from our own then it is not worth doing. And UFOlogy has precious little hope of ever getting anywhere if thats what happens.

This is a test of our willingness to lay aside from squabbles and try to do something positive that will lead us all forward.

I would hope that there are enough people - both pro and anti ETH - willing to give that a try.

>What leads you to believe there would suddenly be any difference
>from the norm, when evidence demonstrating that 'UFO' cases have
>terrestrial explanations has to be faced by those with a
>religious conviction otherwise?

I am not expecting this to happen at all - and it isnt necessary that it should do so for the purposes of the project.

Person A suggests that the 'Puddleville CE 3' be regarded as a

strongly pro ETH case. The panel apply the agreed criteria to this submission and set out to 'score' the case.

Participant skeptic Ivan Ansa will say - 'but Puddleville is actually just a misperception of a telegraph pole - because we know one was there and the witness who thought it was an alien had myopia'.

Participant Ima Bullever says - 'ah, but we have a radar track from the secret Puddleville NSA base that proves some sort of craft was really there and the witness had laser eye surgery the month before so I am sure there is something interesting here.'

I dont expect Ivan Ansa and Ima Bullever to pull back from these positions, but when they individually score the case they will offer 'their' opinion on it. Perhaps Ivan will give it a score of just 8 and Ima will say it merits a 20. The panels score will become an average of their scores and all the other scores and if the make up of the panel is evenly spread and equally representative - as I have argued that it must be - a fair average score will emerge regardless of individual beliefs.

In any case, the choice of the final cases to be submitted as the data most reflective of the ETH will be independent and relative - since, if the panel considers (say) 50 cases and decides that the 20 with the highest average scores are the ones to be submitted then what Ivan and Ima think about any specific one - or their individual views about an explanation / lack of explanation for it - will not effect the panel's verdict in the end.

This is why I proposed a broad church panel and a mutually agreed scoring system up front. It minimises the impact of personal disagreement or individual views on answers to cases.

After all - like I keep saying - the point here is not to come up with watertight cases that 'prove' the ETH but the cases that the panel and UFOlogy say are the 'most' suggestive of the ETH that we have available.

'Most suggestive that we have available' covers any contingency from Ima's no doubt view that 'these cases should persuade you scientist suckers that ET has landed' - to Ivans no doubt 'see what I mean - this feeble load of twaddle is the best we could come up with'.

Yes, thats how these people will see the same selected cases, but it wont really matter that they do because the panel will have done their job in selecting the best available options from the data available. Which is all that we are asking it to do.

>Your endeavours to find that proverbial middle ground are, as
>always, commendable.

>Still, it's not really a new undertaking and you know I've
>previously expressed how, in recent years, it's become evident
>that 'middle ground' effectively no longer exists.

But this project isnt a battle. Thats the point. Individual opinions on cases or even what the resultant evidence in total means are largely irrelevant. Thats the beauty here. All we are suggesting is the discovery of mutual agreement as to UFOlogy's prime candidates for support of the ETH. Not that agreement that they 'do' support the ETH - a totally different thing.

This is something that everyone can have an opinion about and which we can mutually determine regardless of whether we think these cases actually prove anything at all when they are considered together.

Thats why I have been arguing for such a specifically directed project and not one that, for instance, sets out to find the best evidence for real UFOs, or those cases that do suggest the reality of unexplained phenomena.

These might be scientifically more reasonable hypotheses. But we could never expect agreement on such a thing. We can expect something to emerge from reasonable people working to define the most suggestive cases for the ETH.

>The 'serious research' premise presupposes, as it has done all

>along, that 'ufology' and all encompassed therein, has
>demonstrated it merits being worthy of such a renewed
>'scientific' focus in the first place.

>For various and palpable reasons, there might be fundamental
>objections to any such presumption.

No - it simply says the following. UFOlogy has a set of cases reported to it that forms its raw data. From this data a number of theories have been proposed to explain what is going on. The ETH has taken on a particular hold - especially amongst the general public who regard the ETH and UFOlogy as synonymous. Yet there has been no serious attempt by UFOlogy to define those cases from within this data base that do most support / or suggest the ETH as a viable explanation.

Hence, it makes sense to review the data with that premise in mind and come up with the top 20 (or whatever) cases as scored to an agreed system and then at least we have some sort of consensus view on what cases exist to make this theory still popular. Then we can submit these cases to science and ask them to review the evidence in this very specific way, to offer their verdict on strengths and weaknesses of them as support for the ETH (not as UFO cases per se) and we can see where we can go from there.

As far as I can see as a result of this process we have to be better off and with a clearer insight into our data than we are now. And any other consideration surely isnt really too important by comparison with making that kind of forward step.

Does UFOlogy 'merit' this review? Thats a needless question, because its like making up your mind who is at the door before the doorbell rings. Hopefully, science prefers to open it and see.

We have data. We have a widely believed in theory. We have an obligation to test that widely believed in theory against our data. Thats all we are doing here - no preconceptions involved.

I simply do not believe that science would regard that as anything other than a reasonable thing to do.

>For a more wide-ranging opinion, why not 'ask the skeptics!'

>'UFO Skeptics', whilst proven to be an objective forum, has a
>different subscriber base and I'm sure opinions expressed
>therein would be both worthwhile and revealing.

>Perhaps even significantly so.

>Oh, and of course 'welcome'. ;)

And as I have indicated all along, this was never intended as an UpDates pet project but would be taken to a much broader spread of consideration if it gets a momentum to exist. It merely initiated on UpDates as an idea that I tossed out during one of the threads. So its hardly surprising or unreasonable that the early discission of it has focused on here.

But I dont have the least objection to this discussion being taken far and wide. Quite the contrary. I'd welcome it doing so. So if you have your own Lists - debate the project and its intent and let us know what you think.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:51:03 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:19:47 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 04:25:44 +0100
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 16:31:16 -0000

><snip>

>>Indeed it is and this is a fair argument. There must be skeptics
>>on this list. We hear from them often enough. How come they are
>>all silent right now?

>Would it be okay to assume from the above, that you no longer
>consider yourself a skeptic?

>Roy..

Hi,

You can jump to whatever dubious conclusions you like, if they help.

I don't pin labels on myself. I investigate cases as objectively as possible - based on the premise that any outcome is possible at the start of the enquiry. In this way I try to find answers whenever I can. If I can find a reasonable answer then I am happy to say so, and if I cannot find one then I am happy to say so as well.

Sometimes I do. Sometimes I don't. That's the way it is in UFO land.

So what's the point of inventing names to cover either contingency that might arise?

I don't have a mind set about UFOs beyond a simple quest for truth - wherever that truth may lie and wherever the facts may lead in the getting there. You can call that perspective by whatever fancy name - or derogatory term - you like. I won't be offended. But it probably won't adequately cover the truth.

This has always been my stance and it has not suddenly changed. I don't especially perceive this way of doing things as being commensurate with the position of either a believer or a skeptic - in the sense that I think we all understand the normal usage of these words.

I am not sure why you would do so. But if it makes you feel better to build neat picket fences around people, then please be my guest.

Just don't require me to live down to your expectations.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms: 3/23/01

From: **SMiles Lewis** <elfis@austin.rr.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 09:26:12 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:23:10 -0500
Subject: ELFIS-Journal of Possible Paradigms: 3/23/01

Journal of Possible Paradigms: Happy Spring - 3/23/01
<http://www.elfis.net/journal/032301.htm>

Hello again. Welcome to another installment of my Elfis Journal. We've had a couple of Radio:Free:Elfis webcasts since the last journal entry. Our first official show featured local author, investigator and underground comics artist, Mack White. Mack has graciously created the new official RFE animated gif you see here and on the main Elfis & RFE pages.

If you weren't able to catch Mack's appearance on the show simply set your web browser or real player towards this url:

Radio:Free:Elfis Archive & Homepage <http://www.elfis.net/radio>

RFE Premiere with Mack White
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/rfe031201.ram>

For more on Mack White... <http://www.mackwhite.com>
<http://www.bisonbill.com> <http://www.worldwideweb.com>

...and Cartoon Pleroma with Mack White
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/cpl12600a.ram>
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/cpl12600b.ram>
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/cpl12600c.ram>

And speaking of...
Robert Larson's Cartoon Pleroma Archives; look what else has been added:

Fred Alan Wolf on Spirit, Soul and Science
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/cp040599a.ram>
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/cartoonpleroma/cp040599b.ram>

AND COMING SOON! More Archived Shows...
-Featuring David Pursglove editor of Zen & The Art of Close Encounters and organizer of the New Being Project & New Being Seminars
-Featuring Paul Williams on Philip Kindrid Dick
-Featuring Kenny Ausubel on Alternative Medicine Suppression

Last week's Radio:Free:Elfis show featured talk of my own anomalous experiences and the nature of psi phenomena.

RFE Numero Dos with SMiles' Personal Paranormal Experiences
<http://www.elfis.net/radio/rfe031901.ram>

ELFIS ZINE ZONES

RnR - Rants & Reviews

Within the Elfis Rants & Reviews department you will find a new article on the Majestic documents as investigated by Eugenia Macer-Story.

Operation Abject: The Majestic Joker Turned Upside Down
<http://www.elfis.net/rnr/rnrx/abject.htm>

[The idea of the covert use of Role Playing Games and On-Line Games is intriguing. We find the timing of her article all the more interesting in light of the unfolding paranoid vision of Electronic Art's Majestic "video game" whose tendrils are already tangling the ufo/anomaly scene. Keep your eyes peeled for updates to the saga at the url below listed under the Mind Kontrol Corner ZineZone.]

Also in the Elfis Rants & Rants department there is a review of an interesting book...

Salt Dreams: Land and Water in Low-Down California by William de Buys and photographs by Joan Myers.

<http://www.elfis.net/rnr/rnrx/saltdreams.htm>

<http://www.elfis.net/rnr/rnrx/giantrock.htm>

I've implanted photographs within this review that were taken by myself and fellow Kooks from a trip of ours back in 1999. We visited the Integratron and Giant Rock, the olde stomping ground of contactees like George Van Tassel who put on numerous ufo conferences at the rock. Our visit to Landers California and Giant Rock coincided with the public announcement about Terence McKenna's brain tumor. Within the year Terence was dead and Giant Rock had split. The place had a real surreal feel that I think our pictures capture. Check it out.

Also, if you haven't bought a copy of the following books... you should!

The Excluded Middle Anthology-Wake Up Down There!

by Greg Bishop

<http://www.excludedmiddle.com/wudt.htm>

<http://www.wexclub.com/OrderForm.html>

The Shadow Over Santa Susana - The Manson Mythos

by Adam Gorightly

<http://www.mansonmythos.com/>

Sex & Rockets: The Occult World of Jack Parsons

by John Carter

With introduction by Robert Anton Wilson

<http://www.excludedmiddle.com/sexnrkts.htm>

<http://www.feralhouse.com/cgi-bin/store/commerce.cgi?page=rockets.html>

MKC - Mind Kontrol Corner

Majestic Art of Mind Kontrol: with fake news sites, threatening emails and phone calls, sponsorship of real-life ufo researchers and more, this "game" is but one part of the Phil-Dickianization of the media and its desynsitization of the public's ability to discern fact from fiction.

<http://www.elfis.net/mkc/mkcx/majesticarts.htm>

We recently received a "cryptic missive" from a South American researcher concerned with the strange goings on within a Bolivian branch of the global UMMO "cult." Apparently an inside informant has given this investigator details of strange sexual blood rituals and millennialist fervor which he fears could lead to even worse activities. Part of the fun of this article is deciphering the meaning intended behind the reporter's stilted English. <http://www.elfis.net/mkc/mkcx/bolivianummites.htm>

Also check out this recent article on

"Psychotronics - The Art & Science of Tuning In."

<http://www.cnb-scene.com/pspsy.html>

CCS - Cargo Culture Shock

In late January I participated in an interesting local (San Marcos) event which highlighted the interfacing of Art and Science and focused discussion (somewhat) around the film 2001: A Space Odyssey. This event will hopefully be the first in a continuing series. Before my lecture was a talk by a local astronomer about using science to learn the details of historic artist Vincent van Gogh, especially his astronomical paintings such as Starry Night and White House at Night. You can read more about this research here:

New Scientist Newsletter 10 March 2001

<http://www.newscientist.com/newsletter/news.jsp?id=ns228136>

You might also want to check out this online article about an underground filmmaker into UFOs and whatnot:

Secrets of the Shadow World:

What do Sasquatch droppings and flying saucers have in common? George Kuchar, of course.

<http://www.brightlightsfilm.com/28/shadowworld.html>

And... within the Cargo Culture Gallery you will find some of the images that have been looping on the ELFIS Issue X page. Among them are the official joint Disney / DoD Mickey Mouse gas mask, a Y2KFC T-shirt image complete with Grey eyed Colonel and Sony handycam advert featuring cows exiting a flying saucer in a corn field.

<http://www.elfis.net/images/gallery/>

ATA - AusTex Anomalous

Austin MP3.Com Artists:

http://golocal.mp3.com/gir?genre_id=0&geo_id=10052886

ARVC - Austin Remote Viewing Center

Why isn't parapsychology in the school curriculum?

http://www.inq7.net/lif/2001/mar/20/lif_4-1.htm

(Actually, it IS offered at Franklin Pierce College every other year)

<http://www.fpc.edu/pages/Academics/catalog/ps.html>

Fortean Times has interviewed veteran psi researcher Hal Puthoff

<http://www.forteantimes.com/artic/puthoff/puthoff.html>

Institute of Paranormal Investigations - San Antonio

<http://hometown.aol.com/psiexplorer/index.html>

San Antonio Paranormal Research Society

<http://hometown.aol.com/psiexplorer/myhomepage/club.html>

Remote Viewing: Conditions & Potentials

by Christophe Brunski from The Anomalist web site:

<http://www.anomalist.com/commentaries/rvcp.html>

The End of the End of the Paranormal

by Joseph M. Felser from The Anomalist #9

<http://www.anomalist.com/commentaries/endend.html>

Erik "Starblazer" Stearns'

Synergy Research Consortium and RV Training

<http://www.synergy-research.com>

Paranormal Phenomena & Berkeley's Metaphysics

By Peter B. Lloyd

<http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~ursa/philos/psil.htm>

PSI Informatics

By Peter B. Lloyd

<http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~ursa/philos/psi-inf.htm>

The Metaphysics of UFOs: What are UFOs Really?

By Peter B. Lloyd

<http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~ursa/philos/ufol.htm>

From the Austin Anomaly Archives...

PSI - Scientific Studies of the Psychic Realm by Charles Tart

<http://www.elfis.net/eccoofvalis/sociopara.htm>

DreamTime NOW!

Turning Vivid Dreams Into Reality - Wired Magazine

<http://www.wired.com/news/technology/0,1282,41478,00.html>

Elfis Anomaly CommUnity

Jump aboard the Elfis Web-Boards! Join the Elfis network of researchers and readers in healthy debate and dialogue in our message board area as well as the chat areas.

<http://elfis.community.everyone.net/>

Conference UpDates

Forthcoming mini-convention in Clarksburg, W.Va., on the weekend of April 28th With James Moseley and others at the Gray Barker Memorial Library

<http://www.martiansgohome.com/smeat/v48/ss010220.htm>

More National UFO Conference Updates coming soon to

<http://www.nufoc.net>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 12:00:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:25:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Kaeser

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>are sadly mistaken.

<snip>

Lan-

IMO, the public statements of disagreement regarding Dr. Greer aren't designed to impress Skeptics. Like "True Believers", many Skeptics aren't really listening anyway, so what would be the point? In addition, I'm not sure where you come up with "vicious personal attacks", since I've seen nothing but facts posted to the various lists where this discussion seems to be taking place.

I don't think that anyone will simply ignore all information that comes from Dr. Greer's efforts, but you can bet that it will be scrutinized very closely and any flaws will become the subject of discussion very quickly.

I'm in agreement that we need to discuss issues and evidence rather than personalities. But in the eyes of many, Dr. Greer's behavior has become an issue, and it impacts the importance that many believe he has to the genre.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart

From: Gary Hart <geehart@frontiernet.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:17:47 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:27:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:13:50 EST
>Subject: Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Supposedly file sharing is/was a common practise and is
>done by other abduction investigators besides JC.

Robert,

File sharing for research purposes by amateurs is OK. John openly, especially to Missouri-area abductees, promoted himself as a professional. I have never found him to have used the words amateur or hobbyist. John used the terms "clinical therapist", "trained in clinical hypnosis", "received Masters in Social Work", "joined the Academy of Certified Social Workers", "Licensed Clinical Social Worker" terms everywhere. Check his published bios, articles, research papers. If I can show he acted as a professional in doing hypnosis, then I can catch him with his professional regulations.

Some of you have seen the newsletter where John sets up the situation where abductees visit his office and pay a fee... this is fraud and misrepresentation and license violation #1 if he followed through with it... I will leave the answer to the evidence. The group that needs to see all of it will make this judgement. The whole case rests on one question. If the answer is yes to that question, it triggers four "problems".

>The story last year was this was some sort of evil plot hatched
>by JC's ex wife in an attempt to discredit him. Supposedly we
>were told that no files with no identification ever got sent to
>NIDS. Did the abductees actually get copies of their case files
>from NIDS? What in fact actually happened to the case files?

None of this was "hatched" by John's ex-wife. I can prove she was only one of many similarly handled victims: not the first nor last.

John shifts blame to all except himself. MUFON did not investigate because they must have felt the result would expose John and them, too. I made this point clear one year ago: investigate to clear John and MUFON. Nothing happened.

If John acted as a professional, he did Research on Human Subjects which is regulation violation #2. MUFON admits John sold files; says they were his personal files and not logged as theirs, except - wonder of wonders, his cases got logged as Abduction Transcription Research Database files. Not very smart. And it is research...

>Not surprising.

That too. But back to the question of whether the files had names on them. We got back one. A miracle to be sure. Circumstantial evidence because Elizabeth DID have access to her own case file. Let's see: postage matches weight, documentation

for her letter matches file returned. Other evidence documents the process of file retrieval. All personal data un-redacted. Medical records included have SSN un-redacted. Seems John was getting back at her for exposing him. Gee, what a thought.

I thoroughly trust Elizabeth, by the way. All evidence I've seen proves the truth of what she says. John story on the other hand, is not supported by any evidence. If any of you out there have any, I need it now!

But wait - if I can prove he acted as a professional, John violates time #3 by violating the privacy and confidentiality of client files by selling them in any form, signed or not. A client seeing their file material in any public forum or knowing that some forbidden third party has their material may cause serious harm to their mental condition.

Col. Alexander, bless his heart, admitted that the sale was not to NIDS, which has a voluntary series of ethics statements -not a Code in any way, but to Robert Bigelow himself as an individual. Mr. Bigelow has never stated he would protect anyone's privacy and there is no reason to trust him if he did given the situation we find ourselves in.

>Besides Dan who all quit of late?

Since last summer: Ray Fowler - Director of Investigations, Dan Wright - MUFON Deputy Director (second in command), Gerald Rowles - Director of Membership, Carolyn McNellis - Director of Fund Raising and Director of Abduction Research John Carpenter.

>I understand MUFON's membership is down to 2000 or >thereabouts. Interest seems to swell with membership, >and decrease when membership in any organization goes >down.

>Who knows, perhaps some angel will come along buy all the >assets case files and data bases. Naturally all those in power >at the time of the xfer will then be on the board of whomever >said person or organization will be.

MUFON's reputation will be measured by the mess they, those culpable board members, alone created. Some part of MUFON's assets are even now unusable.

And I still do wish all this were not true but mine eyes have seen the light. Some in Ufology are prey and others predator.

My year-long investigation answered all my questions... MUFON knew the answers already. Hiding is an answer.

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This 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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Nick Pope's Weird World - April 2001

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:57:22 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:30:44 -0500
Subject: Nick Pope's Weird World - April 2001

NICK POPE'S WEIRD WORLD

Spring has sprung, so here's the April 2001 round-up of news and views from the world of ufology, the paranormal, and much more besides.

UFOs and MI6

Whilst reading ex-MI6 agent Richard Tomlinson's book, *The Big Breach*, I found (on pages 106 and 107) an intriguing anecdote with a UFO connection. Tomlinson says that the CIA are constitutionally prevented from manipulating the media, but that they occasionally enlist the help of MI6 with such tasks. He cites as an example an attempt to discredit Boutros Boutros Ghali, when he was one of the candidates for the post of UN Secretary General, by planting jocular stories in the press to the effect that he was a believer in UFOs and extraterrestrials. I can recall no such coverage, and wonder if this is a garbled version of the "Third Man" story and the rumours concerning Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

Leap of Faith

Much has been written about astronaut Gordon Cooper and the UFO phenomenon, with various rumours circulating about personal sightings and other involvement. Now he's gone on the record to separate fact from fiction, clarifying what actually happened. His book *Leap of Faith* is an autobiography, published by HarperCollins, and devotes significant space to the 1951 Neubiberg Air Force Base UFO sighting where Cooper and other F-86 pilots unsuccessfully tried to intercept UFOs that had been sighted over the base. Cooper also discusses the famous 1957 UFO case at Edwards Air Force Base, where film was taken. Cooper spoke to the Pentagon and saw the negatives. Cooper nails the myth that he had a UFO sighting while in space, but there's plenty of other intriguing UFO material, together with accounts of his involvement with the channeller Valerie Ramsone, and his meeting with contactee Daniel Fry.

Eye Spy

In last month's column I alerted readers to a new magazine on defence and intelligence issues, which is being launched in May. I inadvertently gave the wrong website, as opposed to:

www.eyespy.com

which is the correct one. If it hasn't yet gone live, it very soon will, so add it to your favourites and stand by for some mind-blowing stuff.

Life Out There

On 16 March 2001 I attended the 2nd World Symposium on Space Exploration and Life in the Cosmos. This event was held in the Republic of San Marino, and concentrated on Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) issues. The best known speaker was Professor Frank Drake from the SETI Institute, who updated the audience on the Institute's plans to expand the

various initiatives currently underway. The long-term plan is to build a radio telescope dedicated to SETI, conducting an all-sky, all-frequency search. In the meantime, there will be a new facility coming on stream in 2005 at Hat Creek Observatory. There is also work going on to move into optical SETI, looking for laser bursts which a civilisation could use to transmit data (details on all this at:

www.seti.org)

I had dinner with Professor Drake on a few occasions over the course of the conference, and learnt a lot about SETI and related issues. Although he's a firm believer in life out there (perhaps 10,000 civilisations in our own galaxy alone, according to the Drake Equation) he's not a believer in UFOs; he feels that the distances are too great and thinks that the consequent time, energy and money required for interstellar travel would be prohibitive. But if SETI does detect a signal from an extraterrestrial civilisation, Frank Drake will doubtless be a hero to ufologists as well as scientists, even if they disagree about the chances of any extraterrestrials actually paying us a visit.

Stephen Hawking Comments on Alien Life

Speaking in February at a charity fund-raising lecture for Newnham Croft Primary School in Cambridgeshire, cosmologist Stephen Hawking made these intriguing comments about extraterrestrial life: "Assuming we don't destroy ourselves in the next one hundred years, I expect we will spread out, first to other planets in the solar system, and then to the nearby stars... It won't be like Star Trek or Babylon 5, with a new race of nearly human beings in almost every stellar system. As we explore the galaxy we may find primitive life, but not beings like us. Even if life develops in other stellar systems, the chances of catching it at a recognisably human stage are very small. It won't be a universe populated by many humanoid races with an advanced but essentially static science and technology. Instead, I think we will be on our own, but rapidly developing in biological and electronic complexity - It could be that there's an advanced race out there that's aware of our existence, but it's leaving us to stew in our own primitive juices. A more reasonable explanation is that there's a very low probability either of life developing on a planet, or of that life developing intelligence".

Lord Lewin and Bentwaters

Richard Hill's biography of the late Lord Lewin has been published by Cassell in hardback and costs £25. Entitled Lewin of Greenwich it's essential reading for those with an interest in modern naval warfare. Lewin saw active service in the Second World War and was Chief of the Defence Staff during the Falklands War, so there's much of interest here. There's a UFO connection, because Lord Lewin was Chief of the Defence Staff at the time of the Bentwaters incident. There's no mention of it, which could mean something or nothing, dependant upon your interpretation. But it is perhaps of interest that on his retirement, Lewin settled in the picturesque Suffolk village of Ufford, no more than a mile or so from the Bentwaters and Woodbridge bases, and the intervening Rendlesham Forest.

Cottingley Fairies

The pictures that fooled the world (or certainly Sir Arthur Conan Doyle) were sold on 13 March at auctioneers Bonhams and Brooks, for £6000 (the estimate had been £3000 - £4000). An unnamed private buyer purchased the glass plates and negatives of some of the pictures taken in 1917 at Cottingley Glen in Yorkshire, by cousins Elsie Wright and Frances Griffiths. The pictures were from the archive of theosophist Edward Gardner - the man who first alerted Conan Doyle to the case. Doyle later published an account in Strand Magazine, and the rest is history. It was not until the Eighties that the mystery was finally resolved: Elsie had drawn the fairies on cardboard, cutting around the edges of the figures and then propping them up with hatpins. Elsie said in 1986 "The joke was to last two hours. It has lasted seventy years".

Nick Pope, April 2001

Nick Pope's four books, Open Skies, Closed Minds, The Uninvited, Operation Thunder Child and Operation Lightning Strike are available from most good bookshops and from all the usual Internet book sites. His British publishers are Simon & Schuster. In America, his first two books are published in hardback by The Overlook Press and in mass-market paperback by Dell Publishing.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

The Real X-Files - April 2001

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 19:05:25 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:34:07 -0500
Subject: The Real X-Files - April 2001

THE REAL X-FILES
With Neil Spring

Hot Gossip Uk
www.hotgossip.co.uk

Hi everybody and welcome to the April 2001 issue of the Real X-Files. For the next six months, I shall relieve Georgina Bruni of her regular responsibility as author of this column, using this space to keep readers of Hot Gossip up to date on all the latest news and views from the ever-changing world of the paranormal.

OXFORD STUDENTS OPEN THEIR MINDS

On Sunday 21st January, Open Minds, Oxford University's first student UFO research society, held its inaugural meeting at Somerville College. I am pleased to say that the event was a resounding success, well attended and certainly thought provoking. In attendance as guest speaker was none other than UFO Magazine's Graham Birdsall, who provided the audience with an informative and balanced over-view of the UFO phenomenon. Also present was Brian James, formerly with the Oxford-based Contact (UK), and now chairman of BUFORA (British UFO Research Association).

Graham unfolded a whole assortment of conspiracy theories, all substantiated by edited declassified official documents, photographs, and impressive video footage. One odd example was a report on a television show covering the subject, which was sent to the military intelligence agencies of leading nations. Graham revealed statements describing aircraft, which, as he put it, "would make George Lucas drool". Reports included seeing flying triangles emerging from giant sea structures off the coast of Iceland and sightings in Varginha of mutant humans, which were seen shortly after a spate of UFO sightings in the area, in January 1996.

Said Graham: "To gain approval to form a UFO society within Oxford University was one hell of an achievement in itself. Among that audience were this country's future teachers, scientists, politicians and journalists, and having seen a fraction of what I would term 'hard evidence', the vast majority were bowled over.

"The hope is that six months or six years from now, one or more of those youngsters might come across this subject in their chosen careers and, recalling what they heard and saw that evening, go on to make a telling contribution."

The Open Minds Society was founded on the 20th May 2000 with the following aims:

1. To encourage, promote and conduct unbiased scientific research of unidentified flying object (UFO) phenomena throughout the United Kingdom.
2. To collect and disseminate evidence and data relating to

unidentified flying objects; To analyse this evidence to the best of the Society's abilities, in an unbiased fashion.

3. To encourage serious academic and topical debate pertaining to unexplained - paranormal phenomena. We are already greatly encouraged by the views expressed by various well-known researchers. Said Stanton T. Friedman: "As a nuclear physicist who has lectured on the topic 'Flying Saucers ARE Real' at more than 600 colleges and universities and at more than 100 professional groups in 15 countries, and who successfully debated at the Oxford University Debating Society in 1995, I am delighted to hear of a UFO study group being formed there."

"I think it is very important for the future leaders of our world to be well informed on this important subject and certainly expect the Society to help in that role."

We hope, too, that in some small way, our society will assist in this aim by publishing articles on our investigations, conducting University seminars and lectures and by posting regular news items on our web site:

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~openmind>

TWIN ABDUCTIONS

As someone who is not simply a reporter of oddities but who also investigates cases of the unexplained, I recently received an intriguing abduction report involving mirror twin sisters, whose lives have been continuously interrupted by strange experiences since they were young children. A full investigation of this case is currently underway and I am in regular contact with the investigator involved.

Those familiar with the so-called abduction phenomenon will know that cases of this sort are rare. Indeed, according to writer Susan Michaels, author of 'Sightings', "Jim and Jack Weiner are the subjects of the only twin alien abduction case on record." It is hoped therefore, that an in- depth investigation of such a case might help us to learn something new about this baffling enigma.

I would therefore be grateful to hear from anyone who is aware of other cases involving the alleged alien abduction of twins. Anyone with relevant information can contact me at the email address below.

CIA RELEASE REAL 'X-FILES'

Documents held by the CIA concerning UFOs and military sightings have recently been made available on the worldwide web. Check

www.ufocity.com

for the relevant links. In addition, anyone interested in learning of what transpired at this year's International UFO Congress Convention and Film festival at Laughlin, Nevada, can read Nick Redfern's summary of the event, at:

www.ufocity.com/features.cfm?NewsID=864

RULE BY SECRECY

On the 21st March, Jim Marrs appeared as a guest on the James Whale radio show to discuss his latest book, 'Rule by Secrecy: The Hidden History that Connects the Trilateral Commission, the Freemasons, and the Great Pyramids'. Jim is also the author of the landmark deconstruction of the JFK Assassination, "Crossfire" (1987), "Alien Agenda" (1997) and "Psi Spies" (2000).

In Rule by Secrecy Marrs painstakingly examines the world's most closely guarded secrets, tracing the history of secret societies and the power they have wielded, from the ancient mysteries to modern- day conspiracy theories. Searching for truth, he uncovers disturbing evidence that the real movers and shakers of the world collude to start and stop wars, manipulate stock markets and interest rates, maintain class distinctions, and even censor the six o'clock news. And they do this under the auspices of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderbergers, the CIA, and even the Vatican. According to Marrs, the power of these groups extends as far

back as humankind's prehistory. Drawing on historical evidence and his own impeccable research, Marrs clearly traces the mysteries that connect these modern-day secret societies to the Freemasons, the Illuminati, the Knights Templar, and Egypt's Great Pyramids. The result is a masterful synthesis of historical information, much of it long hidden from the public, that sheds light on the people and organizations that rule our lives. According to Uri Dowbenko, "Rule by Secrecy" is clearly written, thought provoking, and totally entertaining. And it's the best available alternative history of Planet Earth.' Read his comprehensive review, at:

www.sightings.com/general/marrs.htm

WELSH UFO APPEAL

Readers of the UK UFO Magazine will no doubt have seen the most interesting 'flying arrow' UFO photographs, which appeared in the March/April issue. These photographs were originally taken by a couple residing in North Wales, who, according to Margaret Fry, the original investigator of the case, 'only wanted to know what they were seeing'.

Sightings of UFOs in this part of the world are surprisingly common and I would therefore be interested to hear from anyone who has experienced - or has knowledge of - UFO sightings in Wales.

Until next month my friends, take care and keep watching the skies...

Neil Spring
Email me at: Neil.spring@some.ox.ac.uk

About the Author
Neil Spring is the founding member and President of the student research group 'Open Minds', at Oxford University. His previously published material can be found at:

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~openmind>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart

From: geehart@frontiernet.net
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 12:47:39 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:36:03 -0500
Subject: Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter - Hart

>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:13:50 EST
>Subject: Re: Velez Question On John Carpenter
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Supposedly file sharing is/was a common practise and is
>done by other abduction investigators besides JC.

Robert,

Perhaps I need to be clearer here too. Sharing of case file materials should always be done with the signature of the witness to allow either the whole file with or without personal information to be shared or parts of the observational data (tabulated results, analysis of residue, etc.) to be disseminated, all for proper research purposes. MUFON guidelines require this professional process.

Can anyone argue that a signature doesn't need to be obtained in all cases? What is so hard about obtaining one? Anyone have a problem with this? I never have.

MUFON no longer desires input to their databases because investigators can avoid the sticky, inconvenient signature process by following MUFON's new policy that allows Field Investigators to keep all their files "personal" to protect MUFON itself from unethical activities of it's members.

When abduction files containing transcripts are "shared" or, God forbid, sold for profit then I expect an investigator or researcher to get a signature for permission to release anything anywhere. When you explain clearly what you wish to do with the abductee's material, how you intend to share some material with other researchers, how an abductee's privacy will be protected-it is surprising how much support abductees will give you. The abductees are the ones taking_all_the_risks here... Researchers (stop whining you guys) aren't risking anything.

Because hypnosis is a mental health issue, the serious nature of file material generated by it is at all times an ever more important issue. MUFON specifies but does not support having only professionally trained people doing hypnosis. Good original idea. Bad, even deceptive practice if persons on MUFON's board of directors bend over backwards to avoid following MUFON's own guide- lines. Geez - how can MUFON or anyone else support this morally bankrupt position?

Sharing file materials without the witness's or abductee's signature is a big no-no. It will sure as heck get you in deep doo-doo, quick.

In one Internet message someone else found, John bragged about not getting anyone to sign anything. John did not obtain any signatures from abductees except for the several he videotaped in Australia and look how he ripped them off. His verbal assurances of clinical therapeutic use only were worthless. Abductee's hypnosis files are theirs -the abductees- not a researcher's no matter where they are parked. It is impossible

to argue otherwise.

Abductees: don't let amateurs do hypnosis on you. Let a professional do it but not until you and they affix a signature to an Informed Consent statement so that you, the abductee, can hold that professional legally responsible for future unethical handling of your case material. Protect yourself or the abuse of the aliens won't be the last you experience!

Gary Hart

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Icelandic UFO Experiences?

From: David Hinson <alefnull@webtv.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:48:41 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:38:08 -0500
Subject: Icelandic UFO Experiences?

Hi,

I'm new here. I'm working on a thesis on the possible connections between UFO and fairy experiences. ISTR that belief in fairies is still fairly prominent in Iceland, and so I wonder if UFO beliefs affect fairy encounters and vice versa.

Anything on Icelandic UFOs, especially CE3 and abductions would be greatly appreciated.

David Hinson

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 19:03:56 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:40:27 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>From: Ian Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>are sadly mistaken.

Since when is exposing mendacity and fraud a "vicious personal attack?"

>Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have
>frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years
>on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly
>acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had
>the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as
>"squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think
>these attacks are likely to achieve.

I don't give a fig for what anyone in CSICOP thinks. I never considered them evil, merely close-minded and ignorant of serious factual data. I used to spar with Klass, too. What an utter waste of time!

>If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more
>government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do
>something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something
>despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to
>'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The
>circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my
>opinion, counterproductive.

I've heard this silly argument before, and now I have to ask you whether you have looked into Greer's activities and modus operandi? If you had, you wouldn't consider him merely "another" or "alternative" ufologist. Are you aware of his fraudulent claims in many areas, including the "Best Evidence" report? He and his cult are helping only to discredit serious research. He is no "colleague" of mine. This is far more than "flaws in approach."

>BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually
>gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and
>found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering
>that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a
>risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think
>he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all
>is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

Your definition of fun and mine are quite different. Fun should be innocuous; Greer & company definitely are not innocuous. To remain silent about con-men and frauds is to allow them to dominate the field and discredit everything positive we try to do. You can absolutely count on me to continue exposing fraud at every opportunity.

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Myers

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:41:10 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:44:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Myers

>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:34:07 -0700

>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:29:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

><snip>

By the way, let's not forget this is the same Steven Greer that reported a nerve gas attack on an alleged ET base in the Colorado mountains... enough is enough with Greer and the rest of the UFO fringe. No wonder we can't anywhere in Washington and no wonder UFO people are treated like nut jobs.

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III
UFOWATCHDOG.COM

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/26/01

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:36:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 10:46:19 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/26/01

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 26, 2001

**RICHARD ALLEN AND "THE DAY REAGAN WAS SHOT"
**HUMAN RIGHTS INFORMATION ACT REINTRODUCED
**NIXON MATERIALS, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, ETC.

RICHARD ALLEN AND "THE DAY REAGAN WAS SHOT"

A particularly offensive form of official secrecy involves government employees who abscond with official records and then treat them as private property, sometimes even selling them back to the public in the form of lucrative, self-serving memoirs.

This longstanding problem is highlighted anew by a widely publicized article written by Richard V. Allen ("The Day Reagan Was Shot") and published in the April 2001 issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Mr. Allen, who was President Reagan's first national security adviser, presents transcripts of the deliberations that took place in the White House Situation Room shortly after President Reagan was shot in 1981. The transcripts are derived from a tape recording "being made public for the first time, twenty years after the event."

The transcripts are certainly of great interest, considering the danger and drama of the moment. But they raise unanswered questions about Mr. Allen's possession of the recording and his authority to publish it (and presumably to profit from the publication).

"Why haven't we heard this tape before now?," Mr. Allen was asked last week on National Public Radio. "Why are you coming forward with it 20 years later?"

"Well, I think a 20-year interval is a perfectly respectable one," Mr. Allen replied evasively. He did not address the legality of his custody of the tape.

"Did you run this tape by FBI, CIA, have them listen to it?" asked NPR host Bob Edwards.

"No," said Mr. Allen. "In 20 years, I think we've long passed technologically any threats to national security."

Mr. Allen's casual dismissal of formal declassification requirements is quite ironic, noted Peter Raven-Hansen, professor of national security law at George Washington University, because it is sharply at odds with the classification policies of the Reagan Administration.

President Reagan's controversial National Security Decision Directive 84 established strict procedures to combat the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, including in some cases a requirement to submit proposed publications to prepublication review. The Reagan-era Standard Form 189

encompassed similar restrictions on "classifiable" information, i.e. information that was not classified but might have been by some conceivable standard.

Now that the shoe is on the other foot, Mr. Allen evidently could not be bothered to comply with the declassification review requirements of his own Administration -- requirements that continue to keep millions of other contemporaneous records unnecessarily classified.

(Portions of the newly published transcripts have been redacted without explanation, apparently by Mr. Allen himself. But he no longer has legitimate declassification authority.)

Not all records generated by government officials are necessarily government property. The law makes provision for "personal uncirculated records" (such as diaries) that do not have to be maintained as official documents, one official noted. But it seems clear that Mr. Allen's White House tape recording of deliberations conducted by senior agency officials was not a personal record, and thus ought to have been handled under the Presidential Records Act, which went into effect at the beginning of the Reagan Administration.

A spokesman for the National Archives and Records Administration told Secrecy News dispassionately that "NARA has an interest in these materials [i.e. the Allen tape] and we are looking into them on behalf of the Reagan Library."

Another official lamented the apparent misappropriation of public records by government employees such as Mr. Allen. "It happens every day, in every agency. We try to stop it, but it's hard."

Mr. Allen's Atlantic Monthly article is posted here:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/cgi-bin/o/issues/2001/04/allen.htm>

HUMAN RIGHTS INFORMATION ACT REINTRODUCED

The Human Rights Information Act, a bill to expedite the declassification of records relating to human rights abuses, was reintroduced on March 21 by Rep. Tom Lantos and 63 co-sponsors.

"Executive agencies are in possession of documents pertaining to gross human rights violations abroad that are needed by foreign authorities to document, investigate, and subsequently prosecute instances of continued and systematic gross human rights violations, including those directed against citizens of the United States," according to the bill.

"Only an expedited systematic [declassification] process can help ensure timely investigations of perpetrators of gross and systematic human rights violations...."

The text of the bill (H.R. 1152) is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/congress/2001/hr1152.html>

NIXON MATERIALS, FOREIGN LANGUAGES, ETC.

The National Archives announced that it will open approximately 100,000 pages of documents from the Nixon Presidential Materials Project on Thursday, April 5. "The majority of the records scheduled to be released are National Security Council materials," according to a March 23 NARA press release:

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/nara032301.html>

National security agencies in the U.S. government have an urgent need for employees who are proficient in any of several dozen foreign languages, according to an official survey. The March 2001 National Security Education Program Analysis of Federal Language Needs is posted here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2001_cr/s032201.html

Records concerning Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's considerable stock portfolio will eventually be released under

the Freedom of Information Act, Rear Admiral Craig R. Quigley told a Pentagon press briefing on March 22. "It's outrageous, your Freedom of Information policies," objected one reporter in a testy exchange. "There's no freedom of information." "I disagree with your characterization," said Adm. Quigley. See:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/2001/03/dod032201.html>

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message:

subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre

From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 15:01:48 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:00:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Webre

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>are sadly mistaken.

>Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have
>frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years
>on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly
>acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had
>the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as
>"squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think
>these attacks are likely to achieve.

>If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more
>government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do
>something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something
>despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to
>'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The
>circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my
>opinion, counterproductive.

>BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually
>gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and
>found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering
>that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a
>risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think
>he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all
>is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

Hi All - I really endorse this view. The ad hominem attacks on
Greer and Gersten are unreasonable, and detract from a
discussion of the disclosure issue.

Someone - I think Errol - cross-posted a post of mine on the
Disclosure project from another List where a reasonable
conversation was going on, and now the ad hominem has spread to
my own life. Of course, I stand fully behind my life, an
exemplary life for a 5-planet Gemini. See
<http://www.exopolitics.com>.

I had good reason for not starting a conversation on the
disclosure project on this list. There is simply too much
entrenched unreasonableness here, and positional rantings about
fellow ufologists. It is demeaning to us all, and
counter-productive to disclosure.

Thanks for listening, Alfred Webre, Vancouver, BC.

EcoNews Service - Always online for Ecology, Consciousness & Universe
Exopolitics. Vancouver, BC V6M 1V8
EcoNews <http://www.ecologynews.com/>

Prague <http://mujweb.cz/www/ecologynews/>
mailto:econews@ecologynews.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 20:37:44 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:03:20 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:44:44 -0700

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>>>From: Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>Hi Bob and Don,

>Personally, I think you both miss the point!

>I know a well-known professor of astronomy, who also happens to
>be an abductee. I have no idea whether his abduction experiences
>were of conscious value to him in discovering some of the
>astronomical anomalies for which he is famous. However, I doubt
>it.

>He was in a state of catatonic depression for several hours (to
>several days) after being returned from an abduction; so, he
>would no more be able to make a scientific assessment of what he
>saw than a 2-year old would make if remarking upon viewing his
>first full moon. WOW!

Nor would he be likely to "come out of the closet" for fear of
ending his career, another thing many people miss the point
about. If he saw a disc-shaped UFO with dome and portholes land
in his driveway, he wouldn't dare to report that either.

Sue, thanks for sharing your experiences about Greer and Co. I
have talked to several others who commented on his mercenary
tactics, his zeroing in on gullible people, etc. The affected
people need to come forth and put their comments on record. One
who used to work for him called me and unburdened herself.
However, I am not at liberty to speak for her. And gullible
people who seem to think Greer is just another ufologist in any
innocent sense need to do some homework.

I have directly confronted Webre. He obviously has a chance to
respond if he wishes, but I suspect he will have a hard time
explaining his claims and his advocacies. Any investigative
reporter worth his salt could have a field day with Greer and
Webre.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:05:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:44:44 -0700

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>>>From: Donald Ledger >dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

Sue, Greg, Don, List:

Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the 30% of UFO
reports which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

An abduction support group leader?

Somebody made a good point, recently, also made by Allen Hendry
a quarter century ago, since UFOs are not a recognized field of
scientific inquiry, somebody with training and skills in a wide
variety of disciplines is needed to do useful investigation.
Lone wolfs like this can't be found.

I'm not sure where the train of this discussion is heading, but
we aren't studying entomology, like watching the behavior of
ants outside in the grass, or anything. The number of outdoor
UFO sightings where the object drops below the horizons of the
witnesses has got to be pretty small.

I have spoken to people who watched two "UFOs" move back and
forth in the night sky for two hours. They were convinced that
they were not stars because of this movement, which was caused
by autokinetic motion of the eye muscles. The next night I asked
one to go outside and look up in the same direction that the
UFOs were seen. He admitted that there were two stars in the
same location as the UFOs had been the previous night.

I have looked into numerous reports like this over a 30 year
period. Until somebody gives me another explanation, I rate
astronomers, and ophthalmologists as leading candidates for
inclusion in the "perfect" mix of those best suited to sort out
IFOs like these.

You can pick your own piece of the puzzle and make your own
draft pick for a winning team. The problem, of course, is
getting anyone with actual scientific credentials to bother with
this stuff.

I work at a planetarium. The public asks questions about what
they see in the skies. It's natural for public astronomy
educators to take questions like this and try to provide an
answer. Research scientists and people on a university tenure
track mostly keep away, unless asked. I think that this List has
gone over this area before.

Incidentally, the number of UFO reports I get nowadays is quite small compared to, say, ten or 15 years ago. I don't know why, but in my judgement the Roswell nonsense served to peak public interest in the subject about 1997. It's been downhill since then. This doesn't mean that there aren't reports of lights the sky, but unless somebody comes up with something of a more substantial nature, this will either morph into some kind of 21st Century New New Age hobby or just continue to dwindle away. I mean, I'm 57, who the hell even remembers the late 40s and early 50s saucer flaps?

As for me, my own particular interest is in the astronomical stimuli that cause a third of all UFO reports. But, I'll tell you, sometimes it gets pretty boring getting an umpeenth jiggling star story or South American balloon sighting.

Mighty boring.

Can't we move this along a little, people?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:02:42 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:07:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch

>From: Jan Aldrich <jan@cyberzone.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:52:05 -0500

>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:48:33 -0800
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Don's UFO Repair Shop

>>Dear list:

>>Its a pity that the UFO repair shop (click on URL below) is not
>>on the level. Somebody could go dumpster-diving for broken
>>parts; i.e. physical evidence of ET technology.

><http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/>

>>The lack of street address and clear directions >how to get there
>>is a dead giveaway. Only the town (Crested >Butte, CO) is given
>>with a P.O. Box number instead.

>Larry,

>I always thought that everyone was part of the UFO cover up
>except thee and me, and sometimes I wasn't too sure about thee.
>Now I know you are the UFO Cover Up! These heroic lads at
>Don's are on to something, and you make light of them.

><http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/earthbound.html>

>Look at this. I told you about this years ago.

><http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/mar/m13-022.shtml>

>Even now, UFO Cover Up Hit Squads are probably on their way to
>Don's! They may destroy this important effort, but you are
>exposed, I am reporting you to Richard Boylan!

Hello again:

I would expect a genuine UFO repair shop to have its own domain
name as in DonsUfoRepair.com, or the like; not some URL for a
personal website.

The obviously fake drawing of the shop indicates tune-ups and
body work, but there is no indication whether they use genuine
OEM parts or some junk from disreputable second and third
sources.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Exopolitics - UFO Magazine Article

From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:16:47 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:12:49 -0500
Subject: Exopolitics - UFO Magazine Article

From UFO Magazine, Vol. 15, No. 10
December, January 2001

<http://www.ecologynews.com/cuenews3.html>

Exopolitics:
Toward A Decade of Contact
Preparing for re-integration into Universe society

by Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd

Editor's note: Alfred Webre is an environmental and exopolitical activist, based in Vancouver, British Columbia. See Webre's website at Ecologynews.com for more information about his work. His new book, Exopolitics: A Decade of Contact, is available at www.universebooks.com

VANCOUVER, B.C. In the late 1980s, I was asked to meet with a Gallup family heir who wished to explore a collaborative venture for a public opinion poll of "transformational" attitudes worldwide. Before our meeting, I half expected a dull, cautious businessman-bureaucrat. Instead, in sauntered in a brilliant imagination, a bright intellect, with the twinkle of cosmic change. This Gallup seemed more like a utopian resident of Sir Francis Bacon's New Atlantis (some interpret Bacon's unfinished work as an allegory about Earth's coming integration with a larger Universe society), rather than the stereotypical captain of corporate America. That meeting was my first expansive Gallup encounter.

A decade or so later, I once again encountered an expansive Gallup. This time my encounter was not with a scion, but with a Gallup public opinion poll. The subject matter of the poll related to my research on Exopolitics, the study of politics, government, and law in the Universe. I found the Gallup organization had compiled a public opinion poll that illuminated key terrestrial dynamics of the study of governmental structures and political processes in the Universe.

Yes, you read that sentence correctly. It did say "key terrestrial dynamics of the study of governmental structures and political processes in the Universe." Our terrestrial law of Space now ends at the upper atmosphere, or at best at the Moon. Everything beyond those near-earth orbits is, legally speaking, the Void. No living entity or system of government or law is presumed to exist there. Human law assumes that no supra-human politics or regulation exists in outer or dimensional Space.

Enter Exopolitics
Exopolitics, as a discipline for understanding Universe society through its politics and government, may turn our dominant view of the Universe upside down and inside out. As exopolitics posits, the truest conception of our human circumstance may be that we are on an isolated planet in the midst of a populated, evolving, highly organized inter-planetary, inter-galactic, multi-dimensional Universe society.

From an exopolitical perspective, Earth only appears to be isolated because we are in intentional quarantine, imposed by

the technology and justice of structured, rational Universe society. We may be isolated from the rest of Universe society as the result of a formal, Universe governmental and political process.

Are we as a planet on the verge of being re-integrated into Universe society? That's very likely. The signs are all around us. In fact, as the Gallup organization polls suggests, contemporary human attitudes about our populated Universe may themselves constitute one of the main signs of our pending reintegration into Universe society.

As with other historical transformations of human society, politics may be a key mechanism for navigating Earth's integration into Universe society. Politics is a process by which the interests of individuals, groups, and institutions will mediate, compromise, and create a collective future. Politics, however, does not end at Earth's edge. Politics is a process that is universal. Earth's integration into Universe society is occurring as part of a definable political process within Universe government. That process is part of the discipline we can term exopolitics.

The Exopolitical Majority

Does the exopolitical version of our Universe reality sound vaguely familiar to you? Does it raise a tingle along the back of your neck? Does it have the ring of truth? Or do you react to it as flaky and unscientific? Well, you can compare your own attitudes about exopolitical reality in the results of a very significant public opinion poll by, yes, the Gallup organization. This poll has profound exopolitical implications. This Gallup poll is almost like a "tracking poll" for extraterrestrial politics.

Each of our personal opinions about the reality of an extraterrestrial presence on Earth now falls along a spectrum of public opinion that has already been scientifically measured by the Gallup organization. A 1996 Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of the U.S. adult population believes there is some form of extraterrestrial life. Fully 45 percent of the adult population believes the Earth is visited by extraterrestrial life.

By extension, we may assume that public opinion about extraterrestrial visitation may be roughly the same in the other regions of the planet. The proportion of world youth that likewise believe extraterrestrials have visited Earth may be even higher than the adult population. These polls, I am sure, will be measured in the not too distant future, if they have not been measured already.

The Gallup poll now shows that nearly 100 million adult humans in the United States 45 percent of its adult population believe that Extraterrestrial civilization has visited or visits Earth.

Let's explore the political dimensions of this finding. One hundred million adults is approximately the number of U.S. adults who vote in a U.S. Presidential election! The U.S. Federal Election Commission reports that 96,277,634 persons voted in the 1996 Presidential general election.

We can assume that as a whole these 100 million adults aren't delusional, mind-controlled, or brainwashed. Our poll population can intuitively filter out those extraterrestrial "visitations" which are staged secret psychological warfare operations by human military-intelligence agencies. A more recent poll shows that 70 percent of U.S. adults believe the U.S. government is covering up an extraterrestrial presence.

By the very premises of public opinion polls, these 100 million extraterrestrial-sensitive humans are responding to something they believe is true. Down deep in their intuition they hold that extraterrestrials have visited Earth. Philosopher Immanuel Kant would call this perfectly valid intuitive knowledge. In short, human intuition is reality-oriented enough to filter out false propaganda from Universe reality.

What are the implications of the finding that more adult U.S. citizens believe extraterrestrials visit Earth than vote in a

U.S. Presidential election? Public opinion polls are prime tools in terrestrial politics. Suppose a public opinion poll were to show that 100 million U.S. adults were favor of a particular type of health care or social security plan. You can safely bet that governments and politicians (especially at election time!) would be jumping to meet these poll-driven political demands.

By contrast, a valid public opinion poll showing that 100 million U.S. adults believe there is an extraterrestrial presence is not driving any political outcomes. No mainstream politicians have defined extraterrestrial presence as a live political or public policy issue. No sizable number of citizens of any terrestrial nation are moved to call upon their local politicians or the political process to connect with the extraterrestrial presence, or study it, or even acknowledge it officially. Why is this anomaly occurring in politics and government?

You could say that a major reason for the disconnection between terrestrial politics and the extraterrestrial issue is cultural and contextual. Our modern human culture has not yet placed these issues the UFO phenomenon, extraterrestrial presence, terrestrial politics, and Universe society in the same context. Our "mainstream" collective human mind literally cannot now see how governments and politics might be connected to an extraterrestrial initiative.

But cultural context is not the whole cause. Public interest research shows that a determined covert terrestrial network may be attempting to "engineer" human attitudes toward the extraterrestrial initiative, and in turn, toward Universe society. Two principal tools of this attitude engineering are official secrecy about actual extraterrestrial contact, and a raging information war against the extraterrestrial presence. These quasi-official, secret "black operations" networks appear to be hosted largely in the anglophile countries of United States, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Coincidentally, these anti-extraterrestrial networks are in the countries that manage "Echelon," a secret Internet surveillance operation.

The recent unofficial three-year COMETA study formally suggested the hypothesis of an extraterrestrial presence as viable based on the evidence. The senior French scientists, along with former space and Air Force officials, who completed the COMETA study may be taking sides in the information war. Whether consciously or not, functionally they act as informal diplomatic allies of Universe society. The French government itself has sued the Echelon countries for industrial espionage in violation of the European Union. Thus there may be the makings of a diplomatic divide in the global anti-Extraterrestrial information war!

The anti-Extraterrestrial information war has been in place since the early 1950s. This war has no terrestrial political sanction, has not been approved by any constitutional body, and violates the norms of international law. The illegal information war is, on analysis, a principal exopolitical block to Earth's fuller integration with Universe society.

The Disclosure Movement

Not surprisingly, a public disclosure movement is emerging in North America and worldwide. Its focus is to force credible disclosure of official contact, and to stop the information war against the extraterrestrial presence. Disclosure movements have longstanding political and constitutional roots in the U.S. and elsewhere. Public interest groups have often used the political and constitutional process to make public and stop secret unconstitutional wars and programs. Such was the case in the Watergate cover-up, the Iran-Contra drug-weapons scheme, and the war in Central America (which killed more than a million persons, with questionable constitutional authorization).

Public disclosure of extraterrestrial contact and of the information war is a nexus point where terrestrial politics and exopolitics meet. To mix many metaphors, disclosure is "where the rubber meets the road." Public disclosure is how exopolitics acquires "traction" in human awareness and terrestrial politics. Disclosure is the procedural antecedent to full, sustained, institutional contact with an extraterrestrial (and multidimensional) Universe society.

Televised public legislative hearings on extraterrestrial scientific and public policy issues are a key strategic option for triggering official disclosure. The political and mass-educational impacts of an open, uncensored legislative hearing before a bipartisan, gender-balanced panel of U.S. Congresspersons could be profound.

Televised legislative and educational panels in different regions of the Earth could follow. France, Brazil and Japan are fruitful of venues for public disclosure hearings that readily come to mind. Hearings in these countries may be even more open than hearings in the U.S., the prime venue of the information war. The U.S., with only five percent of the world's population, may be serving as unwitting host for the brunt of the anti-extraterrestrial information war.

Official legislative hearings can create a credible forum for high-impact disclosure testimony and evidence. The prime function of televised public disclosure is global public education about an extraterrestrial presence. There are many concurrent disclosure activities that could provide valuable testimony and evidence for official hearings. These include high-level French participants in the three-year COMETA UFO study, as well as witnesses in Washington, D.C.-based CSETI's disclosure project (where I recently submitted testimony on a 1977 Carter White House extraterrestrial communication study).

Exopolitics: The "Alien" vs. Extraterrestrial Distinction The information war is designed to sow confused, negative human attitudes about extraterrestrial reality. Many "alien abductions" may in reality be classic psychological warfare operations, and a phenomenon of the information war. Abduction experiences may be a mixture of: 1) growth-oriented dimensional experiences of an archetypal nature, as described by Harvard Professor John Mack; 2) psychological operations by various sides in the information war; 3) MILAB or terrestrial military-intelligence operations, mimicking "alien abductions" as part of the information war (thus, many abductions may be "psy-war" phenomena of the anti-extraterrestrial information war).

From an exopolitical perspective, I use the term "extraterrestrial" to refer to organized Universe society as it exists in interstellar and multidimensional space. Extraterrestrial societies are the participants in the exopolitical process. Exopolitics is a fundamental organizing, mediating, social, and governmental process in our interplanetary and interdimensional space. Exopolitics is how a highly populated and regulated Universe governs itself.

The Exopolitics Series (soon to be available on AlienZoo.com) is designed to elicit and illustrate basic principles and dynamics of politics, government, and law in the Universe.

Towards a Decade of Contact: A Vision

How can the human population get beyond the anti-extraterrestrial conceptual traps our institutions and terrestrial leaders keep constructing for us? One way is to build a new, participatory exopolitical process whose purpose is to foment and structure humankind's preparedness to enter interplanetary society.

This participatory process is the Decade of Contact. As a society, we can dedicate a ten-year period of human education and community action around integrating Earth into Universe society. The Decade of Contact is both a process and a public attitude. Extraterrestrial contact is our doorway into re-integration with Universe society. Extraterrestrial contact is an interactive process, both with our fellow humans and with Universe society itself. Just how many decades it will take to re-establish working contact with the organized Universe seems to be partially in our own hands.

The Decade of Contact is simple and straightforward. Any individual, group, age group, institution, nation, or government can participate. Participants in the Decade of Contact commit to transform their lives, their institutional focus, and resources to re-establishing integration with organized interplanetary society. Rejoining Universe society is an exopolitical process,

and will happen only as political momentum gathers at the personal, local, regional, and global levels. The process of Universe integration may take time in lift-off, like a space vehicle starting its long journey with slow lift-off from Earth.

Mobilizing the human species to integrate with Universe society will take place in many concurrent ways. A key task is the gathering of information, research, and scientific and educational resources about Universe society. Our dominant terrestrial model of reality is functionally a legacy from the Middle Ages. Our collective new knowledge base must be assembled from an exopolitical context.

There are also important cultural components to the Decade of Contact, as human awareness builds to a critical mass. These include political movements, public events, concerts, music, art, and media to celebrate Universe society. Our reunion with Universe society is a ground of our basic human rights. The contact process transforms our civilization from within, from a terrestrial culture to a Universal one.

Transformation of human society will occur when we reach a Universe-sensitive critical mass. With approximately 45 percent of Earth's population now extraterrestrial-conscious, can critical mass be far behind?

Copyright © 2000-2001 UniverseBooks.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Body Marks - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:42:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:16:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Velez

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:53:53 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>Date: 25 Mar 2001 08:45:40 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Subject: Re: Body Marks

<snip>

>>Greg,

>>As I said in my wife's case, the triangle was equilateral. I
>>measured .9" separating the marks. I measured both with rule and
>>protractor (60-deg angles). We also phtographed these.

>>I once posted this and asked others to respond if they found
>>others with the same measurements.

>>The hypothesis here was that perhaps the marks were made by an
>>instrument with a fixed three-point penetrator and that if these
>>could be found on a few abductees that it might advance us
>>another half step forward.

>>I never received a response indicating that anyone else came up
>>with the same measurements. I have seen photos that look
>>similar, but it seems no one does the measuring.

>Hello Bill:

>That's excellent really, at least you have some hard numbers.
>Whatever the actual cause of such marks, they can at least be
>compared in a numerical sense. I have no idea why some others
>don't seem to this; its so easy and obvious

>Better yet, its safe and non-intrusive... just get out a
>dime-store ruler and a cheap plastic protractor. Heck. Even the
>crop-circle types will reel out a tape measure and take the
>diameter of those formations.

Hi Laroo, hi All,

You asked:

>Is there a sort of reluctance to take harmless measurements like
>these? Maybe its simple oversight.

Not at all Larry. I mentioned that the last time the triangle
mark appeared was 11 years ago. Long before I made any
connection between my own wierd life experiences and UFO/alien
abduction. As far as I knew I was looking at a really strange
rash or something. I showed it to my MD. But, I didn't think to
whip out a ruler and measure it. I had no reason (or so I
thought) to even think along those lines.

If/when there is ever a recurrence I'll do a number on it. I'm
ready now. Back then, no. My life consisted of getting my ass up

every day, getting into work, spending as much time with my wife & kids as I could manage, and paying my bills on time. "Aliens and UFOs" were literally "another world" and a 'world away' from the one I lived in.

I wish I could go back. Truly... ignorance is bliss.

Regards,

John Velez,

Used to be one of you. Now, I'm an abductee.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Lehmborg

From: **Alfred Lehmborg** <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:51:49 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:42:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Lehmborg

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 22:56:39 -0000

>>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: Re: C.E.: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 15:02:53 -0000

>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 19:39:54 EST
>>>>From: DIG Alfred Webre <Ecotoday@AOL.COM>
>>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM

>>>>Hi! Steve Bassett will be speaking at the National Press Club,
>>>>Washington, DC tonight, March 21, 2001 on Disclosure issues [See
>>>>below]. Steve Greer's Disclosure Project Press conference will
>>>>be at the National Press Club, to be held in early May, 2001.
>>>>The exact date to be announced shortly, which is why it has not
>>>>yet been posted. A major prestigious PR firm will be handling
>>>>press. Both Steve Bassett and myself will be participating in
>>>>Steve Greer's Disclosure process events in May.

>>><snip>

>>>Alfred,

>>>The one time I met you at NICAP decades ago I thought you were a
>>>serious, scholarly person. Now I have my doubts. How can you
>>>support this man? Have you looked into his activities and modus
>>>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

>>Dick - I am sorry but I do not remember meeting you and I have
>>no idea of who you are. There is a quality of "when did you stop
>>beating your UFO researcher" to your post which I find
>>non-professional. Nevertheless I shall answer straight-forwardly
>>why I am devoting my time to the Disclosure process - which
>>includes both the CSETI events May 8-12, 2001 and the follow on
>>UFO/ET political caucuses planned for the rest of 2001.

>Alfred,

>How extremely interesting! And how quickly they forget. This
>already tells me something about your knowledge of the UFO
>field, but your message raised a gigantic red flag to me. It
>just so happens that I have a file of correspondence with you
>(unless you have an evil twin with the same name).

You know -- seriously... enough is enough. What would you gain
in taking this kind of tone in a public forum? As it happens,
while not aspiring to some game of support for any of those
associated in this poor-man's debate and not party or witness to
any of the inevitable plethora of proprietary particulars that

the ufological anointed have woven for themselves in their anomalous boys club over the years, I think you show a little too much tooth in your rebuttal to the other Alfred, a man previously judged by you to be decidedly "serious and scholarly." Again, so that I may be clear, I do not defend the ideas of those criticized, my bone of contention is with this judging tone communicated in your writing. It is a tone I think inappropriate and so counter to eventual cultural resolution that I point it out as an example of the kind of thinking that keeps us locked up in the traditional wheel-spinning mire of intellectual complacency while real spiritual, cultural, and intellectual potential explodes around our heads like bursting shells.

>So I did an internet search on your rather unique name with >fascinating results.

Here, in the proceeding, we seem to have catalogued for our programmed dismissal a list of charges that suggest that Mr. Webre is decidedly not serious, or scholarly. I point out that your research was recent (getting to the bottom of a recent effrontery, perhaps), and the conclusions suggested are an across the grain character assassination perpetrated by Mr. Hall. Regarding fascination, I'm more fascinated by the reasons for Mr. Hall's investigation of Mr. Webre than what was found out about Mr. Webre. The reader might be more fascinated, too.

>>If you knew me as you claim, you would know that in 1977, a >>group of us was able, with the help of the Black Caucus, to get >>the HCSA (House Select Committee on assassinations started to >>investigate the JFK and King assassinations.

>Yes, I met you in 1977 when you were pushing things in the >Carter White House. It seems your interests extend to just about >every "paranoid" topic that titillates the masses. More about >that below.

Ahhh -- Now Mr. Webre is a champion of the paranoids, and might even be some pretender to the paranoid throne... Regarding the "titillated masses" I can only remark that you strike an elitist pose with that charmless assessment. The masses are the way they are not out of the intellectual inferiority that you seem to assume but the cognitive pap and manipulative con games that they receive from the corrupt institutions that pervade their lives, the dismissal and disrespect that they receive from the hyper educated, and the contrived history they learned in their short changed schools. Regarding paranoia -- where there is an actual threat there is no "paranoia". I think there is more that enough evidence to support a threat growing as we speak, and that this threat is predominate on many levels from the psychological to the ecological to the governmental. The masses are "titillated", moreover, only by their fear and mistrust of the foggy propensity and the leadership that won't tell them what it is. Check PBS and Bill Moyers this week for a clue on what I'm talking about. Anything can hide in the kind of institutional sociopathy he will expose on his program.

>>That same public interest advocacy spurs me now to seek open >>congressional hearings on the UFO/ET issue, for US Government >>witnesses - waiving secrecy rules and allowing functional >>disclosure to take place.

>Greer's and your approach will succeed in killing off any >Congressional interest. By the way, I was employed by >Congressional Information Service for over 10 years, and that >(unlike some of your claimed connections) can be documented.

I think you were another of the 'experts' that touted a three decade contribution to the investigation of the anomalous, and where have you gotten us? You seemingly have contributed little to counter well spoken tongues in the pretty cheeks of talking heads. Moreover, your suggestion that Mr. Webre can't document his connections is not proof that he can't document those connections, forgetting that for the purposes of this discussion it is not important that he can document them at all. You suggest that he can't in your oblique way. That's a pretty cheap shot for someone you once thought scholarly and serious.

>>The CSETI Disclosure project approached me in August 2000, and I >>am one of 90 witnesses whose testimony has been videotaped. I >>also submitted a sworn affidavit on the 1977 Carter White House

>>extraterrestrial study. In all my dealings with this project I
>>have experienced professionalism and thoroughness. I have also
>>watched other credible high-level witnesses, military and CIA
>>witnesses, being examined and videotaped in August 2000.

>>This is the first time I have worked with Dr. Greer and his wife
>>Emily, and I find both to be professional, and committed to
>>positive UFO/ET change. For 5 years until 1998 I administered a
>>federally-qualified community health center in the Rio Grande
>>Valley of Texas, and I have a certificate from Harvard School of
>>Public Health in administering physicians.

>Let's see, you also worked for SRI, the New York State
>Legislative Initiative, were a Fulbright Scholar and Yale Law
>School graduate who taught at Yale and the University of Texas.
>And your wife Geri is a "psychic." Have I got the right Alfred
>Webre, or is in only a coincidence that you have the same e-mail
>address?

Forgetting that you describe Mr. Webre as a pretty with-it guy,
there is no profit in the dismissal of something that you
yourself have not proven conclusively to be false. Most of that
stuff might be fake Mr. Hall. Some of it is not, I'm betting,
and that's what keeps all the rest of it burning. That goes for
most of the UFOs, most of the bigfoots, most of what's psychic,
and most of the abductee stuff. Some of that stuff is not
fake. That ought'a raise the hair on the back of your neck and
precipitate humanistic cooperation, not maiming competition. But
maybe that's part of the plan.

>>I have a basis for evaluating the conduct of physicians, even in
>>public interest advocacy. Dr. Greer's support has been exemplary and
>>professional. I am now gladly helping set up Congressional
>>appointments for the witnesses that will be coming to
>>Washington. GOAL; Congressional hearings on UFO/ET issues.

>>Not only that, I will continue to work for open hearings in the
>>political UFO/ET caucuses that are forming for the duration of
>>2001.

>>Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd
>>Vancouver, BC
>><http://www.ecologynews.com>

>A few questions: Are you the Alfred Webre who co-wrote the book
>Age of Cataclysm about coming earth changes, etc, in 1974?

Now Mr. Webre has to pay the freight of your presupposed
judgment as he provides innocent grist for a prepackaged rumor
mill. Was the book that much evidence of cognitive wrong doing
that it is thrown up in his face like the smoking gun of his
intellectual shallowness?

>Are
>those your posts on the Internet about alleged "mind control"
>experiments including the plot to elect G.W. Bush as a
>"destabilization" project?

My only surprise at this would be if it was definitely not
true. The truth of this would not surprise me. I bet the
real truth would surprise all three of us. You and your
brothers demonstrate your grasp on the aggregate craziness.
Don't be so quick with the condescending smirk. It's a
disservice all the way around.

>Did you really say those things about
>the Bilderberger conspiracy and the New World Order rantings?
>Are you the author of the E-book "Exopolitics"? How many other
>crazy ideas do you endorse?

These ideas are not crazy because you say they are. This sounds
a little like Stanton Friedman's identified "research by
proclamation."

>Read John Velez's posting about Greer the same day as yours; I
>endorse it completely. I had thought that maybe you were a dupe,
>but that apparently was too kind of an interpretation.

I've written pretty harshly on Dr. Greer myself. But as I draw
back for an alien view on this thing I see a proactive effort
from that bunch that I just don't detect from yours, whatever a

valid assessment of their ethical intention would provide. This, too, is probably too kind of an interpretation.

>Richard H. Hall

>Whose public record can completely stand up to scrutiny.

And who's to say Mr. Webre's can't. Whatever the truth is, we're still spun in circles by an unelected government, shined on by profit motivated religious organizations, and slyly manipulated by all aspects of corporate media. Anything can hide in that contrived mess. Where is your anger, irritation, and outrage at that which works so busily to keep real truth from the masses -- masses produced to be exactly what these institutions want: greedy consumers and mindless employees. Bill Gates has made billions on his vaporware, and so perhaps Dr. Greer makes a **fortune** on his vapor UFOs, but his ability to do so is encouraged by your invalid mudthrowing at Mr. Webre, someone seemingly taking a proactive stance. I reflect on how far we have gotten with the ufological elite and their comparatively inactive stance and am compelled to continue an alternative investigation. Those despised masses (me, to put a fine point on it) are not getting anything from your lot. They're compelled to look for something that MIGHT work, and not spend much more time looking at what's NOT working. Whose fault is that?

For the masses,

Lehmberg@snowhill.com

~~0~~

EXPLORE Alfred Lehmberg's Alien View" at his Hostpros URL.

<http://www.alienview.net>

Updated All the TIME

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/witches/237/lehmberg.html>

JOHN FORD RESTORATION FUND -- John will be released eventually. He'll need a tax free cash stake to get on his feet. Let's put one together for him; the bigger it is -- the more attention he gets. It could have been you. E-mail for detail. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, scourged by the scurrilous skepti-feebroids.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - Goldstein

From: **Josh Goldstein** <clearlight@t-online.de>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 03:16:59 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:45:46 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - Goldstein

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:01:09 -0500
>Subject: Dr. Leo And The New Age
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>When Lord oh when, is someone one going to do the 'work' of
>conducting a "serious investigation." If just one more of these
>side show clowns tells me that everything is ok because I'm
>getting my paradigm shifted,...

>I'm going to hurl my cookies.

>Preachers should preach,...scientists should do science. Not
>pseudo-religion. (Pseudo-philosophy)

Amen, brother John. That's exactly what I've been posting about.
I'm also sick of this kind of lunacy.

Josh Goldstein

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:39:46 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:47:26 -0500
Subject: NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars

NASA FACES LEGAL CHALLENGE REGARDING MARS

The Electric Warrior : News March 26, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0013.htm>

NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars
From: David Jinks
Formal Action Committee for Extraterrestrial Studies (FACETS)
Date: March 23, 2001

*** Demand letter first step in what could become a highly publicized, hotly contested debate over space agency's treatment of recent Mars imagery ***

Olympia, WA - A space exploration activist group, the Formal Action Committee for Extraterrestrial Studies (FACETS), has taken the first step toward possible legal action against the U.S. space agency for an alleged failure to follow through with earlier promises involving imagery of Mars acquired by the Mars Global Surveyor (MGS).

FACETS has retained the services of Arizona attorney Peter A. Gersten, best known for his successful Freedom of Information Act challenges against the National Security Agency and Central Intelligence Agency in the early 1980s.

A demand letter written by Gersten on behalf of FACETS was recently sent to NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin. The letter asks NASA to train the MGS camera on targets deemed highly anomalous by a number of scientists, including former U.S. Naval Observatory astronomer Dr. Thomas Van Flandern, former Massachusetts Institute of Technology engineer Eugene Mallove and renowned futurist Sir Arthur C. Clarke.

NASA has 30 days to respond to the letter, copies of which was also sent to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the California Institute of Technology, Malin Space Science Systems, Sen. John McCain, The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Los Angeles Times and all major television and radio news networks.

Among FACETS' complaints against the space agency are allegations that NASA encouraged withholding and misrepresentation of MGS imagery.

FACETS is currently soliciting input from all persons, particularly former or current NASA employees, who may have information relevant to the potential lawsuit. Persons interested in joining FACETS are encouraged to e-mail the group at contact@InfoSourceResearch.com.

RELATED RESOURCES

The Case of the Unseen Face
<http://www.infosourceresearch.com/current/unseen-face.html>

How NASA's use of the "catbox" image killed interest in the "face on Mars", and how Mark Kelly's corrected enhancement has revived the debate.

NASA Facing Unprecedented Legal Challenge Regarding its Position on Mars Anomalies
<http://www.infosourceresearch.com/current/nasa-challenge.html>

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 26, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0013.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

ewarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 22:07:17 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:49:08 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 01:45:32 -0500
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

<snip>

>>This is exactly right. Astronomers are qualified to say that
>>somebody's sighting sounds like it might have been Venus. But if
>>they talk about UFO sightings in general, they have no more
>>authority than anybody else. Unless, of course, they've studied
>>the subject. And even then they have no special authority,
>>except on sightings that might have astronomical causes. They
>>certainly - just for instance - have no qualifications to say
>>anything about reported close encounters.

<snip>

>Or, to diagnose abductees as "hallucinating" their experiences.
>Which is precisely what the famous psychologist Carl Sagan did
>on NOVA. Oh, I'm sorry, did I say "psychologist?" My mistake. As
>we all know, Carl Sagan was an astronomer. I just got a little
>confused because he presented his psychological 'diagnosis'
>regarding us, (abductees) on a program that was viewed worldwide
>by many, many, thousands (maybe millions) worldwide.

>If I can be 'psychologically diagnosed' by an astronomer, I
>don't think there's very much that those guys believe is beyond
>their ken. ;)

<snip>

I suggest we be careful with authority figures.

I might point out that Kevin Randle, a Ph.D. in psychology, did
express thoughts of the same taste concerning abductees. And
more...

If I recall correctly, his research was more than questionable.

I did express a few concerns at the time, pointing to the flaws
and backing up my 'thesis' with appropriate references. Never
got to the bottom of the subject as a scholarly discussion ended
in dead ears.

And to put the whole story in context, Greg Sandow did stand on
the Dr's side... against better judgement.

It is unacceptable for astronomers to pretend expertise in
psychology. It is equally unacceptable to accept 'expert'
opinions on face value.

It is also unacceptable to play the double standard game, and

back opinions of people in a public forum because it so happens that you smoke the same cigars.

I understand this part of human nature: it is not what is said but who says it that counts.

Yeah, I get that.

Ah, world, you seek comfort, not truth.

Regards,

Serge Salvaille

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Sparks

From: **Brad Sparks** <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 00:04:01 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:51:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Sparks

>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>Fwd Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 10:34:31 -0500
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Fleming

>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>are sadly mistaken.

>Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have
>frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years
>on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly
>acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had
>the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as
>"squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think
>these attacks are likely to achieve.

>If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more
>government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do
>something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something
>despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to
>'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The
>circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my
>opinion, counterproductive.

>BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually
>gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and
>found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering
>that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a
>risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think
>he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all
>is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

Is there anyone who, if they headed a Disclosure Project such
as CSETI's, their reputation and track record would ruin or
discredit it? Is it possible for someone to be so reckless and
lacking in judgment that by heading up a high-visibility project
dealing with a subject that already suffers from severe
credibility problems that even with their best good-faith
efforts can only serve to damage the credibility of the subject
further still?

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 00:08:47 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:53:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro

>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:34:07 -0700

>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:29:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

<snip>

>>>Have you looked into his activities and modus
>>>operandi? Caveat Emptor!

>Dear John V. and Dick H., Listers and New Age Wantabe Abductees:

>Maybe Alfred W. and Steve B. don't need a boost from behind from
>any of us (abductees). They're probably getting a lot of flak
>from outside the UFO community for participating with Steve G.,
>as it is. So, there must be another reason for their
>participation in Steve's on-going project. Eh?

>Based on information I've received recently from a friend and
>UFO abductee acquaintance, Steve G. is not getting the
>response he expected from the professional/abductee community
>with whom he has been attempting to solicit support (both
>financial and verbal).

>I hope Steve has stopped "calling in" UFOs with flashlights,
>etc. I think he realizes that those abductees from whom he was
>counting on support, became angry skeptibunkers of his motives
>and sincerity to help expose the Urgency and Seriousness of this
>phenom with such "off-the-wall" behavior. As to his
>self-appointed, UFO gov-rep status behavior, I have a lot to
>say.

>IF Steve G. had contacted a few of us who are professionals and
>abductees, without also requesting a financial commitment, it
>would have lent a bit more sincerity to his project. But,
>that's not what happened. He tried to lure "new age" abductees
>to his project by asking for volunteers to help "call-in" UFOs.
>He charged a lot of money for the seminars, and the New Age
>"wantabe abductees" flocked. I questioned not only his
>sincerity, but his sanity. Obviously, Steve G. isn't an
>abductee. He wouldn't be "calling 'em in" if he were. One anal
>probe or memory of a needle implant would cure him (or anyone
>else) of any new-age, wantabe abductee" status. Eh?

>BTW, I would avoid lumping Dr. Mack in with all the "New-Age"
>UFO believers (i.e., "they come in peace...to save us," etc.).
>He's had his own "hell" to live through trying to justify his
>non-abductee understanding of this phenomenon. I don't see any
>other non-abductee professionals standing up against the wall,
>risking their livelihoods, reputations, marriages and professions
>to take such a stand. Unfortunately, I feel Dr. Jacobs has a
>realistic perception of this phenomena, and Dr. Mack better
>listen to him.

>Sue

Your name is Sue. How do you do! And listers and EBK...

Is yours opinion or absolute truth? Is it fact which you are speaking or only your truth? Are others allowed to voice opinions which others do not agree? Or is it unacceptable for people to have opinions which are not in the mainstream?

If Jacobs is in your opinion correct, then why? And if others in your post are incorrect, then why? Questions. Honest questions.

I guess what I object to is the manner in which people are maligned on this List. Gersten is a jerk because he is in a more spiritual mode. OK., maybe not a jerk. Worse. And follows, Mack. And so many others.

You question Steve's sanity. Why? Because of his New Age approach or something else?

I guess I just don't understand. I do understand road rage. What I have trouble with is Internet Rage. Same thing. In my view.

Everyone is entitled to an opinion. But unless we have factual information that one man is wrong, unless we may prove out truth against someone else's and are able to call his (or her) iggerantz, "culpable," then it is the critic who is wrong and not the one being criticized.

Caveat emptor - "Yes."

Cave Canum - "No!"

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 00:14:08 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:56:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Mortellaro

>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>are sadly mistaken.

>Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have
>frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years
>on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly
>acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had
>the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as
>"squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think
>these attacks are likely to achieve.

>If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more
>government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do
>something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something
>despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to
>'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The
>circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my
>opinion, counterproductive.

>BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually
>gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and
>found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering
>that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a
>risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think
>he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all
>is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

Dear Lan, Listers and EBK:

Dylan wrote, "This world is ruled by violence." He may have been mistaken. This world appears to be ruled by people who like to take down other people. Matters not if the people taken down are attempting to do a good job. Never mind if their intentions are positive and good.

Mind only that they are in dischord with the prevailing intuit. And I don't mean them Canadian Indians either.

The spirit of ridicule is alive and well, not merely on this list and on the subject of UFO's and the abduction conundrum, but apparently, all over the planet. It's almost as if we as a culture are regressing.

In words which are adult, in language couched in literacy and erudition, among people who are considered to be mature, there is this, "Nya, Nya" sneer which many with intellectual accuity cannot abide.

Children. Only the big words and correctly structured sentences belie the child within.

The buzz words are New Age, Spirituality, Religion. There are more. But if one mentions the possible "evil intent" of the alien entities, you can almost hear the moan from certain quarters. Almost orgasmic... seemingly guttural pleasure sounds... happy to hear those words are our experts. For uttering (or writing) them means another post with which to rant, flame and criticize. Ayii, ke criticando. ('Scuse the phonetics ... I am only alas, a Guinsoid of Sicilian extraction).

It hurts me whenever I hear it. Inflicting pain on others is the worst thing which one human may do to another. When I see it or hear it, it makes me flinch with pain as if it were me hurting. And when one of us criticizes the critic, we become the target of righteous indignation.

It is the way of it. Almost akin to road rage. Perhaps I may call it "Internet Rage!" Yah. I like that.

On or about 1978 the biggest craze to hit the American road was CB radio. Fantastic achievement by the FCC that one was. They took the eleven meter Amateur band and made it the "Citizens'" band. What was interesting about it was the manner in which otherwise normal people, some, captains of industry, others just plain truckers trying to keep awake and enlightened on traffic and Smokey the Bear, conducted themselves behind the microphone.

They sounded like they owned the road. Cuss words, downright damning statements about one thing or another. But behind that mic. was just a guy. Or a gal. Otherwise, gentle souls with no axe to grind.

But put 'em behind that mic. and they became... God knows what. Experts on everything. Always right. Brave behind the microphone. Take them out of the car or truck, put them in a more normal environment where they were exposed... where their true face and body, body language, name, etc., were known, and they became reserved and, well, normal.

Seems to me to be the same scenario here on the Internet. Hide behind the keyboard and do your Internet Rage. Put them in a known environment where they are exposed and it's business as usual.

Adds bravery and gives courage, this Internet. Like Gripple. Like booz. Yup. Makes you Braveheart and stallwart son.

Fake. It's all a fake.

Jim Mortellaro
President

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 12:21:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:59:15 -0500
Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34 - Bruni

>From: Jenny Randles <MUFON@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Supplement no.34
>Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2001 20:21:31 -0000

>Sorry it was a mammoth post. My mother has been seriously ill in
>hospital for a month and I have had to travel long distances
>every day by public transport, so I had little time to work on
>an argument and resorted to just pasting a lot of text.
>I do apologise for that as I know it can be very frustrating to
>download. I'll try not to do it again.

Sorry to hear about your mother and I hope she is keeping better.

I notice the text is private correspondence between the two of us. Although I have no problem with the content because my book is now published, I do think posting private e-mails which includes text from another person, is not etiquette. Can you consider this in the future Jenny.

>I was only trying to set the record straight with regards to
>your reply to John Rimmer after he had posted the Magonia
>supplement to this list - as well as to indicate that there is
>no mystery about either Bob Easton or Kevin McClure.

I was sure there was no mystery, but Kevin McClure thinks there is and from where I am sitting, it looks like he is saying that I made a mistake and that he is Bob Easton. My argument was that if this is the case then why did you and your co-authors use the name of Bob Easton. I now understand that this is a misunderstanding on McClure's part so thanks for explaining this.

>I certainly am not meaning to have another 'dispute' with you
>over this relatively inconsequential matter. So I hope you don't
>take offence. It is not intended. Generally I thought you
>covered the history of the early days of this case pretty well
>in your book.

No Jenny I do not take offence and thanks for the compliment.

>I had already advised Magonia of the problem via another list -
>as they will confirm. As soon as the supplement appeared (before
>it was posted onto Updates in fact) I had pointed out that Kevin
>McClure supposition about Bob Easton being a pseudonym was, in
>fact, incorrect.

Well that's sorted then. Let's hope McClure and Magonia make corrections concerning the alleged error in my book.

Your quote on McClure is pretty accurate by the looks of it:

'The other was Kevin McClure, who was a specialist in how rumour developed'

What can I say!

Best wishes

Georgina Bruni

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 01:57:35 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 17:56:42 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

>Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2001 04:54:29 +0000
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>Dear Colleagues,

>I am happy to announce that Larry Hatch has won the Lost Haven
>book quiz.

>The question was: What was the Medieval date that the Citizens
>of the Swiss town of Basel described seeing strange globes in
>the sky?

>The Answer: 07 August, 1566,

>Larry will be receiving his book prize in due course.

>To answer the new quiz question go to:

><http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

Hello Roy!

Just a quick note to say thank you, I have received the surprise
book; Graham Hancock, The Mars Mystery.

It will take some time to read it of course, and a quick scan
indicates I might not find it the epitome of credibility.
(Cydonia, pyramids on Mars, reinvented astronomy etc., etc.)

I hope I didn't hurt anyone's feelings with my careless
references to cattle diseases. Frankly, ranchers here are scared
shitless of both plagues, now much in the news.

Very best wishes in any case!

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Bolivian Air Force Jet Pursues UFO

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 07:10:04 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:00:10 -0500
Subject: Bolivian Air Force Jet Pursues UFO

SOURCE: Diario La Prensa (Bolivia)
DATE: March 27, 2001

Object seen between Cochabamba and La Paz: Air Force jet chases
UFO for 30 minutes

A number of hypotheses which sought to explain the appearance of an unidentified flying object (UFO) in the skies of Bolivia were systematically discarded by air traffic controllers in La Paz and Cochabamba, as well as by commercial and military pilots.

The first sighting of the flying object took place near the city of Cochabamba over the Tunari National Park around 7:30 a.m. Following a sequence of rapid movements interrupted by minutes of static flight, the object reached the city, over which it remained until 8:25 a.m.

Eyewitness accounts coincide on the description: a spherical object with a metallic sheen which could not be completely identified due to its sporadic movement. Only minutes before 9 a.m., an object with similar characteristics to the one described by the citizens of Cochabamba was seen over the city of El Alto. Alarmed to the phenomenon, the Bolivian Air Force (FAB) ordered the scramble of a T-33 jet which unsuccessfully tried to approach the object.

"It was a brilliant, metallic-colored sphere, but we could not determine what type of object it was," reported Major Luis Arzabe Torrico, the T-33's pilot, who explained that although his military jet was able to reach an altitude of 42,500 feet, the object maintained the same vertical distance in regard to the aircraft as it did during the jet's takeoff. Minutes after the FAB jet landed at the El Alto Air Base, the object vanished.

Several commercial airliner pilots plowing the Lima-La Paz and Cochabamba-La Paz route reported seeing a large object (considerably larger than a passenger aircraft such as a Boeing 747) to the El Alto tower. The object was also picked up by the television cameras of at least two local stations.

Air traffic controller Jorge Wilstermann in Cochabamba advised that no information had been gleaned on the case, although a technician from that region told the FIDES News Agency that "radars were unable to identify the type of vehicle crossing the skies."

Several people tend toward identifying the object as a weather balloon, but its speed and altitude do not lend credence to this hypothesis. It was also proven that no test flights of any kind were reported in either Cochabamba or La Paz.

#####

Translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Gloria Coluchi

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Further Details On UFO Pursuit By Bolivian Jet

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 07:31:09 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:02:46 -0500
Subject: Further Details On UFO Pursuit By Bolivian Jet

SOURCE: El Diario, Jatha and ANF
DATE: 03.27.2001

Aircraft tried to reach UFO

A military T-33 aircraft belonging to the Bolivian Air Force (FAB) made an unsuccessful effort at intercepting a UFO that soared high over the skies of La Paz.

Toward 09:00 hours, residents of El Alto saw a brilliant object with uncommon characteristics flying over the vicinity of the El Alto International Airport. "I have no idea of what it could be, perhaps with more sophisticated instruments available to the human eye, we could provide evidence as to its nature," said a local resident as he saw the UFO.

Residents of El Alto claim that it was the first time they had seen such a brilliant object in the sky. "It was like a diamond," they remarked with surprise.

Air traffic control personnel from the Aerial Navigation Auxilliary Services Airport Administration (AASANA, in Spanish) stated that a report had been received from Cochabamba concerning a UFO over the region. A functionary added that after 10 minutes of having received the report, the object was seen over La Paz and that a Fighter Group was scrambled to establish positive identification. "This is the first time we have had any visual contact with a UFO," said the functionary.

Col. Carlos Antelo of the Second Air Brigade of the Bolivian Air Force (FAB) headquartered at Cochabamba was at a loss to explain the event which, according to witnesses, involved a circular white spot which halted and moved at high speed. When the object was seen from El Alto, the FAB did not hesitate to order the takeoff of a T-33 aircraft. Maj. Luis Arzabe Torrico piloted the craft for more than half an hour without being able to identify it.

Upon returning to the base, the military pilot said that it was not possible to identify the aircraft and that the vertical distance between his jet and the UFO remained the same since the moment of takeoff. He explained that the reached an altitude of 42,500 feet and was still unable to make out the object's configuration.

Arzabe said that the UFO, according to AASANA, was at a height of 2.8 over the start of the El Alto runway and at an altitude of 25,000 feet prior to the military jet's takeoff. "After 20 minutes of flight time when we reached the 3.50 level, the object was at the same distance, in other words, it maintained the same vertical separation from us since takeoff", he explained.

"It's shape was not clearly made out. It was a brilliant sphere with a metallic sheen we believe comes from solar reflections. The object type has not been determined despite having reached the 4.25 level," he added. The pilot noted that the object was static at times and then moved slowly away. The UFO vanished from the skies of La Paz only few minutes after the Fighter

Group's interceptor descended without having been able to reach it. The authorities at the AASANA tower reported that no information had been secured about the event, although a technician had stated that "radar was unable to identify the type of craft moving across the sky."

Researcher Denis Sanchez explained that from the moment that the unidentified object was reported, permanent measurements were made through high density telescopes up to 32 magnifications. He said that the object's figure resembles that of a high altitude balloon, and is reminiscent of the experiments carried out in other countries to measure the atmosphere, which have similar configurations. "Given its permanent mobility at over 42,000 feet, they can easily be at any location, although they are generally controlled by ground equipment. Judging by its figure at 10 tenths of a degree, we suppose that the object measures between 10 and 15 feet in diameter," he noted.

#####

Translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special thanks to Gloria Coluchi.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Body Marks - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 27 Mar 2001 06:47:27 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:05:31 -0500
Subject: Re: Body Marks - Hamilton

>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Body Marks
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 17:48:02 -0700

>>Date: 25 Mar 2001 08:45:40 -0800
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>From: Bill Hamilton <skywatcher22@space.com>
>>Subject: Re: Body Marks

>>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Body Marks [was: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA]
>>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 10:36:22 -0500

>>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 16:06:08 -0500
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins Lectures At MUFON-LA

>Dear Greg, Bill and John, EBK and other Listers,
>My father had a constant red triangle on his upper right thigh,
>visible only when he wore shorts. I thought it was a birth mark.
>I think that's what he called it. I used to get 'em on my back,
>near my right shoulder blade, but I thought they were sun-burn
>rashes (or something).

>Personally, I think they're getting better at leaving no marks
>or scars. I had x-rays of my lower back in 1992, which showed
>nasty looking bone spurs about 4" long growing on either side of
>my 3rd lumbar vertebrae.

>Then, in June or July, 1996 I had a "dream" about the ETs asking
>me if I would allow them to do surgery on my back to fix it. I
>vehemently said, "NO!" I remember laying down sideways on their
>examining table, suddenly very sleepy. I closed my eyes and a
>nanosecond later woke up, sat up (with some help from
>them)...still arguing about not wanting them to do surgery. I
>was allowed to get down from the table, walk from our bathroom
>(their much larger examining room), climb into bed and go back
>to sleep. I remembered the "dream" the next morning, thinking it
>was another "check-up" visit. I even wrote John V. about it
>shortly after it happened.

>Just last October, 2000, I had my back x-rayed again. The bone
>spurs are gone! I tried to get the 1992 back x-rays sent to my
>doctor here. They sent the mammogram x-rays instead, and said
>they couldn't find the other ones! There are no scars...just a
>couple of dimples on either side of my spine, where there
>apparently weren't any dimples before. My husband noticed the
>dimples. He also found the cancerous lump in my left breast. I
>attribute the dimples to old-age and over-weight. I don't see
>any scars. I may be in denial (again). It works great,
>sometimes.

Sue,

This is very interesting as I had a case involving a friend at

MUFON-LA who had something in her left breast. The doctors wanted to perform a biopsy to determine if it was a cancerous tumor.

She was scheduled for the procedure, but before it was undertaken, she experienced a night-time visit from the aliens and when she kept her appointment at the hospital, another X-ray revealed that the object thought to be a tumor had vanished.

She presented me with before and after medical documents on this.

Bill Hamilton

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 12:03:50 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:10:20 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 06:24:17 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 01:46:35 -0500
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>>>Date: Fri, 23 Mar 2001 12:30:18 EST
>>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Could the whole abduction/ET thing be travelling further and
>>>further along the wrong road, getting further and further away
>>>from the phenomenon it is trying to explore?

>>Hi Karoline, hi All,

>>I don't pretend to know what's really going on. I can only speak
>>for myself and say that my conclusions regarding UFOs and
>>"aliens" are based on (first person) Life experiences with them.

>>_I_have_no_other_choice_.

<snip>

>>"What's a poor boy to think!" ;)

>I totally accept that.

>I am not suggesting for a minute that nothing happened to you,
>or that you just imagined it, or whatever.

Hi Karoline,

*Listers: Looooong one ahead. Karoline's response was long and she raised many points that I wish to address. Unless you're a 'hard core' List junkie, move on to the next post. You've been duly warned. ;) JV

You write:

>But the simple facts of what you have here is your sighting of
>some kind of weird glowing thing, followed by a huge chunk of
>missing time and inexplicable physical injuries. We can make a
>reasonable guess that these things all fit together in some way
>- but _how_ they fit together we just have no clue.

That's not really true. You can't isolate me or my 'case' from the many hundreds/thousands of others worldwide. There are folks from all corners of the globe who are not only reporting the same kinds of events involving "UFOs" and "critters," but in many instances the same sequence of events. Those reports cannot/should not be ignored at the expense of the rest. It would be throwing out the baby with the bath water.

>The assumption made by Budd Hopkins and many others in such
>cases is that the glowing object was a craft of some kind and
>the missing time and physical injuries were inflicted by beings
>from another planet somewhere in our galaxy.

I cannot speak for any others but as for Budd,....

Karoline I worked very closely with Budd for many years. For a large portion of that time we were also good friends. There is not a whole lot that he didn't share with me (in terms of his own thoughts and feelings regarding abduction) in all that time. I also got to watch him when he was 'working' with others on many occasions and under many varied conditions.

Budd has never said in public, or in private, that the abductions are definitely being, "inflicted by beings from another planet somewhere in our galaxy." Which is not to say that he does not -speculate- that these reported "non-human" beings may not be "from here." It is a reasonable speculation in consideration of the information that is being provided to him by the experiencers.

This next comment is important and I cannot say it enough times:

Folks labor under the delusion that Budd (or other researchers) somehow 'dictate' or 'plant' the conditions or details of the abductions. And that the abductees then come along and 'parrot' them back to Budd. That's 'bass ackwards.'

That's not how it works. Or how Budd works. I'm not playing apologist for Budd either, I'm telling it like it is. I was observing his every move like a Hawk and watching for any signs of "leading" or "suggestion" and I never once saw evidence of it. Budd "earned" my respect through his actions, words, and deeds over a period of almost 6 years of very regular contact. Believe me, if he wasn't on the 'up and up' I would have busted him long before all that time had passed. Nobody as 'pathological' as Budd would have to be, (if the things that are said about him were true) would be able to keep up the charade (successfully) for so many years and under so many different circumstances.

So, the way it works is:

We come to him and report what is happening to us. He then bases his assessments and conclusions (and books) on the information and details that [we are providing to him.] For reasons I cannot explain, some folks have a penchant for reversing the actual order of things. The truth is,...

Budd "parrots" what we tell him! ;) Not the other way around.

>But what tends to be forgotten is that equally well it might
>not. The glowing object could be an ET craft, but it could be
>almost anything else as well - from a portal into another
>dimension to a strange kind of plasma ball which induces vivid
>mind-experiences so intense they actually cause physical
>injuries to occur (in a way similar to the creation of stigmata
>and other mentally-induced physical damage).

If you or Dr. Persinger can please explain to me how a "plasma ball" can leave behind physical evidence (that to a trained physicians eye) resembles the work of a surgeon, (and deep inside my sinuses mind you,) I'm all ears.

Karoline, it's ok to speculate that it 'could be' this, or it 'could be' that, but at some point you have to narrow your options and go with the strongest 'contenders.' In the case of abductions we have reports of "craft" which demonstrate flight and motion characteristics unlike anything known on earth. The reports of the occupants although varied, are usually of "non-human" entities. These "entities" can demonstrate abilities which are (again) unknown to us as human beings. (ie; telepathy, mind control, the ability to physically control a human being at will, to pass through solid objects, float rather than walk, etc., etc.)

Non-human ET craft and activity isn't the only possibility, but damn if it isn't the best one on the block. At least in terms of

fitting/explaining what so many of us (witnesses) recall happening to us over our lifetimes.

I'm not stupid or gullible by any stretch of the imagination. I'm telling you that as "far out" as the ETH sounds, it is the one and only theory I have ever heard that fits what myself and others have been experiencing to a tee. Nothing else I've heard even comes close.

To be perfectly frank with you, I think a hallucination producing plasma ball is far more implausible than the ETH. But then that's just me and my own opinion. Maybe ET sounds more way out to you than plasma balls that can trick someone's mind (and do it consistently from person to person) into having the "same" hallucination -no matter 'who' is exposed to it.

Think about it.

Honest, I don't know 'what' it all really is, or represents, but I have to go where the evidence leads me. For now,...ETH is the best "meat on the table" at least in terms of actually fitting what we, (abductees) are reporting.

>It could be anything, and most of the things it could be are >probably too strange for us to even imagine.

I agree. But then maybe it isn't. Maybe it's a case of, 'what you see, is what you get.'

>All you have - all any of us have to whom the impossible seems >to occur - is the bare fact of the event. These things DID >happen to us. But no one on this earth can tell us what that >means, no matter how much we want them to.

I'm not searching for a "meaning." I want answers. And ones that I can rely on if possible. For 'meaning' I turn inward, not outward.

>We want to be told there is an answer, a label, a name. We want >to listen to someone telling us we are 'abductees' or 'past life >experiencers', or 'remote viewers' or whatever. It's so >reassuring to be given an answer, even a scary one.

Speak for yourself. Personally I don't have any of the "needs" that you are ascribing to yourself or abductees in your statement. I learned to think for myself and make up my own mind many, many, moons ago.

>But the danger is the label becoming more important than the >reality; the man-made explanation obscuring or even re-shaping >the hard reality of the event.

That's true if you are 'unsure' of either yourself or the experiences themselves. It just doesn't happen to be the case with me.

>As I mentioned last time, if I experience missing time and 'wake >up' remembering a strange house from long ago - with images of >an owl reaching through the window to get me, and of talking to >people in powdered 18th C wigs - and if I have scratches all >over my body that were not there before my 'absence', naturally >the first thing I want is someone to tell me what the hell is >going on.

You betcha. Especially if it involved UFOs and aliens instead of strange houses and powdered wigs. But then we're discussing UFOs and aliens, not old houses and powdered wigs. ;)

>I am vulnerable. My mental parameters have been smashed flat by >perceptions and physical experience I have always believed to be >impossible I am desperately in need of reassurance, for someone >to say 'it's okay, we know what this is'.

If you concentrate on grounding yourself solidly within your self, your 'vulnerability' and 'need for reassurance' will disappear along with your fears like leaves in a strong wind.

Anchor yourself within yourself there is no force in the Universe that will be able to move you from that spot. True.

>In the present climate the primary 'orthodox' explanation on

>offer for my experience, would probably be - alien abduction.
>The scratches, the missing time, the imagery of the owl
>certainly seem to fit into that paradigm, don't they?

They do only if they also include waking, conscious contact with UFOs or non-human beings. That would kind of 'narrow the field' for you. As it is, what you describe sounds like it could just as well be a dream and nothing more. Is whatever happened to you something that happened while you were awake and going about your daily business? Or did you "dream" it? Did you encounter a UFO? Have you had any contact with what appears to be non-human beings? That, for me would make the difference.

>But what about my big old house? what about my images of talking
>to human beings who are now dead? Is there anyone to offer any
>kind of answer to that?

Karoline I studied with people who identified themselves as "Mystics" for seventeen years. For the kinds of experiences that you are having you need to consult a psychologist or to investigate what is known about such psychic phenomena. Or, to talk to an occultist/mystic who is familiar with the literature and traditional theories and teachings about such phenomena. I know nothing of "speaking to the dead" or what the image of the "big house" may be or represent.

If you had told me that you encountered a strange craft, and that the occupants didn't appear to be human, or that some kind of contact or interaction ensued that left behind physical traces, and we'd be having a different conversation.

Maybe you need to be investigating something other than alien/UFO abduction as an explanation for your own experiences. I'm not dismissing the possibility that it may all be abduction related, only that your options are much more open than are my own given what I have experienced. (Lived through)

>So if I want to get myself an
>explanation, feel a sense of identity with others who have
>suffered like me, I might easily be persuaded that my big old
>house was actually a misremembering for a big new space ship,
>mightn't I? And the powdered people - a screen memory for greys.

Yeah, if you're mindless, gullible, and easily swayed. Otherwise, who is there that can convince you that 'square' is 'round.' ;)

>So, in effect by imposing a probably false 'understanding' on my
>experience, I (and everyone else) lose any chance of ever truly
>understanding it.

Not if you're sure of yourself, and you work actively to maintain an open mind. You have to be able to live with open questions. Something which goes against the the grain. It takes effort and strength of character and conviction to do so. Not for the weak.

>Isn't there plenty of evidence to suggest this is actually
>happening? Aren't there dozens if not hundreds of 'non-typical'
>cases which while containing elements of 'abduction' experience
>(scars, missing time, whatever), also contain elements that
>suggest explanations very different from nuts and bolts space
>craft from another planet. Guys in stetsons for example, or
>people who seem to be from the past; or just plain wacky stuff
>that doesn't look like anything sensible at all?

There's that too. But it doesn't detract one iota from the 'hard core' of cases that report UFO/alien contact and abduction.

>I mean - what if the whole ET idea is totally wrong? And what if
>my 18th C house is actually a rare but telling clue to the
>origin of this whole phenomenon, which if followed up might
>solve everything - and instead of investigating it we discard it
>- because it doesn't fit our current theory?

>What then?

Then we'll join a List that discusses that phenomenon and we'll try to sort it all out together. Much as we are doing here. Until then, you'll find me right here on ->(UFO)<- UpDates. ;)

Warmest regards,

John Velez
Hard Cheese

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 13:28:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:12:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Salvaille

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>>I have added some comments to this discussion as it has
>>developed. I'm still not certain how this idea of a council
>>compares with methods of peer review used in scientific
>>disciplines, particularly with the ubiquitous nature of the
>>internet. I know that things are changing rapidly in the way
>>science is being reported and reviewed.

<snip>

>In reality this was not suggested as a scientific analysis of
>the UFO evidence, but a process whereby Ufology should determine
>the cases that it considered strongest in support of the ETH.
>After doing that it could 'then' submit them to science for
>their scrutiny - during which time science could follow whatever
>process it deemed appropriate.

<snip>

Don't you think a Scientific Panel would be a better idea? If
this is open to discussion (it is, isn't it?), it is quite
natural that your Council idea evolves following input from
multiple and diverse sources.

I, for one, have proposed the formation of a group with
pertinent scientific credentials to get scientific credibility.
With Bob Young, this makes two of us.

<snip>

>I only at first suggested creating a mini net list formed of
>those participants who were in some way given a mandate by their
>peers to agree upon cases that they considered most appropriate
>to submit to science. And that the list be comprised in equal
>numbers of: pro ETH Ufologists, uncommitted Ufologists,
>skeptics and outside scientists who were willing to take part in
>the debate but had no axe to grind on UFOs beyond an interest in
>seeing what evidence there was.

>The point never was - so far as I was concerned - to create a
>panel that would produce a scientifically watertight bunch of
>cases which could be thrust in front of the world with the words
>'see - we told ya' appended. Simply a selection process from
>within Ufology to find those cases that the community regards as
>most supportive of the ETH and submit them to science for their
>assessment.

>So I am a little baffled as to where this need for the 'peer

>review' of science comes into things.

<snip>

Again, is your proposal definitive?

Maybe we should rephrase the Council proposition:

"Let's create a panel that would produce a scientifically watertight bunch of cases which could be thrust in front of the world with the words 'see - there is something there' appended."

Who would be against that?

<snip>

>No person - however
>experienced as a Ufologist - is going to know which cases
>support the ETH or those that will even give science cause to
>think that they might.

<snip>

This may be the first mistake.

Maybe we should present the data and simply get it 'acknowledged' by science. So far, ufology has failed to even accomplish that.

We need to get to cross the street if we want to get to the moon.

<snip>

>So who peer
>reviews this data within Ufology given that its main aim is not
>to come up with the strongest, best investigated cases, per se,

<snip>

Maybe we should sit down and do some brainstorming and ask simple basic questions:

1. What is the purpose of the Council?
2. What should be the purpose of the Council?
3. In what way should the Council operate to achieve the desired purpose?
4. What structure?
5. What modus operandi?
6. Who?

<snip>

>So - what I suggested was simply a rounded and democratic way
>for Ufology to define which cases it felt it should submit as
>primary candidates to science.

<snip>

A great idea. And your primary target is science.

<snip>

>A process that would in of itself
>be a useful step regardless of whether science took any of them
>seriously, laughed them all out of court or - more likely -
>found them sufficiently inconclusive as to hedge their bets.

<snip>

There is a contradiction here. The means must fit the goals.

Since you have some doubt with the method, maybe we should think of a better method.

Who knows what could come up?

<snip>

>The latter part of the experiment is down to science and what
>they do with the data.

<snip>

The first part of the experiment is us and the latter part is science. Since we're somewhat trying to sell a product, it should undoubtedly be tailored to the client's needs.

<snip>

>It has been interesting - though - to see how some have read
>other motives into what I argued. Or how the concept is being
>misunderstood in ways that might suit individual interpretations
>of the phenomenon.

>But I wanted to make clear (if I hadn't done
>already) that this was never my idea to turn Ufology into a
>science or to define evidence that will stand up to scrutiny .

<snip>

This may not be your idea. Is it because it is unfeasible? Or is it because it is undesirable?

If it is desirable, then is it possible to devise a procedure that could at least place ufology within striking distance?

<snip>

>Of course, we have to bear these ideals in mind when deciding
>upon the cases to be referred. But in essence this is an
>exercise in clear thinking by the UFO community.

>It comes down to one basic question - really - if a majority of
>people in the UFO world support the ETH as the most likely
>solution to the unsolved cases (and I think that they do) then
>it is proper to ask that we spell out the cases that most
>persuade the majority of that view. Then we can turn these over
>to science for their opinion on how well these do - in fact -
>support the ETH.

>Seems a simple enough idea to me, and one that after we have
>done this experiment leaves us knowing more than we know right
>now - one way or the other.

<snip>

A good plot in need of some tweaking.

Is there a way to use the List of to structure a thread that would allow evaluation and establishment of a basic proposal?

<snip>

>>I think that Jenny's proposal to float something to the UFO
>>Skeptics List for more idead is a good one. I'd like to see what
>>is suggested.

>Some already seem to have made up their mind - based on what I
>have seen on there. But I do intend to post something and try to
>'win their support' as they probably do not understand what the
>point of all this is as yet.

<snip>

This aspect of the question has annoyed me from the beginning.

This is not a theology debate - although ufology is in need of devil's advocates.

Skeptics are not a 'faction' of ufology, no more than newagers are a 'faction' of psychology.

Granted, there is a group a people who proclaim themselves skeptics in relation to ufology. These people negate even the existence of any phenomena. In this regard, they do not differ from the proponents of a flat Earth, who BTW are not a 'faction' of geography.

We should seek the other - the true - skeptics: people who are highly critical of all material concerning ufology, their interest stemming from the notion that, all considered, 'there is something out there'.

If these are the 'skeptics' you are referring to (and are they really the ones you are referring to?) I don't think you need to beg for their attention. You do need their approval though, as for the goals, the means and the methods.

<snip>

>As I have explained before owing to my mothers serious ill
>health my time is at a huge premium right now and its all I can
>do answering a couple of messages a day. So please bear with me.

<snip>

Sorry about that.

Regards,

Serge Salvaille

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

UFO Materials Wanted For Local School

From: Philip Mantle <pmquest@dial.pipex.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:50:46 +0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:16:35 -0500
Subject: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School

Dear All,

I wonder if you might possibly be able to help me. In recent weeks I have been involved at Batley Boys High School in West Yorkshire, who run their own 'Mystery Club' in their own time. So far I have made one presentation at the school with others planned.

Most of the boys involved in the 'Mystery Club' are at the bottom end of the educational ladder, and until they showed an interest in the UFO subject their teachers were hard pushed to get them to put pen to paper. When it comes to UFO's, there seems to be no stopping them.

It is hoped of course that this will overlap into their normal academic studies and I have offered to do all I can to encourage this.

Like most schools the one thing they are short of is resources. I personally have already donated a number of items including books, video's, posters etc, but they require many more. I will be going through my own collection of such material to see what else I can donate that I feel will be suitable for their age range (11 - 13).

I would therefore like to ask if any of you would like to contribute any kind of UFO resource material that you think might be appropriate. This could be books, video's, CD-ROMs, DVDs, posters, badges, in short, just about anything.

If you have any such items I can assure you that it would be greatly appreciated by all of the boys.

The success of the 'Mystery Club' at Batley Boys High School seems to have been a great success so far with interest being shown from two other local high schools as well. I have already offered my spare time to help here as well.

I'd like to thank you for your kind assistance with this request and if you require any further information please do not hesitate to ask.

Yours Sincerely,

Philip Mantle.

PLEASE RE-POST.

Philip Mantle,
1 Woodhall Drive, Batley, West Yorkshire, England, WF17 7SW.
Tele: 01924 444049. E-mail: pmquest@dial.pipex.com
www.beyondroswell.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Jacques Vallee?

From: **Thiago L. Ticchetti** <thiagolt@opengate.com.br>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:52:15 -0300 (BRT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:18:54 -0500
Subject: Jacques Vallee?

Hello,

I would like to get in touch with Mr. Vallee. Does someone have his contact?

Regards,

Thiago Luiz Ticchetti
vice-chairman EBE-ET

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 15:56:28 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:20:16 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Young

>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 17:04:46 -0500
>Subject: UFO Over Arica, Chile
>From: Scott Corrales <lornisl@juno.com>

> SOURCE: La Estrella de Arica, Vol. 25,
>DATE: March 25, 2001

>UFO SEEN OVER ARICA

<snip>

>The phenomenon made itself visible around 18:00 hours, when
>dozens of citizens raised their eyes skyward to look at it and
>wonder aloud what it could be; many of them rapidly reached the
>conclusion that they were in the presence of a UFO. At that
>time of day, the object had the appearance of a first magnitude
>star with a glow similar to that of the planet Venus, but
>whitish or metallic in color, and moved slowly toward the
>southwest (headed toward the sea). As the sun vanished below the
>horizon, the object's glow diminished and its color turned to
>red before disappearing only a few minutes after 19:00 hours.

>The public gathered around a photographic and optical equipment
>shop located at the corner of 21 de Mayo and Patricio Lynch
>streets, where people stood in line to catch a glimpse of the
>object through a telescope. Those lucky enough to see the object
>thus aided described it as "a cup without a handle and a
>dangling thread" or "a cup without a base and a very narrow
>foot."

<snip>

>The fact that the object vanished almost simultaneously before
>the eyes of those seeing through telescopes and those seeing it
>unaided suggests that it disappeared because it stopped shining,
>rather than due to distance. Furthermore, the gradual manner in
>which this happened, and the time at which the incident occurred,
>leads to the conclusion that the object wasn't self luminous,
>but rather reflected the sun's light.

>Given the witnesses' description and the object's slowness and
>deliberate movement, many thought that it could be a balloon.

Scott:

What reasons can you list why this could not be considered a
balloon?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: UFOs And People? - Maccabee

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:12:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:22:06 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs And People? - Maccabee

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: UFOs And People?
>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:49:28 -0500

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 02:01:15 EST
>>Subject: UFOs And People?
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>What Is It About UFOs And People, Anyway?

>>Pop, Mom and an aunt saw a UFO with me not terribly long ago.
>>They don't like to speak about it because, well, frankly, they
>>really don't believe that what they saw could possibly have been
>>what they saw. Really!

>>It was real to them. They saw it. We discussed it afterwards. We
>>each described what we saw. There weres no discrepancies among
>>us. It was there. It flew off. It was huge. It was a triangular
>>object more than a football field large apex to apex. It had
>>lights all over it. It was hovering over our lake across the
>>street. Westchester County. Just like Imbrogio and company
>>described in their book about the Westchester Triangle. >

<snip>

>>Pop cannot believe his senses. Mom does, but does not wish to
>>upset pop. He is going to be 89 in August. My aunt is just too
>>terribly shy to speak about it, as her religious intensity
>>disallows any such discussion as even a possible reality.
>>Another aunt and her son, also witnesses, cannot bring
>>themselves to admit it, even in friendly counsel such as a
>>>openers.

>>The problem is profoundly interesting and should be made part of
>>the research of this phenom. For it points to what must be very
>>large numbers of people who have seen a UFO or even had what
>>they perceive to have been an abduction experience. I am pretty
>>well convinced that a good deal more people have had the
>>experience than will ever admit. Maybe the survey which was
>>supported by Hopkins was not so far off base after all. And
>>maybe Jacobs is not terribly far off the mark either. Especially
>>if the above is true.

>>Maybe not.

>>In conclusion, there is as usual, no conclusion. Nothing else is
>>revealed. Not in this post. So what? Why the hell should I be
>>any different than the rest of you researchers?

>>Huh?

>This one was profound...an uncomfortable but inevitable truth...
>I was glad to read it.

Long ago I realized the existence of this phenomenon which is related to the "Emperor Has No Clothes" Syndrome.

You refer to the Ultimate cover up, before which all other cover-ups pale....

I have mentioned this many times in the past (in lectures) and now once again refer to the (gulp! shudder! Oh, the wormwood and the gall.....)

*****SELF- cover up!*****

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:16:32 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:23:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100
>Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 09:03:49 -0500
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Jenny, Dick, Brad, List:

>>I have added some comments to this discussion as it has
>>developed. I'm still not certain how this idea of a council
>>compares with methods of peer review used in scientific
>>disciplines, particularly with the ubiquitous nature of the
>>internet. I know that things are changing rapidly in the way
>>science is being reported and reviewed.

>In reality this was not suggested as a scientific analysis of
>the UFO evidence, but a process whereby Ufology should determine
>the cases that it considered strongest in support of the ETH.

Jenny:

OK, I follow.

>After doing that it could 'then' submit them to science for
>their scrutiny - during which time science could follow whatever
>process it deemed appropriate.

Why would skeptics need to be included if "the science" comes
later? I'm confused.

<snip>

>The point never was - so far as I was concerned - to create a
>panel that would produce a scientifically watertight bunch of
>cases which could be thrust in front of the world with the words
>'see - we told ya' appended. Simply a selection process from
>within Ufology to find those cases that the community regards as
>most supportive of the ETH and submit them to science for their
>assessment.

In all due respect, I'm not sure that there is a difference,
except in the way that you've worded the two ends of the
paragraph.

>So I am a little baffled as to where this need for the 'peer
>review' of science comes into things.

Sorry. My confusion, I guess.

<snip>

>But I wanted to make clear (if I hadn't done
>already) that this was never my idea to turn Ufology into a
>science or to define evidence that will stand up to scrutiny .
>Of course, we have to bear these ideals in mind when deciding

>upon the cases to be referred. But in essence this is an
>exercise in clear thinking by the UFO community.

>It comes down to one basic question - really - if a majority of
>people in the UFO world support the ETH as the most likely
>solution to the unsolved cases (and I think that they do) then
>it is proper to ask that we spell out the cases that most
>persuade the majority of that view. Then we can turn these over
>to science for their opinion on how well these do - in fact -
>support the ETH.

OK. I'm not trying to take your comments out of context and
trump you, but I now understand that what your trying to get at
is a cheering section, and an agreed upon cheer.

In all due respects, Jenny, I'll wait for the peer review and
science until after we see the list.

Sorry to hear about your mother, hope she's doing better.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 15:19:09 -0600
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:25:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Clark

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 16:44:44 -0700

>>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 16:40:16 -0500

>>>>Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2001 20:01:35 -0400
>>>>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research

Bob,

>I have spoken to people who watched two "UFOs" move back and
>forth in the night sky for two hours. They were convinced that
>they were not stars because of this movement, which was caused
>by autokinetic motion of the eye muscles. The next night I asked
>one to go outside and look up in the same direction that the
>UFOs were seen. He admitted that there were two stars in the
>same location as the UFOs had been the previous night.

You're providing us, sad to say, with precisely the sort of
anecdotal yarn ufologists are regularly reviled for relating. Or
is a skeptic/debunker's anecdotal testimony of more evidential
worth than a ufologist's? And if you're trying to tell us that
witnesses can be fooled by well-known, voluminously documented
(usually by ufologists) misperceptions, what's your point? Do
you actually think none of us knows this?

>Incidentally, the number of UFO reports I get nowadays is quite
>small compared to, say, ten or 15 years ago. I don't know why,
>but in my judgement the Roswell nonsense served to peak public
>interest in the subject about 1997. It's been downhill since
>then. This doesn't mean that there aren't reports of lights the
>sky, but unless somebody comes up with something of a more
>substantial nature, this will either morph into some kind of
>21st Century New New Age hobby or just continue to dwindle away.

I doubt that very much. More likely, future generations of
scientists are going to wonder why their colleagues chose to pay
more attention to easily explained and not very interesting
misperceptions of astronomical bodies, et al., while ignoring
the body of well-investigated, never satisfactorily explained
UFO cases. I believe the phrase "pathological science" will
enter the discussion, and those being discussed will not be the
serious ufologists and scientifically trained investigators who
documented a phenomenon people like you wanted to wish out of
existence.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:27:43 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:28:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Young

>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 15:01:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

<snip>

>Of course, I stand fully behind my life, an
>exemplary life for a 5-planet Gemini. See
><http://www.exopolitics.com>.

>I had good reason for not starting a conversation on the
>disclosure project on this list. There is simply too much
>entrenched unreasonableness here, and positional rantings about
>fellow ufologists.

Dear Alfred:

Which five? And did your five planet plot take into account the
Regression of the Equinoxes?

Clear skies,

Bob Young
ex-Aquarian (March 18)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Don's UFO Repair Shop

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:39:56 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:30:21 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Don's UFO Repair Shop

>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:02:42 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop

<snip>

>The obviously fake drawing of the shop indicates tune-ups and
>body work, but there is no indication whether they use genuine
>OEM parts or some junk from disreputable second and third
>sources.

Hi, Larry:

Yeah, you'll never get the Millenium Falcon to do those 90
degree wheelies with disreputable junk yard parts.

Man, where do these guys come from?

Always truck'in,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars -

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:55:26 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:32:09 -0500
Subject: Re: NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars -

>From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: NASA Faces Legal Challenge Regarding Mars
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:39:46 -0800

>-----
> NASA FACES LEGAL CHALLENGE REGARDING MARS

>The Electric Warrior : News March 26, 2001
><http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0013.htm>

Wonderful. Space exploration conducted by lawyers. They even want to have judges direct the pointing of the cameras.

Hey, ufologists don't need peer review, they've got Appellate Review.

Think I'll just chew the carpet at the observatory tonight.

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:01:10 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:34:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 15:01:48 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 14:20:59 -0600
>>From: Lan Fleming <apollo18@swbell.net>
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>I disagree strongly with Steven Greer and Peter Gersten on a
>>number of things, but if someone thinks vicious personal attacks
>>on these people is somehow going to impress so-called skeptics
>>with the high standards of "serious" ufologists, I'm afraid they
>>are sadly mistaken.

>>Leon Jaroff is one of the high priests of CSICOP. I have
>>frequently crossed swords with him over the past several years
>>on AOL message boards. After reading about one particularly
>>acrimonious exchange between two UFO investigators about who had
>>the higher standards of research, Jaroff derided both of them as
>>"squabbling loons." That kind of reaction is about all I think
>>these attacks are likely to achieve.

>>If someone thinks they have a better approach to achieving more
>>government openness on the question of UFOs, then they should do
>>something about it. If Greer or Gersten can accomplish something
>>despite what may be flaws in their approach, I say more power to
>>'em. At least they're doing something besides sniping. The
>>circular firing squad approach to political action is, in my
>>opinion, counterproductive.

>>BTW: Over several years of conflict, Jaroff and I have actually
>>gotten to kind of appreciate each other's sense of humor and
>>found we shared certain philosophical positions. Discovering
>>that the enemy is not evil incarnate after all is sometimes a
>>risk in these protracted struggles. Of course, I still think
>>he's a fanatic debunker and he still thinks I'm a loony, so all
>>is not lost. Otherwise, it just wouldn't be any fun.

>Hi All - I really endorse this view. The ad hominem attacks on
>Greer and Gersten are unreasonable, and detract from a
>discussion of the disclosure issue.

>Someone - I think Errol - cross-posted a post of mine on the
>Disclosure project from another List where a reasonable
>conversation was going on, and now the ad hominem has spread to
>my own life. Of course, I stand fully behind my life, an
>exemplary life for a 5-planet Gemini. See
><http://www.exopolitics.com>.

>I had good reason for not starting a conversation on the
>disclosure project on this List. There is simply too much
>entrenched unreasonableness here, and positional rantings about
>fellow ufologists. It is demeaning to us all, and
>counter-productive to disclosure.

>Thanks for listening, Alfred Webre, Vancouver, BC.

Hello Alfred,

I'm still listening, and waiting for a response as to your selective memory and your various selective listings of alleged accomplishments, and your rather bizarre list of advocacies.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: **Richard Hall** <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:10:04 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:36:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Sue, Greg, Don, List:

>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the 30% of UFO
>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>An abduction support group leader?

Whence cometh this 30% statistic? Maybe your own experience, but I doubt seriously that it is based on anything broader. And, as usual, it depends on how you define "UFO" in the first place. IFOs of astronomical objects generally are very easy to weed out as essentially irrelevant to the argument.

>Somebody made a good point, recently, also made by Allen Hendry
>a quarter century ago, since UFOs are not a recognized field of
>scientific inquiry, somebody with training and skills in a wide
>variety of disciplines is needed to do useful investigation.
>Lone wolfs like this can't be found.

Can't disagree with this, except that a lot of "lone wolfs" are out there doing a very good job. I think you mean to say that "ufology" is not a recognized field of study, which is surely accurate. But investigating UFO reports scientifically is not only possible, it is highly desirable and some of us have been doing it for a long time. Only to be met with glib, and quite false, "statistics."

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:56:45 -0000
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:40:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Hall

>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 18:51:49 -0600

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 22:56:39 -0000

>>>From: Alfred Webre <EcoRadio@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 20:33:33 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>You know -- seriously... enough is enough. What would you gain
>in taking this kind of tone in a public forum? As it happens,
>while not aspiring to some game of support for any of those
>associated in this poor-man's debate and not party or witness to
>any of the inevitable plethora of proprietary particulars that
>the ufological anointed have woven for themselves in their
>anomalous boys club over the years, I think you show a little
>too much tooth in your rebuttal to the other Alfred, a man
>previously judged by you to be decidedly "serious and
>scholarly." Again, so that I may be clear, I do not defend the
>ideas of those criticized, my bone of contention is with this
>judging tone communicated in your writing. It is a tone I think
>inappropriate and so counter to eventual cultural resolution
>that I point it out as an example of the kind of thinking that
>keeps us locked up in the traditional wheel-spinning mire of
>intellectual complacency while real spiritual, cultural, and
>intellectual potential explodes around our heads like bursting
>shells.

Alfred,

Oh do you? How interesting.

"Judging tone," eh? Do you defend mendacity, dishonesty,
misrepresentation, etc. in the UFO field? I thought not. I am
raising serious issues that bear on the credibility of Webre.
Like it or lump it, that is entirely fair and reasonable, and
badly needed in view of widespread credulous acceptance of
people who, if you examine who they are and what they claim, do
not deserve to be taken seriously.

>>So I did an internet search on your rather unique name with
>>fascinating results.

>Here, in the proceeding, we seem to have catalogued for our
>programmed dismissal a list of charges that suggest that Mr.
>Webre is decidedly not serious, or scholarly. I point out that
>your research was recent (getting to the bottom of a recent
>effrontery, perhaps), and the conclusions suggested are an
>across the grain character assassination perpetrated by Mr.
>Hall. Regarding fascination, I'm more fascinated by the reasons
>for Mr. Hall's investigation of Mr. Webre than what was found
>out about Mr. Webre. The reader might be more fascinated, too.

"Charges?" No, questions. "Character assassination?" Only if I'm wrong, in which case I would apologize. I raised questions that you apparently don't want to consider and don't think important.

>>Yes, I met you in 1977 when you were pushing things in the
>>Carter White House. It seems your interests extend to just about
>>every "paranoid" topic that titillates the masses. More about
>>that below.

>Ahhh -- Now Mr. Webre is a champion of the paranoids, and might
>even be some pretender to the paranoid throne... Regarding the
>"titillated masses" I can only remark that you strike an elitist
>pose with that charmless assessment. The masses are the way they
>are _not_ out of the intellectual inferiority that you seem to
>assume but the cognitive pap and manipulative con games that
>they receive from the corrupt institutions that pervade their
>lives, the dismissal and disrespect that they receive from the
>hyper educated, and the contrived history they learned in their
>short changed schools. Regarding paranoia -- where there is an
>actual threat there is no "paranoia". I think there is more that
>enough evidence to support a threat growing as we speak, and
>that this threat is predominate on many levels from the
>psychological to the ecological to the governmental. The masses
>are "titillated", moreover, only by their fear and mistrust of
>the foggy propensity and the leadership that won't tell them
>what it is. Check PBS and Bill Moyers this week for a clue on
>what I'm talking about. Anything can hide in the kind of
>institutional sociopathy he will expose on his program.

Well, obviously you want to believe Webre, so you have my sympathies. Once again, I have defended the general accuracy of what "the masses" are reporting in regard to UFOs. If you don't see the paranoia in his advocacies, then God bless us all!

>I think you were another of the 'experts' that touted a three
>decade contribution to the investigation of the anomalous, and
>where have you gotten us? You seemingly have contributed little
>to counter well spoken tongues in the pretty cheeks of talking
>heads. Moreover, your suggestion that Mr. Webre can't document
>his connections is not proof that he can't document those
>connections, forgetting that for the purposes of this discussion
>it is not important that he can document them at all. You
>suggest that he can't in your oblique way. That's a pretty cheap
>shot for someone you once thought scholarly and serious.

No, four decades going on five. Where have I gotten you? Is it all on my shoulders? I'll be very happy to have my peers comment about my contributions to trying to understand what is going on. I have pretty well asked Webre to document his connections; don't hold your breath. And why is that not important? If someone is lying and embellishing, that is not important in considering how seriously to take him?

>>Let's see, you also worked for SRI, the New York State
>>Legislative Initiative, were a Fulbright Scholar and Yale Law
>>School graduate who taught at Yale and the University of Texas.
>>And your wife Geri is a "psychic." Have I got the right Alfred
>>Webre, or is in only a coincidence that you have the same e-mail
>>address?

>Forgetting that you describe Mr. Webre as a pretty with-it guy,
>there is no profit in the dismissal of something that you
>yourself have not proven conclusively to be false.

Very simply, I have raised serious questions and issues. It is not my responsibility to prove falsehoods; it is his responsibility to answer legitimate questions.

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 27](#)

Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Truncated

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 17:45:10 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:47:15 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Truncated

Filer's Files #13 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
March 27, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
Webmaster Chuck Warren <http://www.filersfiles.com>,

ARE UFOs A THREAT TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY?

In this weeks files we review UFOs and aircraft safety. UFOs were observed in Pennsylvania, Maryland, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Illinois, Washington, Puerto Rico, Bolivia, and France. The Bolivian Air Force chased a UFO with a jet over La Paz. Leonard Stringfield one of the greatest Ufologists of all time told me of his meeting with Robert C. Gardner an UFO investigator who had interviewed General Benjamin Chidlaw, then in charge of US Eastern Air Defense. Later General Chidlow became head of the Air Defense Command. In his book "Saucer Post.. 3-0 Blue" by Leonard Stringfield reveals in the course of the half hour interview General Chidlaw stated the following,

"We have stacks of reports about flying saucers. We take them seriously when you consider we have lost many men and planes trying to intercept them." Later work, supporting Gardner's statement came from a Cincinnati, who, with rank in the Air Force Reserve, had access to certain bits of off-the-record information. It was during the Cincinnati flap of 1955, that he related to a GOC supervisor, who in turn told me that the Air Force was losing almost a plane a day." Page 91.

If these statements are true I can understand the government secrecy. As I write this it was announced that an Army RC-12 twin engine crashed in Germany and two Air Force F-15s crashed into a mountain on a clear day in Scotland. My aircrew was asked to intercept a UFO by London Control over England. We dove on the hovering UFO flying above the red lined speed of our aircraft. Fortunately the plane held together, but the excitement of the chase can cause accidents. I had a huge solid return on my radar as we dove near the UFO it suddenly launched into space. There are other unexplained crashes of our aircraft.

Thirteen months ago, Alaska Airlines Flight 26 plummeted into the Pacific off Southern California and 88 people were killed. The families have filed a claim against the Federal Aviation Administration wanting an explanation why their loved ones were killed. The Boeing MD-83 actually manufactured by McDonnell Douglas, which has since merged with Boeing is blamed for the crash. Failure of the plane's jackscrew assembly, a part in the tail section that helps control the up-and-down movements of the aircraft, is suspected as the cause of the crash. However, the real question is what caused the jackscrew to fail?

Allegedly a happy married pilot chose to commit suicide and kill the occupants of EgyptAir Flight 900. Loved ones of the flight crew have contacted me and were outraged at this explanation for the crash. Is it possible the pilot dove his plane to avoid a collision? An Army C-23 Sherpa aircraft mysteriously lost its tail (horizontal stabilizer) and apparently part of its wing prior to crashing and killing 21 on March 3, 2001. No evidence of explosion, fire, mechanical problems or even serious weather

phenomenon is reported. Yet, a slow moving prop planet mysteriously crashed. Despite reports of bad weather, the Sheriff claims it did not start raining until he had reached the crash site fifteen minutes after the plane crashed. See Filers files for photos of the C-23 crash.

These crashes have been going on for fifty years and its time to realize the UFOs in our skies may be responsible. These may not represent attacks or hostile action. They may the result of tremendously powerful machines coming too close to our aircraft, or our pilots attempting to avoid a mid air collision. Dan Wilson of Panesville, Ohio kindly sent me data on numerous mysterious crashes. He pointed out that a UFO was sighted in South Carolina the same day as the C-23 crash occurred not far away in Georgia. On several occasions when MUFON personnel attempted to investigate UFOs their plane mysteriously crashed or they were found dead under mysterious circumstances. I will admit that much of this is speculation based on circumstantial evidence, but isn't it time to look at some of the facts?

SOUTH CAROLINA OVAL SHAPED UFO

ST. GEORGE -- It was oval shaped with several lights, and about the length of a pickup. It was an oval shaped object observed on March 2, 2001. It had flashing white lights on the bottom. I saw it just over a cornfield that Thursday night at 12:31 AM. It just hovered in one spot and then it shot off. I didn't even see it leave. I ran home immediately and told everyone. They didn't believe me. I hope you do. Thanks to NUFORC www.ufocenter.com.

<A HREF="<http://www.ufocenter.com/>">FLORIDA TWO SILENT WEST BOUND OBJECTS GULF COAST OF FLORIDA

SARASOTA -- I live in Bradenton, Florida, have been a letter carrier for thirty years and I am currently 53-years old. I was an Air Force dependent and spent three years in the US Army 1966-69 serving a year combat tour in Vietnam. On the morning of Sunday, March 11, 2001, my wife and I took four of our dogs to Sarasota. I was about 50 yards in front of my wife, when I heard the noise of a small plane overhead and looked up. I located the plane another object caught my eye at 9:45 AM. This object was light gray and circular. Seagulls are common here but it did not waver or move erratic as they do. It was obvious this object was moving in a direct line westward. I then noticed another object of the same description in what appeared to be about a quarter mile a part traveling same direction and speed as the first. Other than the small plane's engine, there were no other sounds of aircraft. However, my years around all types of aircraft left me with the certainty that these two objects were not normal aircraft. There were no distinctive markings, lights, or other features; just to very light gray circular objects. Editor's Note: Peter Davenport called me last week and we discussed several cases. He indicated this witness was quite credible and this a good report. NUFORC www.ufocenter.com.

ALABAMA UFO BUZZES SMALL PLANE

IRVINGTON -- On Sunday, February 18, 2001, at 6:25 p.m., a small private plane was making its approach into the airport in Mobile, Alabama, when the youthful pilot spotted a blue UFO. The pilot, his brother, and a male friend of their father, who was serving as the check pilot saw the object. According to the witness, his "Dad's friend is a commercial and instrument-rated pilot." The young pilot described the UFO as "a large blue light, fast-moving." He added, "I'm a private pilot. I had just gone flying and was on my way home when, to the left of me, a blue light appeared and shot forward at an incredible rate of speed. It then arced upward and streaked into the sky." At the time of the encounter, their single-engine propellor plane was passing over Irvington near Mobile. Thanks to Peter B. Davenport of the National UFO Reporting Center report www.ufocenter.com. <A HREF="<http://www.ufocenter.com/>">NUFORC

NATIONAL AVIATION REPORTING CENTER ON ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA

The distinguished researcher Dr. Richard Haines (NASA, Ret.) has, with Ted Roe, recently helped to establish a new national organization called NARCAP. The latter is singular among world organizations in providing a completely confidential center where pilots, air traffic controllers, and radar operators can

report their sightings of anomalous phenomena which threaten aviation safety. These reports can be made confidentially by telephone and Internet. The Center is staffed by technical specialists who -- in contrast to current civilian and government institutions -- will not endanger air safety by either skewing or suppressing the reports. These specialists tentatively include Joel Bartlett (Meteorology), Capt. Neil Daniels (Pilot), Susan Dreiske (Information technology & science), James McCampbell (Engineering Physics), James E. McClenahan (Air Traffic Control, FAA regulations, Brian E. Smith (Aerodynamics), Willy Smith (Physics, Field Investigations), and Robert Stahl (Flight Instructor, Accident investigation, Systems Engineering). Dr. Haines states in his PRESS RELEASE, among other things, that "Based on a comprehensive review of past US pilot, radar operator, and controller reports, we believe there is a potential and ongoing threat to aviation safety posed by so-called anomalous aerial phenomena... We would like to work with the nation's airlines to implement special pilot training classes directly related to coping with such close encounters in the air." For further information contact Ted Roe, Executive Director NARCAP, PO Box 140, Boulder Creek, CA 95006 (T: 831-338-4783). www.narcap.org. Thanks to Dr. Robert Trundle

NEW YORK UFOs

LAKE ONTARIO - Tim Beckley writes UFO reports over Lake Ontario are nothing new. We published photos in UFO REVIEW and UFO UNIVERSE showing the UFOs in flight. We even gave the photos to Omni magazine to publish but they never published. Tom Grey was one of my contacts up in Canada. There was also a fellow with a talk show. I once gave a talk over on the Canadian side in and I remember they had all kinds of stories to tell. The objects would come right down over the barge lane and go into the water so the guys working on the barges would know something. I wonder if there is a barge workers union or something like that? www.webufo.net, www.mrcreepo.com. Thanks to Tim Beckley MRUFO@webtv.net

PENNSYLVANIA ZIG-ZAGGING LIGHT

INDIANA COUNTY -- On the evening of March 19, 2001, at approximately 7:50 P.M., a witness observed an odd light source in the southern sky that was a "wide band of white light." This solid band of light began to move east. It then made a clockwise loop and it continued to rotate until it returned to the position where it had started the loop movement. At that point, the band suddenly changed and became just a white dot of steady light, which quickly turned to a red color. The red light began a series of about eleven zig-zagging maneuvers as it moved towards the southeast. Suddenly, the red light vanished. At the time of the observation the sky was clear. The witness who was standing outside in his front yard, indicated that the entire sighting lasted less than a minute. This sighting took place in the vicinity of the Homer City power station in Indiana County. UFO sightings have been active in this area ever since the power plant was constructed in the 1960s. Thanks to Stan Gordon, PA UFO Hotline: 724-838-7768 <http://www.westol.com/~paufu>

MARYLAND VIDEO OF RODS, CYLINDERS AND DISCS

BALTIMORE - Bill Bean sent me a video with numerous amazing UFOs. These include UFOs flying over commercial aircraft as they land at Baltimore Airport. Bill video tapes many anomalous objects flying near his Woodlawn home. Some of his friends are joining him in nightly skywatches. They even appeared on Fox 45 Television in an interesting segment showing some of their video. Many of the UFO videos were unexplainable and represent some excellent work. Thanks to Bill Bean for his video and great work.

ILLINOIS MANEUVERING LIGHTS CONTINUE

ROCKFORD -- Todd Livengood writes that I was watching Channel 13 news at ten o'clock this past Sunday, March 18, 2001, and the weatherman reported they had received a lot of phone calls about lights seen from North Main Street. They had a live camera on the street for the whole telecast, but they didn't see anything except for a light that appeared 'mostly' stationary for about 5-6 minutes when they first arrived at the scene. The light then just vanished. The did not show the 'stationary light' during the telecast.

Kristyn S. reports that my mother and I were heading south on Alpine Road on Tuesday, March 20, 2001, at 6:50 PM when she suddenly saw fifteen lights. They were not way up in the sky. They seemed as though they were right close to us. They were individual glowing orange lights. The objects had lights and an aura or haze around them. They were not in a specific formation, but one was way out of the cluster by itself. Some objects emitted other objects. Some objects changed colors. They were traveling quite fast also. Then suddenly they would flash bright white and disappear one at a time. I even saw one split into two and then turn white. It was crazy. We tried to take a photo but by the time we got a camera, there was only one left. It was a weird experience. Thanks to Todd Livengood- lightfate@aol.com

NEW MEXICO, ROSWELL RESEARCH UPDATE

The Roswell research team of Tom Carey and Don Schmitt have just returned from yet another research trip to Roswell, NM as they continue to investigate the most famous UFO case of all time. It was their tenth such trip since teaming-up in May, 1998 for the express purpose of bringing the case to a definitive conclusion, one way or another. As the World War II generation passes on at an ever-increasing rate, the chances of finding firsthand witnesses to the 1947 events correspondingly diminishes at an alarming rate. Even so, the team found a new firsthand witness on this most recent trip. The witness was a member of one of the three 509th bomb groups at Roswell Army Air Force. Prior to takeoff, he checked out the specially prepared B-29 that transported the craft that crashed north of Roswell. The witness stated, "I never saw anything like it before or since." It was fitted in the bombay compartment and turned on its side and flown to Wright Field in Ohio.

The Carey/Schmitt investigative team has also enlisted other researchers in New Mexico to continue the investigation to find the ultimate truth. The team believes that the true impact [crash] site is still to be located. On this most recent trip, the team believes they got within five miles of the true crash site. Carey gave a presentation to 130 people at the International UFO Museum and Research Center in Roswell titled, "Flight to Fort Worth - Beginning of the Cover-up." Thanks to Tom Carey TCarey1947

NEVADA VIDEO OF UFO

LAUGHLIN -- Casey Holt and two of his friends had sighting on Monday, March 5, 2001. There were two bright spherical or oval shaped objects seen during the day at about 2:30 PM drifting slowly from the northeast to the northwest. They seemed quite high but lower than the clouds and about 60 degrees up. The size was 1/16 the diameter of the moon. One object appeared to flash red, blue, dark, and white and rotated in a counterclockwise direction around the more stationary bright white or silvery reflective object. The two objects were seen for a little over ten minutes during which about 1-1/2 minutes of video was taken of the bright white object. The video is in the process of being analyzed. Thanks to Casey Holt caholt@juno.com

WASHINGTON - HIGH SPEED LIGHTS

SEATTLE --I received a phone call from Peter Davenport, reviewing an astounding series of sightings near Seattle on March 13, 2001. Numerous astronomers working with Peter were also startled by the series or reports. Several yellow colored lights flew up Puget Sound to Vancouver Island a distance of 80 to 90 miles in 30 seconds. Moving at an estimated speed of 10,000 mph the object flew parallel to the ground without making any noise. No known celestial object, meteor, bolides could explain the sighting by multiple witnesses. Thanks to Peter Davenport NUFORC www.ufocenter.com

PUERTO RICO UFO

LAS PIÑAS HILL -- Researchers Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman have brought to our attention a sighting, which took place on March 12, 2001, at 2:00 AM. Witnesses to the event were A. Serrano and A. Leon, who were sitting on their porch at that time and saw a bright light heading toward them from the mountains near Aguas Buenas and over Hwy 1. The object's brightness increased as it approached, as did its size. It flew at low altitude over a

farm located some 15 meters away from where the witnesses sat.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Serious Research - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 19:15:14 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 09:38:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Strickland

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 12:58:27 +0100

>>From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:33:19 -0000

>>>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Mar 2001 22:51:10 -0000

>>Jenny wrote (snipped):

>We have data. We have a widely believed in theory. We have an
>obligation to test that widely believed in theory against our
>data. Thats all we are doing here - no preconceptions involved.

>I simply do not believe that science would regard that as
>anything other than a reasonable thing to do.

Of course, you're correct, Jenny, if all of us were dealing with the 'same' perceptions. Unfortunately, that's the crux of the matter. Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, "The mind once stretched by a new idea, never regains its original dimension." I think that's appropos for the issues at hand here.

Also, the individual case study does not a population make for statistical purposes, and the parameters for each case study are so widely varied, I think we'd have to have a statistical analysis done on each case study, just to find like parameters on which to base the wider study.

Also, the panel would play hell trying to tell an abductee that his/her experience doesn't warrant further study! I can hear it already! Yipes! Talk about a schism! Listen y'all... I mean this... Jenny, to each abductee, their individual case study and experiences cut through "theory" like a laser beam through rock. Most abductees aren't ready or willing to submit to the "Venus Rising," and "Swamp Gas" explanations common with skeptics like Phil Klass. Those won't cut through anything, anymore.

I'd put my whole series of abductions up on trial, and love to see anyone find the answers. Please! But, my guess is, the skeptics won't have the perseverance to follow through to find the answers, even if the answers were hitting them over the head. Their bias may keep them from finding the hard truth...even if it's **not** what I think I experienced.

And then, there's the issue of who gets the credit...the skeptics will want and expect "carte blanche" to do with the information whatever they want. Sorry. I've been down that road. That's one reason the skeptics aren't flocking to this panel, Jenny. Until that's clear and in writing, I doubt you'll get many abductees flocking to the panel to tell their experiences either.

You're right. This is going to take some doing my dear. I'm listening. What can I do to help?

Jenny, I hope your mother is feeling better. Spring is coming... even at 8620 ft elevation!

Sue

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

OT - The Omega Man

From: Kelly <kellymccg@attcanada.ca>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 21:30:00 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 09:42:38 -0500
Subject: OT - The Omega Man

Hi Errol! The following article is off topic but I think may interest many on your list if you want to post it! Hope all is well.

Kelly

Source: The New Scientist

<http://www.newscientist.com/features/features.jsp?id=ns22811>

From New Scientist magazine, 10 March 2001.

The Omega Man

He shattered mathematics with a single number. And that was just for starters, says Marcus Chown

TWO plus two equals four: nobody would argue with that. Mathematicians can rigorously prove sums like this, and many other things besides. The language of maths allows them to provide neatly ordered ways to describe everything that happens in the world around us.

Or so they once thought. Gregory Chaitin, a mathematics researcher at IBM's T. J. Watson Research Center in Yorktown Heights, New York, has shown that mathematicians can't actually prove very much at all. Doing maths, he says, is just a process of discovery like every other branch of science: it's an experimental field where mathematicians stumble upon facts in the same way that zoologists might come across a new species of primate.

Mathematics has always been considered free of uncertainty and able to provide a pure foundation for other, messier fields of science. But maths is just as messy, Chaitin says: mathematicians are simply acting on intuition and experimenting with ideas, just like everyone else. Zoologists think there might be something new swinging from branch to branch in the unexplored forests of Madagascar, and mathematicians have hunches about which part of the mathematical landscape to explore. The subject is no more profound than that.

The reason for Chaitin's provocative statements is that he has found that the core of mathematics is riddled with holes. Chaitin has shown that there are an infinite number of mathematical facts but, for the most part, they are unrelated to each other and impossible to tie together with unifying theorems. If mathematicians find any connections between these facts, they do so by luck. "Most of mathematics is true for no particular reason," Chaitin says. "Maths is true by accident."

This is particularly bad news for physicists on a quest for a complete and concise description of the Universe. Maths is the language of physics, so Chaitin's discovery implies there can never be a reliable "theory of everything", neatly summarising

all the basic features of reality in one set of equations. It's a bitter pill to swallow, but even Steven Weinberg, a Nobel prizewinning physicist and author of *Dreams of a Final Theory*, has swallowed it. "We will never be sure that our final theory is mathematically consistent," he admits.

Chaitin's mathematical curse is not an abstract theorem or an impenetrable equation: it is simply a number. This number, which Chaitin calls Omega, is real, just as pi is real. But Omega is infinitely long and utterly incalculable. Chaitin has found that Omega infects the whole of mathematics, placing fundamental limits on what we can know. And Omega is just the beginning. There are even more disturbing numbers--Chaitin calls them Super-Omegas--that would defy calculation even if we ever managed to work Omega out. The Omega strain of incalculable numbers reveals that mathematics is not simply moth-eaten, it is mostly made of gaping holes. Anarchy, not order, is at the heart of the Universe.

Chaitin discovered Omega and its astonishing properties while wrestling with two of the most influential mathematical discoveries of the 20th century. In 1931, the Austrian mathematician Kurt Gödel blew a gaping hole in mathematics: his Incompleteness Theorem showed there are some mathematical theorems that you just can't prove. Then, five years later, British mathematician Alan Turing built on Gödel's work.

Using a hypothetical computer that could mimic the operation of any machine, Turing showed that there is something that can never be computed. There are no instructions you can give a computer that will enable it to decide in advance whether a given program will ever finish its task and halt. To find out whether a program will eventually halt--after a day, a week or a trillion years--you just have to run it and wait. He called this the halting problem.

Decades later, in the 1960s, Chaitin took up where Turing left off. Fascinated by Turing's work, he began to investigate the halting problem. He considered all the possible programs that Turing's hypothetical computer could run, and then looked for the probability that a program, chosen at random from among all the possible programs, will halt. The work took him nearly 20 years, but he eventually showed that this "halting probability" turns Turing's question of whether a program halts into a real number, somewhere between 0 and 1.

Chaitin named this number Omega. And he showed that, just as there are no computable instructions for determining in advance whether a computer will halt, there are also no instructions for determining the digits of Omega. Omega is uncomputable.

Some numbers, like pi, can be generated by a relatively short program which calculates its infinite number of digits one by one--how far you go is just a matter of time and resources. Another example of a computable number might be one that comprises 200 repeats of the sequence 0101. The number is long, but a program for generating it only need say: "repeat '01' 400 times".

There is no such program for Omega: in binary, it consists of an unending, random string of 0s and 1s. "My Omega number has no pattern or structure to it whatsoever," says Chaitin. "It's a string of 0s and 1s in which each digit is as unrelated to its predecessor as one coin toss is from the next."

The same process that led Turing to conclude that the halting problem is undecidable also led Chaitin to the discovery of an unknowable number. "It's the outstanding example of something which is unknowable in mathematics," Chaitin says.

An unknowable number wouldn't be a problem if it never reared its head. But once Chaitin had discovered Omega, he began to wonder whether it might have implications in the real world. So he decided to search mathematics for places where Omega might crop up. So far, he has only looked properly in one place: number theory.

Number theory is the foundation of pure mathematics. It describes how to deal with concepts such as counting, adding, and multiplying. Chaitin's search for Omega in number theory started with "Diophantine equations"--which involve only the

simple concepts of addition, multiplication and exponentiation (raising one number to the power of another) of whole numbers.

Chaitin formulated a Diophantine equation that was 200 pages long and had 17,000 variables. Given an equation like this, mathematicians would normally search for its solutions. There could be any number of answers: perhaps 10, 20, or even an infinite number of them. But Chaitin didn't look for specific solutions, he simply looked to see whether there was a finite or an infinite number of them.

He did this because he knew it was the key to unearthing Omega. Mathematicians James Jones of the University of Calgary and Yuri Matijasevic of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics in St Petersburg had shown how to translate the operation of Turing's computer into a Diophantine equation. They found that there is a relationship between the solutions to the equation and the halting problem for the machine's program. Specifically, if a particular program doesn't ever halt, a particular Diophantine equation will have no solution. In effect, the equations provide a bridge linking Turing's halting problem--and thus Chaitin's halting probability--with simple mathematical operations, such as the addition and multiplication of whole numbers.

Chaitin had arranged his equation so that there was one particular variable, a parameter which he called N, that provided the key to finding Omega. When he substituted numbers for N, analysis of the equation would provide the digits of Omega in binary. When he put 1 in place of N, he would ask whether there was a finite or infinite number of whole number solutions to the resulting equation. The answer gives the first digit of Omega: a finite number of solutions would make this digit 0, an infinite number of solutions would make it 1. Substituting 2 for N and asking the same question about the equation's solutions would give the second digit of Omega. Chaitin could, in theory, continue forever. "My equation is constructed so that asking whether it has finitely or infinitely many solutions as you vary the parameter is the same as determining the bits of Omega," he says.

But Chaitin already knew that each digit of Omega is random and independent. This could only mean one thing. Because finding out whether a Diophantine equation has a finite or infinite number of solutions generates these digits, each answer to the equation must therefore be unknowable and independent of every other answer. In other words, the randomness of the digits of Omega imposes limits on what can be known from number theory--the most elementary of mathematical fields. "If randomness is even in something as basic as number theory, where else is it?" asks Chaitin. He thinks he knows the answer. "My hunch is it's everywhere," he says. "Randomness is the true foundation of mathematics."

The fact that randomness is everywhere has deep consequences, says John Casti, a mathematician at the Santa Fe Institute in New Mexico and the Vienna University of Technology. It means that a few bits of maths may follow from each other, but for most mathematical situations those connections won't exist. And if you can't make connections, you can't solve or prove things. All a mathematician can do is aim to find the little bits of maths that do tie together. "Chaitin's work shows that solvable problems are like a small island in a vast sea of undecidable propositions," Casti says.

Take the problem of perfect odd numbers. A perfect number has divisors whose sum makes the number. For example, 6 is perfect because its divisors are 1, 2 and 3, and their sum is 6. There are plenty of even perfect numbers, but no one has ever found an odd number that is perfect. And yet, no one has been able to prove that an odd number can't be perfect. Unproved hypotheses like this and the Riemann hypothesis, which has become the unsure foundation of many other theorems (New Scientist, 11 November 2000, p 32) are examples of things that should be accepted as unprovable but nonetheless true, Chaitin suggests. In other words, there are some things that scientists will always have to take on trust.

Unsurprisingly, mathematicians had a difficult time coming to terms with Omega. But there is worse to come. "We can go beyond Omega," Chaitin says. In his new book, Exploring Randomness (New Scientist, 10 January, p 46), Chaitin has now unleashed the

"Super-Omegas".

Like Omega, the Super-Omegas also owe their genesis to Turing. He imagined a God-like computer, much more powerful than any real computer, which could know the unknowable: whether a real computer would halt when running a particular program, or carry on forever. He called this fantastical machine an "oracle". And as soon as Chaitin discovered Omega--the probability that a random computer program would eventually halt--he realised he could also imagine an oracle that would know Omega. This machine would have its own unknowable halting probability, Omega'.

But if one oracle knows Omega, it's easy to imagine a second-order oracle that knows Omega'. This machine, in turn, has its own halting probability, Omega", which is known only by a third-order oracle, and so on. According to Chaitin, there exists an infinite sequence of increasingly random Omegas. "There is even an all-seeing infinitely high-order oracle which knows all other Omegas," he says.

He kept these numbers to himself for decades, thinking they were too bizarre to be relevant to the real world. Just as Turing looked upon his God-like computer as a flight of fancy, Chaitin thought these Super-Omegas were fantasy numbers emerging from fantasy machines. But Veronica Becher of the University of Buenos Aires has shown that Chaitin was wrong: the Super-Omegas are both real and important. Chaitin is genuinely surprised by this discovery. "Incredibly, they actually have a real meaning for real computers," he says.

Becher has been collaborating with Chaitin for just over a year, and is helping to drag Super-Omegas into the real world. As a computer scientist, she wondered whether there were links between Omega, the higher-order Omegas and real computers.

Real computers don't just perform finite computations, doing one or a few things, and then halt. They can also carry out infinite computations, producing an infinite series of results. "Many computer applications are designed to produce an infinite amount of output," Becher says. Examples include Web browsers such as Netscape and operating systems such as Windows 2000.

This example gave Becher her first avenue to explore: the probability that, over the course of an infinite computation, a machine would produce only a finite amount of output. To do this, Becher and her student Sergio Daicz used a technique developed by Chaitin. They took a real computer and turned it into an approximation of an oracle. The "fake oracle" decides that a program halts if--and only if--it halts within time T. A real computer can handle this weakened version of the halting problem. "Then you let T go to infinity," Chaitin says. This allows the shortcomings of the fake to diminish as it runs for longer and longer.

Using variations on this technique, Becher and Daicz found that the probability that an infinite computation produces only a finite amount of output is the same as Omega', the halting probability of the oracle. Going further, they showed that Omega is equivalent to the probability that, during an infinite computation, a computer will fail to produce an output--for example, get no result from a computation and move on to the next one--and that it will do this only a finite number of times.

These might seem like odd things to bother with, but Chaitin believes this is an important step. "Becher's work makes the whole hierarchy of Omega numbers seem much more believable," he says. Things that Turing--and Chaitin--imagined were pure fantasy are actually very real.

Now that the Super-Omegas are being unearthed in the real world, Chaitin is sure they will crop up all over mathematics, just like Omega. The Super-Omegas are even more random than Omega: if mathematicians were to get over Omega's obstacles, they would face an ever-elevated barrier as they confronted Becher's results.

And that has knock-on effects elsewhere. Becher and Chaitin admit that the full implications of their new discoveries have yet to become clear, but mathematics is central to many aspects of science. Certainly any theory of everything, as it attempts

to tie together all the facts about the Universe, would need to jump an infinite number of hurdles to prove its worth.

The discovery of Omega has exposed gaping holes in mathematics, making research in the field look like playing a lottery, and it has demolished hopes of a theory of everything. Who knows what the Super-Omegas are capable of? "This," Chaitin warns, "is just the beginning."

Further reading:

Exploring Randomness by G. J. Chaitin, Springer-Verlag (2001) "A Century of Controversy Over the Foundations of Mathematics" by G. J. Chaitin, Complexity, vol 5, p 12 (2000)

The Unknowable by G. J. Chaitin, Springer-Verlag (1999)
"Randomness everywhere" by C. S. Calude and G. J. Chaitin, Nature, vol 400, p 319 (1999) <http://www.cs.umaine.edu/~chaitin/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - McCoy

From: **GT McCoy** <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 19:50:44 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 09:45:51 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age - McCoy

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 03:16:59 +0100
>From: Josh Goldstein <clearlight@t-online.de>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Dr. Leo And The New Age

>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:01:09 -0500
>>Subject: Dr. Leo And The New Age
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: <updates@sympatico.ca>

><snip>

>>When Lord oh when, is someone one going to do the 'work' of
>>conducting a "serious investigation." If just one more of these
>>side show clowns tells me that everything is ok because I'm
>>getting my paradigm shifted,...

>>I'm going to hurl my cookies.

>>Preachers should preach... scientists should do science. Not
>>pseudo-religion. (Pseudo-philosophy)

>Amen, brother John. That's exactly what I've been posting about.
>I'm also sick of this kind of lunacy.

>Josh Goldstein

Hello All, Josh & John,

All I can say with the reintroduction of Greer & Co. as we
speak. Amen! Too.

GT McCoy

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [clearlight](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - McCoy

From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 20:19:45 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 09:51:48 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - McCoy

Hello all, Bob, Larry.

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:39:56 EST
>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:02:42 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop

><snip>

>>The obviously fake drawing of the shop indicates tune-ups and
>>body work, but there is no indication whether they use genuine
>>OEM parts or some junk from disreputable second and third
>>sources.

>Hi, Larry:

>Yeah, you'll never get the Millenium Falcon to do those 90
>degree wheelies with disreputable junk yard parts.

>Man, where do these guys come from?

>Always truck'in,

>Bob Young

Yes, I agree. Could explain the 100% Zeta Retuculan parts are stamped with Hieroglyphics depicting a Coyote chasing a Roadrunner and the repeated words 'ACME' throughout.

GT McCoy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: UFOs And People? - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 23:45:32 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 09:56:23 -0500
Subject: Re: UFOs And People? - Mortellaro

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:12:53 -0500
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: UFOs And People?
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: UFOs And People?
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:49:28 -0500

>>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 02:01:15 EST
>>>Subject: UFOs And People?
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>What Is It About UFOs And People, Anyway?

>>>Pop, Mom and an aunt saw a UFO with me not terribly long ago.
>>>They don't like to speak about it because, well, frankly, they
>>>really don't believe that what they saw could possibly have been
>>>what they saw. Really!

>>>It was real to them. They saw it. We discussed it afterwards. We
>>>each described what we saw. There weres no discrepancies among
>>>us. It was there. It flew off. It was huge. It was a triangular
>>>object more than a football field large apex to apex. It had
>>>lights all over it. It was hovering over our lake across the
>>>street. Westchester County. Just like Imbrogio and company
>>>described in their book about the Westchester Triangle. >

><snip>

>>>Pop cannot believe his senses. Mom does, but does not wish to
>>>upset pop. He is going to be 89 in August. My aunt is just too
>>>terribly shy to speak about it, as her religious intensity
>>>disallows any such discussion as even a possible reality.
>>>Another aunt and her son, also witnesses, cannot bring
>>>themselves to admit it, even in friendly counsel such as a
>>>>openers.

>>>The problem is profoundly interesting and should be made part of
>>>the research of this phenom. For it points to what must be very
>>>large numbers of people who have seen a UFO or even had what
>>>they perceive to have been an abduction experience. I am pretty
>>>well convinced that a good deal more people have had the
>>>experience than will ever admit. Maybe the survey which was
>>>supported by Hopkins was not so far off base after all. And
>>>maybe Jacobs is not terribly far off the mark either. Especially
>>>if the above is true.

>>>Maybe not.

>>>In conclusion, there is as usual, no conclusion. Nothing else is
>>>revealed. Not in this post. So what? Why the hell should I be
>>>any different than the rest of you researchers?

>>>Huh?

>>This one was profound...an uncomfortable but inevitable truth...

>>I was glad to read it.

>Long ago I realized the existence of this phenomenon which is
>related to the "Emperor Has No Clothes" Syndrome.

>You refer to the Ultimate cover up, before which all other
>cover-ups pale....

>I have mentioned this many times in the past (in lectures) and
>now once again refer to the (gulp! shudder! Oh, the wormwood
>and the gall.....)

>*****SELF- cover up!*****

Gentlemen, Errol and Listers ...

First, thank you for your comments. The (gulp, shudder, Oh the
humanity... etc.) is truth... self cover up.

I visited my parents last evening. I wanted to make sure that
dad remembered his promise to Alfred Lehmborg and the World Wide
Renaissance crew to supply us with his miscellaneous ramblings.
You see, my dad is also a writer. Our WWR crew liked what they
read and dad no longer has exactly the same memory as he did
just a few years ago. I wanted to make sure that no matter what
else happened, he did not forget the sighting we had as a
family.

Dad promised me that for his one and only son, in fact, his one
and only child, he would come out of his closet and describe his
sighting which occurred with my mom, aunt, myself and my
beautiful wife, Rosemarie present. For my dad, this will be a
very powerful and emotional experience. Dad does not like to
think in terms of earrings for men, pierced body parts for men
or women, UFO's and most especially, anything which would (in
his mind) detract from his respectability. As our guests now
know, dad is a very well known and respected man in his
community ... man of the year in fact.

Now this is important. My dad's memory is faulty. He does not
recall anything vividly, most especially recent events and this
sighting took place not more than 9 months ago. Whenever dad
attempts to repeat something from memory, it will usually come
out somewhat bass ackwards.

Not this time. My father, age 89 (in August) recalled every
single detail of this event without faltering one dot. And as
he described it, he could not refrain from choking up. Dad's
like that in his latter years.

We all looked at dad as he described the events, comparing it
with my notes and the article I wrote for Jeff Rense's site, he
quoted the entire thing nearly perfectly.

This is the kind of impression such an event leaves with the
experiencer. Very traumatic when your paradigm is completely
destroyed. My dad spent his career as an electro-optics
engineer, specialising in Quality Control and Reliability. In
the last few years of his employment, he worked on the Hubbel
telescope with Perkin Elmer Corporation. He spent much of his
professional life in aerospace, like his genius marketer son. He
has seen up close and personal, some of the most futuristic
hardware in this world. Nothing surprises my pop.

But this sighting of a triangular UFO did. Dad weeps when he
speaks of the sighting and has not forgotten a damned thing. His
denial is from the inside out; not from the outside in. He will
deny the event and what he saw but not to himself, just to
everyone else. But when his sone pressed him "For the book
Dad... " he relented. For me.

Pop's cover up is not exactly as you described it Bruce. And
believe me when I tell you that he surprised me with this
revelation and with his recall. What it means is that to Dad,
this was a traumatic experience. Once in a lifetime. It
completely destroyed his most recent paradigm.

Al and my dad had a "discussion" about my dad's favorite hero,
Christopher Columbus. This is the only subject which will make
dad shed tears. See, Dad researched Columbus' life for three
years. He became Columbus, his hero since boyhood.

Now there is another subject.

Al, next time you come for a Sicilian feast, there is another subject which can break the poor guy up. We'll have to feed him at least one more of his martini's before we broach this subject.

Best,

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland

From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 21:44:18 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 10:15:05 -0500
Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project - Strickland

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 00:08:47 EST
>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Sue Strickland <strick@H2Net.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 15:34:07 -0700

>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 21:29:19 -0500
>>>Subject: Re: Dr. Greer's Disclosure Project
>>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

Dear Jim,

What? You gotta be kiddin' me?

You're questioning my motivation for stomping on Steve G.'s behavior for using abductees for "callin' in UFOs" for "wantabe abductees" for money?

I must have missed something between your righteous anger and my own sense of forlorn distaste for being raped!?

In your old age, have you forgotten "their" little-known, little-discussed bedside manner when you were a tyke?

If you need some reminders, write me off-line. I'll be glad to remind you. You need some coffee if you think I'd let internet rage catch me unawares, especially on this list.

Sue

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 01:07:22 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 10:16:29 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:16:32 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100
>>Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 09:03:49 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

<snip>

>In all due respects, Jenny, I'll wait for the peer review and
>science until after we see the list.

Jenny, Serge:

Oops.

What I meant to say was that, "I'll wait for the peer review and
science after we see the list, [to put in my two cents]."

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:24:57 -0800
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 10:25:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Hatch

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:39:56 EST
>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 14:02:42 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop

><snip>

>>The obviously fake drawing of the shop indicates tune-ups and
>>body work, but there is no indication whether they use genuine
>>OEM parts or some junk from disreputable second and third
>>sources.

>Yeah, you'll never get the Millenium Falcon to do those 90
>degree wheelies with disreputable junk yard parts.

>Man, where do these guys come from?

Hello Bob!

This fellow seems to come from Crested Butte, CO. I thought it was a rather inventive gimmick, a UFO repair shop. With UFOs buzzing hither and yon, some repair facilities would seem to be in order.

<http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/>

I just wish it were done a bit more convincingly like Alien Abductions Inc. (URL below)

<http://www.alienabductions.com/index2.html>

That red herring was so nicely crafted that it took me a while to see that it was a put-on, rather than some commercial venture to milk the abductee wannabes.

The put-on will usually leave out certain bits of info; most especially a phone #, street address or anything similar which might cause complications.

Best!

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louse

From: KarolineLouise@aol.com
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 05:16:09 EST
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 10:30:17 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Louse

> Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 12:03:50 -0500
> Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
> From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>> From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>> Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 06:24:17 EST
>> Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>> To: updates@sympatico.ca

Hi John - and all other interested parties,

First I'd better make it clear I don't have any of the experiences I outlined in my last post. I have no memory of being abducted into an 18th C house or of talking to dead people. I was positing a 'typical' experience of that kind, based on the myriad reports of such things by apparently honest and sincere people.

The point I am making is that while there seems undoubtedly to be something very strange going on - we presently have no idea what that something is.

People are reporting missing time, and conscious or retrieved memories of encountering or being abducted by a vast array of strange creatures - small grey 'aliens', tall grey aliens, tall blond humans, reptiles, small hairy men in blue cloaks, large insects with wands, ancient wizards, wise men from the distant past, other wise men from the distant future, very odd men in cowboy hats - in fact the list and variety is almost endless.

The 'alien abduction' explanation creates its case by selecting a sample of these - the greys (large and small), some reptiles and a few insects, and discarding the rest.

But this is a purely man-made and largely arbitrary distinction, isn't it?

Let's suppose we have three different individuals who all report experiences that are pretty typical of the broad range that is out there.

Person A has a period of missing time, remembers an absence of background sounds (the Oz effect), a strange pulsating light in the sky and an encounter with a small grey and a space ship that leaves him with inexplicable marks on his body.

Person B has a period of missing time, an absence of background sounds, a pulsating light and a strange encounter with a man in a cowboy hat, which also leaves him with inexplicable marks on his body

Person C experiences missing time, absence of background sounds, a strange light in the sky and an encounter with a Godlike being who tells him how to save the world, and leaves him with inexplicable marks on his body

- can we really justify claiming that they are all entirely separate phenomena?

Does it make any kind of sense to determine that person A was abducted by aliens, while person B had a 'temporal lobe episode' (or whatever), while person C is a mystic? Or that they were all really abducted by aliens - only the last two are in denial and have 'screen memories'?

It's pretty apparent that these three have as much in common as they have in difference. Aren't they likely therefore to all represent various aspects of a single phenomenon? One more bizarre, more complex. more plastic in its 'reality' than we can possibly conceive?

With that in mind, John, let's look at the very good points you raise.

>You can't isolate me or my 'case' from
>the many hundreds/thousands of others worldwide. There are folks
>from all corners of the globe who are not only reporting the
>same kinds of events involving "UFOs" and "critters," but in
>many instances the same sequence of events. Those reports
>cannot/should not be ignored at the expense of the rest. It
>would be throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Absolutely. Your experience should not be ignored. No experience should be ignored. Neither the small greys, nor the tall wizards, nor the reptiles, nor the guys in the stetsons, nor the guys from the past or the guys from the future. That is exactly the point I am making.

>Folks labor under the delusion that Budd (or other researchers)
>somehow 'dictate' or 'plant' the conditions or details of the
>abductions. And that the abductees then come along and 'parrot'
>them back to Budd. That's 'bass ackwards.'

>That's not how it works. Or how Budd works.

I am sure you are right. I am sure no one is deliberately trying to contaminate anyone's memories.

Bt that isn't quite what I meant. The point is that the sheer prevalence of the 'alien abduction' imagery puts pressure on people, quite unconsciously to try and shape their own weird anomalous experience to fit this template.

As I suggested before, if person D experiences missing time and an encounter with the Marquis de Sade at a masked ball, which leaves them with apparent chemical burns on their skin, the current tendency is for them and those who investigate them to take the part of their experience that fits the 'alien abduction' template and discard the bits that don't.

We would likely be told or hear it suggested that the Marquis de Sade represented a 'screen memory,' and the subject might even be hypnotised by a believer in small greys who succeeds in discovering that the Marquis was actually a lot smaller and greyer than previously believed.

You see my point?

>If you or Dr. Persinger can please explain to me how a "plasma
>ball" can leave behind physical evidence (that to a trained
>physicians eye) resembles the work of a surgeon, (and deep
>inside my sinuses mind you,) I'm all ears.

I can't.

But I can't explain how a real physical alien being can travel through a solid wall. or how a small grey could even get here by physical flight from the nearest plausible star. Nor can I suggest any plausible way that evolution could produce a six foot telepathic preying mantis on a planet hundreds of light years from earth.

That's the point here isn't it John. There is something going on we can't explain. Something completely bizarre, involving missing time, and extraordinary encounters with impossible things. Science and rationality say that none of it can possibly be happening.

But apparently it is.

In this situation, plasma balls, aliens, pan-dimensional superbeings, mind-monsters, are all equally impossible - and all equally likely.

(By the way - I tend to think Dr Persinger is missing the point more spectacularly than any believer in small greys. You put his helmet on and see a mind-picture of an alien - ergo (he says) all aliens are inventions of the mind.

So, if you put his helmet on and see a mind picture of a cat - are all cats inventions of the mind?

Really it's too idiotic for words. He needs to learn a little logic and a lot of humility).

>Karoline, it's ok to speculate that it 'could be' this, or it
>'could be' that, but at some point you have to narrow your
>options and go with the strongest 'contenders.'

But, since we know nothing about what these things are or how they get here. And since their very existence violates most of our perceived universal laws - how on earth do we possibly decide what the "strongest 'contenders'" are?

How can anyone assess the relative probabilities at work?

What is the relative probability between six impossible things?

>In the case of
>abductions we have reports of "craft" which demonstrate flight
>and motion characteristics unlike anything known on earth. The
>reports of the occupants although varied, are usually of
>"non-human" entities. These "entities" can demonstrate abilities
>which are (again) unknown to us as human beings. (ie; telepathy,
>mind control, the ability to physically control a human being at
>will, to pass through solid objects, float rather than walk,
>etc., etc.)

I think you are at risk of making the whole thing seem more homogeneous than it really is.

The occupants of these craft are indeed varied - some human, some not. We have reptiles (various), greys (large, small or in between), blond nordics, small hairy types in blue, intelligent insects, and bearded wise men. The craft themselves present as many differences as similarities and many very compelling well-documented stories contain no 'craft' at all.

The things that unite all these bewildering variations are the experience of being 'taken' - into another world or another place, or a 'space-ship' - missing time, strange markings on the body, a tendency for the experience to run in families.

These are about the only documentable consistencies - the rest is a morass of confusion in which the 'classic' perception of 'aliens' plays only a small part.

>Non-human ET craft and activity isn't the only possibility, but
>damn if it isn't the best one on the block. At least in terms of
>fitting/explaining what so many of us (witnesses) recall
>happening to us over our lifetimes

>I'm telling you that as "far out" as the ETH sounds, it is the
>_one_and_only_ theory I have ever heard that _fits_ what myself
>and others have been experiencing _to_a_tee_. Nothing else I've
>heard even comes close.

But wouldn't the idea that they were mutant humans from the future fit your experience just as well? Or if they were pan-dimensional superbeings who could manipulate the human mind into 'living' imaginary experiences that were so vivid they produced physical effects on the body?

Really the possibilities are almost endless - and all equally impossible. But then the whole thing is impossible. Why are pan-dimensional superbeings less impossible than intelligent mantids or small grey humanoids that can walk through walls?

This world is teeming with people who have encountered the impossible in a bewildering variety of forms. Instead of seeking to categorise them all into neat but probably meaningless little man-made pigeon-holes, we could be looking to what links them and to what they maybe telling us.

I am suggesting that the 'alien abduction' thesis gives way to a broader less category-obsessed understanding of this phenomena, which recognises that a large percentage of its own cases involve neither 'aliens' nor 'abduction'.

If we go back to the beginning of my post and remember our three experiencers. I suggest that instead of telling person A he was abducted, and person B he has a temporal lobe problem, and person C he is a mystic (ie he's nuts), we try instead to find out why these people are all experiencing missing time, encounters with throbbing lights, manifest strange marks on their bodies and all seem to see very different but equally impossible things.

Because I think that's the key. The one thing that unites them all. They touch the impossible and it burns them.

KL

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Re: Icelandic UFO Experiences? - Aubeck

From: Chris Aubeck <caubeck@email.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 06:04:11 -0500 (EST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 15:22:17 -0500
Subject: Re: Icelandic UFO Experiences? - Aubeck

>From: David Hinson <alefnull@webtv.net>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:48:41 -0500 (EST)
>To: updates@sympatico.ca (UFO UpDates - Toronto)
>Subject: Icelandic UFO Experiences?

>Hi,

>I'm new here. I'm working on a thesis on the possible
>connections between UFO and fairy experiences. ISTR that
>belief in fairies is still fairly prominent in Iceland,
>and so I wonder if UFO beliefs affect fairy encounters and
>vice versa.

>Anything on Icelandic UFOs, especially CE3 and abductions
>would be greatly appreciated.

>David Hinson

Hello David,

I have also been working on a thesis regarding the relationship between the fairy faith and UFOs. I began in 1989 (more or less) and have accumulated a great deal of information on this subject.

We could swap notes if you tell me which issues interest you particularly, as this field is vast. Icelandic fairies have also come to my attention though I have not yet had the chance to look into Icelandic ufology.

When approaching this area of research one must take the following factors into account (among others), especially if the thesis is to be exhaustive:

1)The beginning of oral traditions - and in Iceland, of course, the bulk of fairy 'reports' have been passed down orally - cannot usually be dated. However it is important to note the earliest date on which they were collected or published. Chronology is the key to making fairy/alien comparisons, as I have mentioned in previous postings on UFO UpDates. You must uncover the earliest UFO reports to check whether a historical overlap occurred between the two kinds of narratives.

2) It can be surprisingly fruitful to pay attention to the names given to each kind of 'fairy-like' entity in popular tradition. Try to look into the etymological roots of the names. This may also reveal that folkloric beings not generally regarded as 'fairies' were originally conceived as such, and thus deserve your attention.

3) Don't forget to keep an eye on what was happening in other areas of the world during the times when particular fairy 'cases' allegedly took place. (You never know!)

4) You may find similarities between Icelandic folklore and abductions, close encounters, mutilations and human illness. This is what I have found in the fairy faiths of many different

countries. But each of these must be dealt with as separate issues in your research as a causal link between them has yet to be established even in ufology (no matter what they tell you).

5) You will find an interesting correlation between Icelandic, Canadian and African fairy faiths, which are all still alive in varying degrees. South America is also worth looking into.

Hope some of this helps. My own work is not complete yet, even after a decade of research, so your idea to focus on a specific region such as Iceland may be a good idea if you want faster results.

Chris Aubeck

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 28](#)

Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:22:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 15:26:37 -0500
Subject: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp

Source: The National Post

<http://www.nationalpost.com/>

Wednesday March 28, 2001, p. A1

N.S. town's new postmark pays homage to UFO visit

Les Perreux
National Post

Residents of Shag Harbour, N.S., will be mailing an image of a flying saucer with every letter and package after Canada Post approved a new postmark commemorating a visit 34 years ago by an unidentified flying object.

The crash has become the subject of popular lore, including a book, and has also made the town a tourist draw.

The locally designed ink stamp, used to mark and date outgoing mail, depicts a flying saucer hovering over water with a lighthouse and boat beneath it. The scene refers to an incident in 1967 in which an apparent UFO plunged into the bay near the town and sent the RCMP, Coast Guard and townspeople on a fruitless search-and-rescue mission.

"There are so many people coming in who are interested in having their picture taken here or having their mail stamped, I though we needed something with a UFO design," said postmaster Cindy Nickerson, who came up with the idea for the stamp two years ago. The design is also being used on T-shirts, hats and commemorative wooden nickels.

At about 11:30 p.m. on Oct. 4, 1967, Laurie Wickens and three friends were driving home when they saw an orange light heading toward the water, and called police.

"At first the cops didn't want to believe us, but then we found out another cop had seen it too," Mr. Wickens recalled yesterday.

He and several witnesses, including RCMP officers, watched the light floating on the water until it sank. An all-night search found nothing except a 600-metre strip of floating, yellow scum.

No official explanation has been offered for the lights, but theories at the time had a Cold War influence and involved a Russian spacecraft or submarine. Mr. Wickens believes it was a U.S. military plane.

Canada Post has created many postmarks for communities, including a teddy bear hugging a heart for Love, Sask., and Anne of Green Gables for Cavendish, P.E.I.

"It's a concept that goes over very well with collectors," said Tim McGurrian, spokesman for Canada Post.

The ink stamp will be officially unveiled in May.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Corrales

From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 05:37:58 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:39:34 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile - Corrales

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 15:56:28 EST
>Subject: Re: UFO Over Arica, Chile
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: UFO Over Arica, Chile

>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Date: Sun, 25 Mar 2001 17:04:46 -0500
>>Subject: UFO Over Arica, Chile
>>From: Scott Corrales <lornis1@juno.com>

>>SOURCE: La Estrella de Arica, Vol. 25,
>>DATE: March 25, 2001

>>UFO SEEN OVER ARICA

><snip>

>>The phenomenon made itself visible around 18:00 hours, when
>>dozens of citizens raised their eyes skyward to look at it and
>>wonder aloud what it could be; many of them rapidly reached the
>>conclusion that they were in the presence of a UFO. At that
>>time of day, the object had the appearance of a first magnitude
>>star with a glow similar to that of the planet Venus, but
>>whitish or metallic in color, and moved slowly toward the
>>southwest (headed toward the sea). As the sun vanished below the
>>horizon, the object's glow diminished and its color turned to
>>red before disappearing only a few minutes after 19:00 hours.

>>The public gathered around a photographic and optical equipment
>>shop located at the corner of 21 de Mayo and Patricio Lynch
>>streets, where people stood in line to catch a glimpse of the
>>object through a telescope. Those lucky enough to see the object
>>thus aided described it as "a cup without a handle and a
>>dangling thread" or "a cup without a base and a very narrow
>>foot."

><snip>

>>The fact that the object vanished almost simultaneously before
>>the eyes of those seeing through telescopes and those seeing it
>>unaided suggests that it disappeared because it stopped shining,
>>rather than due to distance. Furthermore, the gradual manner in
>>which this happened, and the time at which the incident occurred,
>>leads to the conclusion that the object wasn't self luminous,
>>but rather reflected the sun's light.

>>Given the witnesses' description and the object's slowness and
>>deliberate movement, many thought that it could be a balloon.

>Scott:

>What reasons can you list why this could not be considered a
>balloon?

Greetings Bob--

Guess what? It probably was a balloon.

The problem is that INEXPLICATA has posted a number of stories concerning the passage of MIR Balloons over the southern hemisphere and they haven't prompted your interest.

Perhaps if you'd read them you'd see that great care is being taken in differentiating the true unidentifieds from the weather balloons.

When confirmation is received from the MIR Balloon program I shall be posting it as well.

Very best regards,

Scott Corrales
Institute of Hispanic Ufology
www.inexplicata.com

"You must do what you feel is right, of course.."
---Obi-Wan Kenobi to Luke Skywalker, SW:ANH (1977)

[[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 > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor

From: Kelly <kellymcs@attcanada.ca>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:41:40 -0500
Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor

Source: The Los Angeles Times

<http://www.latimes.com/news/state/20010327/t000026482.html>

Tuesday, March 27, 2001

Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific
May Have Been Meteor

A bright red and green light that appeared to plunge into the Pacific Ocean on Monday night may have been a meteor, an astronomer said.

About 30 people from Santa Barbara to Marina del Rey called U.S. Coast Guard and law enforcement officials about 8:20 p.m. to report what they thought was a meteorite, a flare or a downed aircraft, authorities said.

Crews in boats and helicopters equipped with infrared scopes were sent to search for crash debris in Los Angeles Harbor and Marina del Rey, but they found nothing.

Paramedic Robert Johnson saw the brilliant burst of light in Sherman Oaks while sitting around a bonfire with fellow firefighters.

"I could see how people thought it was a plane," he said. "There were flames coming out, but they were green and large.

"This thing was hot and just going before it disappeared below the horizon," he said. "I thought it was going to crash into something."

Troy Powers, a museum guide at Griffith Observatory, said that judging from the descriptions, "it could have been a meteor."

"It might have impacted the water, although that's pretty rare," he said. More likely, he said, "it was a meteor, between the size of a naval orange and a basketball, about 40 to 50 miles high in the atmosphere."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 15:41:10 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:51:00 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Serge Salvaille <sergesa@sympatico.ca>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 13:28:58 -0500

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><snip>

>Don't you think a Scientific Panel would be a better idea? If
>this is open to discussion (it is, isn't it?), it is quite
>natural that your Council idea evolves following input from
>multiple and diverse sources.

Hi,

Of course this is open to discussion. That's why I raised the
idea.

Ufology can do whatever it feels appropriate - although I have
to say I think it is now obvious that Ufology is way too
fractionalised that to even think about most of them working
together looks impossible.

That - to me - pretty well explains why Ufology is going nowhere
fast, because if we cannot even lay aside differences of opinion
long enough to work together on a simple project for just a few
months then it is pointless thinking about doing anything a lot
harder.

If it is decided to create some sort of different initiative
heading off at a tangent then that's fine by me. As you know I
believe in democracy.

But I remind this thread began simply as an idea put out by me
for a very precise reason. It was to get Ufology to define those
cases that most persuade the field that the ETH is a prime
option for the resolution of the UFO mystery. Then to put those
cases to ETI scientists and ask them to comment on how well /
poorly this actual set of data did support the existence of ET
being here on earth now.

That seemed a simple, sensible way to objectify what evidence
there was for Ufology's seemingly most popular theory. To lead
us from current uncertainty (because we would get a dozen
different answers to this question if we asked it now) into an
agreed data base around which we had at least a clear record of
the scientific perspective on a very specific set of cases put
to science with very precise questions to answer.

By all means, move into some totally different idea if that's

what is generally felt makes most sense. As and when there is some specific idea on the table with a very precise goal suggested for it to pursue then I will happily comment.

For now I would merely say that what I was trying to do was to get away from the talking shop / lets argue forever about the same old contentious cases.

To try to prove to science that something is going on sounds a fine ideal - but the problem is that it is very vague and is also compounded by the knowledge that Ufology is not a single phenomenon.

In fact, it is a combination of many phenomena reported under one catchall phrase and so any attempt to prove 'its' worth collectively has to fail because you are using a lot of non relevant data to try to prove something that isn't very clearly defined in the first place. You wont convince a physicist with lots of cases they consider more relevant to psychology - and vice versa.

That's largely why prior attempts such as Condon et al have contributed useful things but failed to indent global awareness. Because it is impossible to adequately prove Ufology is of interest to science if you adopt a scattergun approach whereby you examine 50 cases - 20 of which may be IFOs, 10 of which might be some sort of rare atmospheric anomaly , another 10 of which might interest perceptual psychologists as possible anomalies of consciousness, 5 of which might suggest new clues about physical laws of the universe and 5 that just might possibly point towards the ETH.

(And these are merely figures plucked out of the air not meant to mean anything in their own right - except as an illustration)

My point is that by not defining up front what you are trying to establish - more exactly than 'to show real UFOs exist' - then you will put off more people than you persuade by getting lost in a confusion of data that is really relevant to some other field of study.

At least by focusing precisely on cases that support one theory - the ETH in my proposal - and seeking to establish what we do and do not have that argues precisely in favour of this possibility - then we have a very clear question - a very clear way of asking it - and very clear answers that will ultimately emerge.

I don't have a problem with any research proposal that takes this into account and tries to avoid duplicating the failed efforts of the past .

So what ideas on this score does anybody have?

>I, for one, have proposed the formation of a group with
>pertinent scientific credentials to get scientific credibility.
>With Bob Young, this makes two of us.

Fine - but a group to then go on and do what and how? Nothing is stopping you creating such a group - indeed most of the major groups - such as MUFON and CUFOs - have panels of scientific advisors that already work in such a way.

I would suggest that what we need to do is create a research proposal and then find the right way to build the team in order to carry it out. Not to create a team and then decide what it should do to justify its existence.

>Again, is your proposal definitive?

Of course not. It was an idea set up to address a very specific research project. That's all. And it obviously would never work without broad support (which it clearly isn't getting) so its a none starter anyway.

>Maybe we should rephrase the Council proposition:

>"Let's create a panel that would produce a scientifically
>watertight bunch of cases which could be thrust in front of the
>world with the words 'see - there is something there' appended."

Which is really what Condon did, and various others since. I don't object to anyone giving this another go. But given the response to well meaning and fairly well conducted recent projects (like Sturrock's) I sadly don't see this achieving anything new unless it has a more specific aim in mind.

But this is not meant to deter you from trying - just an expression of my pessimism that more of the same will take us any further than it has done before.

>Who would be against that?

Like I said I am not 'against' it. It would in no way achieve the aim that I had in the first place - which was very precisely to define the evidence that Ufology claims to hold in support of the ETH. But that's fine, of course. That was only my suggestion.

Ufology clearly seems happier just to accept a belief in the ETH and doesn't seem to find it necessary to establish what data exists that would justify such a concept.

I have learnt something from that recognition. So I am not unhappy! Indeed the past two weeks have been an illuminating experience in various ways.

But by all means give it a go. I am sure you will solicit wide support from pro Ufologists. And disdain from skeptics. And I am afraid I suspect that at the end of the day you'll make no serious impact on the world at large or likely be any further forward in terms of what we know than we are today.

However, I sincerely hope that this project gets going and proves me wrong. And I welcome any serious initiative to apply scientific logic to Ufology so I am by no means against trying.

><snip>

>>No person - however
>>experienced as a Ufologist - is going to know which cases
>>support the ETH or those that will even give science cause to
>>think that they might.

><snip>

>This may be the first mistake.

>Maybe we should present the data and simply get it 'acknowledged'
>by science. So far, ufology has failed to even accomplish that.

Well it has tried often enough - eg through the Sturrock report and the AAAS symposium report, etc. But you cannot just get data 'acknowledged'. What is anyone supposed to acknowledge about it?

(a) The existence of unsolved cases? (But then who doubts this - nobody does so far as I know)

(b) That these cases are insoluble? (Some might acknowledge that for now some are - others will flee the prospect for fear it sends the wrong message that they now 'believe' in UFOs - and since for virtually every celebrated case some skeptic somewhere is going to soon enough issue an alternative review saying that this case is really a such-and-such - then any sensible, uncommitted commentator will simply say - lets wait and see - and a few scientists just might privately admit - hey this looks interesting but I daren't say so openly as I would face peer pressure for doing so) (Which is more or less the position that we are in already)

(c) That these cases offer proof of 'new' science? (Heres where the vagueness of that idea comes to the fore. Yes, I think some cases do suggest this. But I know that some seemingly impressive cases fall apart over time. So I would be reluctant to say that I believe any one case 'proves' UFO reality and would be wary of such a statement even based on a collection of cases?)

Why - because what do we mean by 'UFO reality'? That some cases are novel atmospheric phenomena? That another intelligence is visiting us? As soon as you get into the area of trying to conclude something as vague as 'UFOs are real or unexplained'

then you start to deter scientists because they do not like admitting to what is in effect an unasked question - what is really going on here? They see that any positive answer they give might be inappropriate once people put to the vagueness of 'UFO reality' whatever they personally take to mean by that term)

>Maybe we should sit down and do some brainstorming and ask simple >basic questions:

>1. What is the purpose of the Council?

Like I noted - when I first suggested such a concept it was merely a way to answer that very specific question about the ETH. If it is set up to address anything other than that then its format will indeed need to adapt. But the answer to this question is needed before any attempt is even made to create a panel.

And I have made my views known that it has to be created to do something more specific than to 'prove that something is going on' .

>2. What should be the purpose of the Council?

To answer whatever question (as per 1 above) it was created to ask.

>3. In what way should the Council operate to achieve the desired >purpose?

That can only come when we know what 1 and 2 are.

>4. What structure?

Ditto

>5. What modus operandi?

Ditto

>6. Who?

Ditto

><snip>

>The first part of the experiment is us and the latter part is >science. Since we're somewhat trying to sell a product, it >should undoubtedly be tailored to the client's needs.

I completely agree with that sentiment.

>>But I wanted to make clear (if I hadn't done >>already) that this was never my idea to turn Ufology into a >>science or to define evidence that will stand up to scrutiny .

><snip>

>This may not be your idea. Is it because it is unfeasible? Or is >it because it is undesirable?

I don't follow what you are saying here? Is what undesirable and to whom? Ufology cannot really be a science because it is a collection of existing sciences (which may or may not include exobiology). All we can try to do is apply scientific thinking to what is largely just data collection and very rarely steps beyond into research.

I also deliberately avoided the idea of finding data that would stand up to scrutiny for all kinds of reasons.

Firstly, since the specific question posed was the support for the ETH then there fairly obviously isn't any proof of this theory or Ufology would be very aware of it. All we have is suggestive evidence. Not any kind of actual proof.

Secondly, creating data that will stand up to scrutiny takes us into that tricky area - that Ufology spends most of its time engaged upon - arguing over the pros and cons and solutions /

non solutions to various cases. So I can predict with near certainty that no panel - whoever is on it and however hard they work - is going to come up with data that will be accepted as solid evidence for UFO reality in the eyes of even a straight 51% majority of people.

We simply exist in a field where all cases are defined by less than clear cut evidence with a sliding scale of probabilities of explanation ascribed to each one. Some people (and that means most scientists) are inevitably going to decline to support the reality of any case for which even a moderately reasonable rational explanation also exists. And that means most of our cases. And they are not wrong by their own rules to do just this. Even though in some cases it is perfectly possible that the UFO solution is ultimately the correct one and there is 'no' IFO explanation.

So if we seek to define evidence that is broadly accepted. Who do we want to accept it and what do we want them to accept that it means?

Accepting data that proves UFO reality is a very different thing from accepting that there is data that is presently unexplained. These are not the same thing at all - unless you strictly define a UFO as something presently unexplained that may actually become explained as a known phenomenon with the passage of time.

Just as coming up with data that is widely accepted as supporting the ETH is different from the more realistic goal of discovering the data that causes some people to consider it to be support for the ETH.

In other words we have to tailor the questions that we ask towards ones that at least have a possibility of gaining consensus amidst a UFO field that is deeply fractionalised. Otherwise why are we doing this?

It seems as if we are - in effect - doing this work to persuade the already persuaded of something that they already know!

>This is not a theology debate - although ufology is in need of >devil's advocates.

>Skeptics are not a 'faction' of ufology, no more than new agers >are a 'faction' of psychology.

>Granted, there is a group a people who proclaim themselves >skeptics in relation to ufology. These people negate even the >existence of any phenomena. In this regard, they do not differ >from the proponents of a flat Earth, who BTW are not a >'faction' of geography.

>We should seek the other - the true - skeptics: people who are >highly critical of all material concerning ufology, their >interest stemming from the notion that, all considered, 'there >is something out there'.

My suggestion was that the panel comprise four equal groups of people - pro ETH Ufologists, the open minded researchers you note above, outside scientists (and ETI specialists) and skeptics. Why? Because these basically represent the four main sections of the community that take any genuine interest in the question of the ETH. Therefore in any rounded research into the evidence we have regarding this theory they all deserve a voice.

I agree that there is a distinction between skeptics (who in my eyes are cautious doubters who are seeking the truth even if it is mundane) and debunkers (who I regard as zealous unbelievers out to disprove UFO reality). The latter would never contribute much to such a debate - sadly - as it would be anathema to them. So I think we are talking about the same kind of skeptics here.

It is pointless being on any panel unless you have an open mind and are willing to review the evidence. You should be there to let the evidence guide you to a point where you speak out about what you find. You should not be there to use it as a vehicle to sound off about your own pre-existent pet thinking.

But thanks for the constructive thinking you have exhibited in this message. It was appreciated.

Best wishes,
Jenny Randles

\

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Serious Research - Randles

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 16:03:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:53:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:16:32 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 11:38:36 +0100
>>Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 09:03:49 -0500
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Randles

>
>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2001 10:16:12 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Why would skeptics need to be included if "the science" comes
>later? I'm confused.

Hi,

From my perspective because I was trying to create a rounded decision making process whereby we could all try to agree on those cases from within Ufology that most specifically pointed towards the ETH as a resolution.

If skeptics were excluded they would unquestionably say afterwards - waste of time. They never asked us to comment. We would have told them that such and such a case was worthless. So the whole study is worthless.

We undermine our own work by allowing such preventable things to happen.

If you circumvent later criticism by giving an equal say to all you then at least you have a fighting chance of creating a mutually agreed set of cases. After all skeptics are not being asked to endorse any case as being support for the ETH. They can believe every single case does not do so if they wish. They are simply helping to chose from the available cases the ones that best point in that direction.

They don't have to point very far in their eyes. Just more than the ones they 'don't' choose!

If the aim is to get a broad church on anything - and with such fractionalisation in Ufology it has to be - then you can only do that by inviting the 'enemy' to sup at your table. I see nothing wrong in trying to do this. We need to get away from this 'them and us' mentality which is dragging us down.

If you want science to look at data and truly regard it as the choice of the UFO community then don't you think they are going to take more seriously a selection that had input from skeptics from the start rather than one that skeptics would be shouting abuse at even before it landed on the desk of the first scientist?

Surely if it is possible to reach a consensus then the selection of cases is much the stronger for being so?

>>The point never was - so far as I was concerned - to create a
>>panel that would produce a scientifically watertight bunch of
>>cases which could be thrust in front of the world with the words
>>'see - we told ya' appended. Simply a selection process from
>>within Ufology to find those cases that the community regards as
>>most supportive of the ETH and submit them to science for their
>>assessment.

>In all due respect, I'm not sure that there is a difference,
>except in the way that you've worded the two ends of the
>paragraph.

I think there is a big difference. If you offer data to science with the premise that it backs the reality of the ETH then science concludes that you have made up your mind without consulting the experts in ETI studies. Which they will take to be themselves, of course.

That faux pas would psychologically motivate them against you from the get go.

If, on the other hand, you say these are the cases which offer some indication of possible alien presence and it is from these that we have formulated the ETH as a theory of possible explanation. Now we are turning to you as experts on ETI and asking - how well do you think these cases match what you know about ETI? At least then you would be regarded as going about this in the right way, having an open mind and - I would hope - you might get some sensible answers rather than merely dismissive ones.

>>But I wanted to make clear (if I hadn't done
>>already) that this was never my idea to turn Ufology into a
>>science or to define evidence that will stand up to scrutiny .
>>Of course, we have to bear these ideals in mind when deciding
>>upon the cases to be referred. But in essence this is an
>>exercise in clear thinking by the UFO community.

>>It comes down to one basic question - really - if a majority of
>>people in the UFO world support the ETH as the most likely
>>solution to the unsolved cases (and I think that they do) then
>>it is proper to ask that we spell out the cases that most
>>persuade the majority of that view. Then we can turn these over
>>to science for their opinion on how well these do - in fact -
>>support the ETH.

>OK. I'm not trying to take your comments out of context and
>trump you, but I now understand that what your trying to get at
>is a cheering section, and an agreed upon cheer.

No - I don't think so. I was trying to get Ufology (in all its facets) to define those cases that are the most suggestive of the ETH. They must exist if the ETH is to have any basis other than a dreamt up idea without evidential support. So it makes sense - surely - to agree which cases best match that possibility. Then put these cases to the relevant scientific experts in that field for them to comment on how well they perceive that these cases are in scientific terms suggestive of the ETH.

At the end we know more about the ETH than we do right now. We at least have an agreed set of prime cases that are suggestive of it. And we have a scientific analysis of these cases by working experts in that field who have assessed them with a very specific goal in mind - to tell us if they do - or do not - match what they expect of ET presence on earth and if not then why not. That allows us to look for cases that the ETI experts tell us ought to exist and that differ from the ones we presented to them in order to find evidence to support the ETH.

So I don't see this as creating a cheering section at all. I see it as asking - and trying to answer - a very precise question about the UFO field.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 10:38:40 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:56:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop - Young

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:24:57 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:39:56 EST
>>Subject: Re: Don's UFO Repair Shop
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

><http://www.geocities.com/ResearchTriangle/Lab/3126/>

I just wish it were done a bit more convincingly like Alien Abductions Inc. (URL below)

Larry:

Oh, I think it's fun. I really like the question, "Does your ship have a history of similar problems?" I was tempted to e-mail them, "yeh, repeated crashes".

><http://www.alienabductions.com/index2.html>

Cool! I love the abduction testimonials.

Royce Myers II ought to investigate these guys for his UFO dirt bag or whatever it is. Inquiring minds want to know.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sandow

From: **Greg Sandow** <greg@gregsandow.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 11:12:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:58:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Sue, Greg, Don, List:

>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the
>30% of UFO
>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

Bob, nobody says astronomers aren't qualified to identify astronomical IFOs. The only question is whether they're qualified to make pronouncements about the totality of UFO reports.

As in: "Well [this is the voice of a TV newscaster] we've heard from Jeremy Otter, the famed UFO researcher. And now a comment from Susan Celestina, professor of astronomy at the state university: 'Many of those purported UFOs turn out to be misidentifications of Venus. There's nothing to this UFO business; all sightings can be explained.'"

Professor Celestina, in this invented but all too familiar example, would be talking through her hat. Unless she's made a deep study of UFOs, which in most cases her real-world equivalents haven't, she should, more honestly, say: "Many UFO reports turn out to be misidentifications of Venus, or other astronomical objects. I can't say anything about the rest."

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Jones

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 19:04:41 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 03:59:38 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Jones

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:50:46 +0000
>From: Philip Mantle <pmquest@dial.pipex.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School

>Dear All,

>I wonder if you might possibly be able to help me. In recent
>weeks I have been involved at Batley Boys High School in West
>Yorkshire, who run their own 'Mystery Club' in their own time.
>So far I have made one presentation at the school with others
>planned.

>Most of the boys involved in the 'Mystery Club' are at the
>bottom end of the educational ladder, and until they showed an
>interest in the UFO subject their teachers were hard pushed to
>get them to put pen to paper. When it comes to UFO's, there
>seems to be no stopping them.

<Snip>

>I would therefore like to ask if any of you would like to
>contribute any kind of UFO resource material that you think
>might be appropriate. This could be books, video's, CD-ROMs,
>DVDs, posters, badges, in short, just about anything.

>Philip Mantle.

Philip

If you care to give me an address I will happily send two free
copies of the CD-Rom that I produce, or I could post them to
you.

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.
Sean Jones
<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Brad Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 16:49:40 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 04:04:22 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Brad Sparks

>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

>>Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 19:26:48 -0500
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>ET via space travel is the simplest to explain truly
>>unexplainable sightings which include observations of structured
>>objects.

>Bruce,

>"Simple" if you can point to non-UFO, mainstream science data in
>support of same. But science itself has none to offer. To
>counter this lack of freely available data ufologists typically
>resort to one of the following arguments: 1) scientists just
>haven't looked at the available UFO "evidence" or they would
>know better; 2) science has been brainwashed by the Air Force
>and other Establishment elements, 3) a whole host of Government
>acronyms have covered up the "truth" from all the sciences in
>this country, as well as every other country in the world.

Hi Dennis & Bruce,

I found this posting while clearing my backlog. In reply to
Dennis' three points above:

1) Scientists Have Looked at the UFO Evidence. REPLY: Hynek, McDonald, Sturrock and many others argued strenuously that their scientific colleagues have not been giving adequate attention to the UFO problem. Please re-read Hynek's chapter 12 of The UFO Experience, "Science Is Not Always What Scientists Do." Can you refute Hynek's and McDonald's and Sturrock's and Maccabee's facts and arguments on this?

By my estimate, the scientific community has given the UFO problem less than 1 year of full study in the past 54 years or so since Arnold or the ghost rockets (yes, that's what I said, ghost rockets, US AAF Intelligence brought in two scientists to study ghost rockets in 1946, Dr. James May and Dr. Charles L. Carroll, Jr., so scientists were actually involved that early). By "full study" I mean having on the order of 100 McDonalds running around full-time studying the UFO subject as they do with researching dolphins and their intelligence, investigating Martian craters, scrutinizing the mating habits of insects, exploring electron holes in semiconductors, counting interstellar dust particles, etc. That includes the Condon Committee (about 7.5 Full Time Equivalents of scientific work for 2 years), Battelle (a handful part-time for 2 years), and McDonald's couple of years working on UFO's essentially full-time circa 1966-70, plus Hynek's part-time efforts, Bruce's part-time efforts, etc. There have never been 100 of them working on UFO's full time at any one time.

A full scientific study of UFO's since Arnold should have had something on the order of 5,400 scientist man-years of effort. Instead we've had maybe 50 man-years of scientists on it, possibly 100. And the results are consistent with the level of scientific effort applied: Barely scratching the surface.

(2) Science Has Not Been Brainwashed by USAF etc. REPLY: The USAF established a secret policy in 1952 of handling UFO's in a Public Relations fashion due to Cold War fears that the Soviets could exploit UFO's for psychological warfare purposes. The AFOIN Staff Studies are in the declassified files. There is no indication that the scientific community was going to be exempted or immunized from the effects of this debunking policy and in fact scientists were to be enlisted in the debunking effort itself. Ruppelt personally contributed to this policy development, which gutted his Project Blue Book and turned it into a PR debunking shell, about which he later complained as if he had had no knowledge of how it happened. All was set in motion June 5-July 22, 1952, well before the much despised Robertson Panel and the heavy CIA involvement. The Top Secret Air Intelligence Study 203 of 1948-9 stated the deepest fear of all -- that the Soviets could psychologically negate or diminish the US's nuclear advantage by claiming to have superior secret weapons such as saucers (UFO's). Remember, such perceived impressions skillfully manipulated by propagandists have real political impacts and do not require any actual secret weapon to exist, only a belief that they do or might exist. Look at how the North Vietnamese skillfully manipulated world and U.S. public opinion to their advantage so that they could win the Vietnam War against the U.S.'s superior technology and forces.

(3) Govt "Acronyms" Do Not Cover Up UFO Evidence from Science. REPLY: See above for discussion of AF policy. Cold War concerns opposed declassification of UFO files and hindered scientific access to data. See Hynek's chapter 11.

>>Of course, if there are no such reports (all misidentifications, >>hoaxes or delusions), then there is no point in making any ET >>argument. (I note that Dennis still hasn't responded to my query >>as to whether or not he accepts ANY sighting as unexplained and >>truly unexplainable.)

>Of course there are reports. I accept many of them as >unexplained and unexplainable -- by their very nature. I accept >my own sighting as inherently unexplainable, if for no other >reason than that I will never be able to acquire all the >relevant data regarding same. It will be forever and always >unexplainable, yea, verily, and amen.

<snip>

Dennis have you ever posted your complete UFO sighting details? Where can I read about it?

What are "the relevant data" or are you just making a general statement not intended to be analyzed in any depth?

In the philosophy and methodology of science, it is understood that data are only "relevant" to a particular theory or hypothesis being tested. For example, in meteorological optics, the most "relevant" piece of data is the size of the grazing elevation angle to a possible inversion layer or supra-lapsed layer, something that is often not obtained by UFO investigators. You can have all the inversion you want but if the angle is greater than about 1/2 degree you won't have a mirage image to pose as a UFO. But this angle relative to horizontal atmospheric layers is not even "relevant data" to the usual astronomical explanations of celestial bodies high up in the sky. Etc. etc.

If after running through all the known conventional theories to explain it and failing to find any that fit, there are no more theories then there are no more "relevant data" to be gathered or inferred. But if ETH is still viable then there might data relevant to that theory that haven't been extracted yet.

I think what you're trying to get at is that the UFO sighting is a past event and not repeatable, therefore it isn't "scientific." Well, "science" studies a great many non-repeatable past events such as supernovas, geologic events,

meteors, atmospheric sprites and jets, etc. As Vallee explained way back in 1966, the event may not be repeatable per se or reproducible, but the record of the event can be studied scientifically. Physical evidence can be studied. And in fact, witnesses can be re-interviewed (or interviewed for the first time) and even calibrated as to their observational abilities. To a large extent, if a series of similar events recurs then there is a certain degree of "repeatability." Forensics studies unique one-time events. The Tunguska explosion in 1908 was a unique event but it has been studied scientifically.

Brad

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Part II

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 15:44:03 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 04:07:33 -0500
Subject: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Part II

Many readers reported they did not receive the 2nd Part of these files. Many servers apparently can not handle the length
Regards, George Filer

Filer's Files #13 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
March 27, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
Webmaster Chuck Warren <http://www.filersfiles.com>,

ARE UFOs A THREAT TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY?

In this weeks files we review UFOs and aircraft safety. UFOs were observed in Pennsylvania, Maryland, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Illinois, Washington, Puerto Rico, Bolivia, and France. The Bolivian Air Force chased a UFO with a jet over La Paz. Leonard Stringfield one of the greatest Ufologists of all time told me of his meeting with Robert C. Gardner an UFO investigator who had interviewed General Benjamin Chidlaw, then in charge of US Eastern Air Defense. Later General Chidlow became head of the Air Defense Command. In his book "Saucer Post.. 3-0 Blue" by Leonard Stringfield reveals in the course of the half hour interview General Chidlaw stated the following,

"We have stacks of reports about flying saucers. We take them seriously when you consider we have lost many men and planes trying to intercept them." Later work, supporting Gardner's statement came from a Cincinnati, who, with rank in the Air Force Reserve, had access to certain bits of off-the-record information. It was during the Cincinnati flap of 1955, that he related to a GOC supervisor, who in turn told me that the Air Force was losing almost a plane a day." Page 91.

2ND PART OF FILES

PUERTO RICO UFO

LAS PIÑAS HILL -- Researchers Orlando Pla and Lucy Guzman have brought to our attention a sighting, which took place on March 12, 2001, at 2:00 AM. Witnesses to the event were A. Serrano and A. Leon, who were sitting on their porch at that time and saw a bright light heading toward them from the mountains near Aguas Buenas and over Hwy 1. The object's brightness increased as it approached, as did its size. It flew at low altitude over a farm located some 15 meters away from where the witnesses sat. The flying object was flying in general direction from Puerto Rico's northern coast toward its southern coast, finally vanishing over Las Piñas hill. The 2nd PART witnesses did not detect any unusual smells related to the event, but remarked that the sighting left an odd taste in their mouths, which they described as similar to "putting a battery between one's lips." An almost imperceptible buzzing sound, "like that of bees" also accompanied the event. Both witnesses agreed that the object was so bright that it was painful to look at, and that its true shape could not be made out because of the brightness. It appeared to have "something like luminous mirrors" along its bottom section, which seemed to rotate. They estimate that the UFO was some 10 meters in length. Scott Corrales Institute of Hispanic Studies.

BOLIVIA VIDEO OF SATURN SHAPED DISK

COCHABAMBA -- Gabriel Villarroe reports that for the last 70 minutes local television has been taping and showing a UFO over the city on March 26, 2001. Beginning at 7:20 AM up to now the local TV's are taping a UFO with a saucer shape. The object is silver with a sphere and a disk. It looks very much like Saturn through a telescope, with the exception that it moves back and forth in the sky and as crossed over 120 degrees in less than an hour. Thanks to Gabriel Villarroe 591-772-7000 Editor's Note: We are attempting to obtain a copy of this tape.

BOLIVIAN AIR FORCE JET CHASES "UFO FOR 30 MINUTES

LA PAZ - A number of hypotheses, which sought to explain the appearance of an UFO, were systematically discarded by air traffic controllers in La Paz and Cochabamba, as well as by commercial and military pilots. The first sighting of the flying object took place near the city of Cochabamba over the Tunari National Park around 7:30 AM. Following a sequence of rapid movements interrupted by minutes of static flight, the object reached La Paz over which it remained until 8:25 AM. Eyewitness accounts coincide on the description: a spherical object with a metallic sheen, which could not be completely identified due to its sporadic movement. Alerted to the phenomenon, the Bolivian Air Force (FAB) ordered the scramble of a T-33 jet, which unsuccessfully tried to approach the object. "It was a brilliant, metallic-colored sphere, but we could not determine what type of object it was," reported Major Luis Arzabe Torrico, the T-33's pilot, who explained that although his military jet was able to reach an altitude of 42,500 feet, the object maintained the same vertical distance in regard to the aircraft as it did during the jet's takeoff. Minutes after the FAB jet landed at the El Alto Air Base, the object vanished. Several commercial airliner pilots plowing the Lima-La Paz and Cochabamba-La Paz route reported seeing a large object (considerably larger than a passenger aircraft such as a Boeing 747) to the El Alto tower. The object was also picked up by the television cameras of at least two local stations. A technician told the FIDES News Agency that "radars were unable to identify the type of vehicle crossing the skies." Several people tend toward identifying the object as a weather balloon, but its speed and altitude do not lend credence to this hypothesis. Thanks for translation (c) 2001. S. Corrales, Institute of Hispanic Ufology and Gloria Coluchi.

FRANCE FLYING TRIANGLE SIGHTING

PARIS -- Jonathan Dunford writes, " I'm an ex-patriot who's been living in Paris for 16 years. I must start by saying I am an amateur Ufologist. My French wife has tolerated my interest in the UFO phenomena but has always been skeptical. Last night, March 26, 2001, at about 10:15 P.M., returning in our car from Orleans to Paris (near Antony not far from Orly airport) while driving on the highway we noticed off the shoulder to the right, three white lights in a triangular form with a RED one (somewhat larger) in the middle. The light in the middle was red and the surrounding ones white, I was driving so I didn't get a chance to stare at it...

My wife immediately opened the car window, and noticed the massive structure that at first she thought was sitting on a pole. Then this "thing" disappeared suddenly and with no noise in the fog. It was a classic flying triangle experience. I 'm thrilled as I study the subject with such passion, but have never witnessed a UFO "in the flesh." My wife who never even wanted to hear such a thing now knows that UFOs exist (she is convinced thought that this structure must be terrestrial and some sort of sophisticated military project). I would like to know if any of the many cars on highway reported the incident. Thanks to Jonathan Dunford, Paris dunford@noos.fr

SOUTH AUSTRALIA SIGHTINGS

Dave writes, "The first time I saw a UFO was when I was fourteen years old in 1979. I was walking home about 9.25 PM when a shadow went over my head. I cringed and looked up and saw this incredibly huge dark shape about 100 feet above me traveling north. No sound, no lights -- nothing! It scared the living daylights out of me. I jumped into a bush and watched it pass by. Its shape was circular. I could see the stars outlined all around the object and it cast this monstrous shadow on the

ground. Best visual encounter I ever had in my life! I stood there cowering in the bush till it had gone a few miles off and then ran like the wind home! Sure, at the time I was scared, but I wonder what a UFO was doing around my neighborhood. I live about five miles from the RAAF base Edinburgh and UFO's were seen near bases a lot. This is a "Weapons Research Establishment" (W.R.E. - now named DSTO of "Defence and Sciences Technology Organization") Its a hi-tech hub for defense research. Several years ago a journalist disclosed while working on a corporate video for the DSTO he had entered an off-limits hangar that contained saucer shaped craft -- as he described it when noticed in hangar, he was swiftly escorted out and told not to talk about what he had seen. Others have stated that there is a top secret project named "Project Apotheosis" that involves the transport of alien craft from the DSTO to another secret location. Perhaps it was the DSTO that was the focus. After all, some of best defense projects in the world have come from there.

We had other sightings in the 70's as well of strange lights doing right angle turns. The most recent sighting was last month while my brother and I watched a satellite pass overhead. Suddenly a bright light "switched on" in our view up in the sky and became really bright, then moved across the sky at a great pace till it disappeared. It took all of two to three seconds for it all to happen. It was like someone had kicked the engines to life and flattened the throttle. That's the best way I can describe it. Thanks To Dave For His Report

NEW JERSEY GREAT UFO CONGRESS 2001

BORDENTOWN -- March 31 and April 1, at the Days Inn on Route 206 at the NJ Turnpike Exit #7. Jan Aldrich will talk about his Project 1947 investigations, Don Ecker will discuss the Dark Side of the Moon, Viki Ecker's talk concerns "In Search of the Secret Keepers," Dolores Cannon discusses The Soul, Between Death and Life, Richard Cassaro will speak on the truth concerning Ancient Egypt, , Bob Durant's talk is about The Ramey Memo, and Nancy Talbot talk is on the Physical Evidence regarding plants, soils at crop formation sites. Call Pat Marcatillio for reservations at 609 631-8955

NEW NASA SHUTTLE VIDEO OF UFOs IN SPACE

Jeff Challender has prepared a new tape of various UFOs that were caught on recent Shuttle video footage. Jeff has over an hour long tape of UFOs shot in space. Jeff spends hundreds of hours watching the shuttle broadcasts from space and is now an expert on NASA missions and even those onboard the shuttle are unlikely to see what Jeff does. Using Jeff's directions you will be able to learn the difference between space junk, ice crystals and real UFOs. I feel confident we could go into a court of law and convince any jury that there are UFOs moving at high speed around the Earth. Send \$25 to: Jeff Challender 2768 Mendel Way - Sacramento, California 95833-2011

BEFORE YOU BUY OR SELL A HOME SEE MY FREE REPORT

All real estate agents are not the same? Some real estate agents are part timers and inexperienced. Others are experts with an excellent experience and capabilities. When you are selling or buying your home, you need to make sure you have the best real estate agent working for you before you make any important financial decisions on one your biggest investments! Remember, the majority of people do not know the right questions to ask, and what pit falls can cause major problems. Picking the right real estate agent can be a wonderful experience, and picking the wrong one can be a big mistake that can waste your time and cost you thousands! Find out, " What you need to understand before hiring any real estate agent!" Learn how you can obtain the best real estate agent for your needs. To get a free copy of this report, just call (609) 654-0020 or e-mail us at Majorstar@aol.com. We can also help you with your own or corporate Worldwide Relocation to Australia, Benelux, Canada, Cayman Is, England, France, Guam, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the US.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL -- For more detailed monthly investigative reports subscribe to the MUFON JOURNAL that costs only \$30 per year by contacting MUFONHO@aol.com. Mention that I recommended

you for membership. Filer's Files is copyrighted 2001 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the files on their Web Sites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. These reports and comments are not necessarily the official MUFON viewpoint. Send your letters to Majorstar@aol.com. Sending mail automatically grants permission for us to publish and use your name. Please state if you wish to keep your name, address, or story confidential. Caution, most of these are initial reports and require further investigation.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Re-send

From: Kelly <kellymcg@attcanada.ca>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:22:22 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 04:09:47 -0500
Subject: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Re-send

[Apologies To Kelly for the original being attributed to the wrong sender at the archive--ebk]

Source: The National Post

<http://www.nationalpost.com/>

Wednesday March 28, 2001, p. A1

N.S. town's new postmark pays homage to UFO visit

Les Perreault
National Post

Residents of Shag Harbour, N.S., will be mailing an image of a flying saucer with every letter and package after Canada Post approved a new postmark commemorating a visit 34 years ago by an unidentified flying object.

The crash has become the subject of popular lore, including a book, and has also made the town a tourist draw.

The locally designed ink stamp, used to mark and date outgoing mail, depicts a flying saucer hovering over water with a lighthouse and boat beneath it. The scene refers to an incident in 1967 in which an apparent UFO plunged into the bay near the town and sent the RCMP, Coast Guard and townspeople on a fruitless search-and-rescue mission.

"There are so many people coming in who are interested in having their picture taken here or having their mail stamped, I thought we needed something with a UFO design," said postmaster Cindy Nickerson, who came up with the idea for the stamp two years ago. The design is also being used on T-shirts, hats and commemorative wooden nickels.

At about 11:30 p.m. on Oct. 4, 1967, Laurie Wickens and three friends were driving home when they saw an orange light heading toward the water, and called police.

"At first the cops didn't want to believe us, but then we found out another cop had seen it too," Mr. Wickens recalled yesterday.

He and several witnesses, including RCMP officers, watched the light floating on the water until it sank. An all-night search found nothing except a 600-metre strip of floating, yellow scum.

No official explanation has been offered for the lights, but theories at the time had a Cold War influence and involved a Russian spacecraft or submarine. Mr. Wickens believes it was a U.S. military plane.

Canada Post has created many postmarks for communities, including a teddy bear hugging a heart for Love, Sask., and Anne of Green Gables for Cavendish, P.E.I.

"It's a concept that goes over very well with collectors," said Tim McGurrian, spokesman for Canada Post.

The ink stamp will be officially unveiled in May.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

ENN - Our Universe Not Alone, Say Scientists

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto**
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 13:46:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 13:46:11 -0500
Subject: ENN - Our Universe Not Alone, Say Scientists

Source: ENN - Environmental News Network

http://www.enn.com/news/wire-stories/2001/03/03252001/upi_universe_42706.asp

Our Universe Not Alone, Say Scientists

Sunday, March 25, 2001
By United Press International

Spanish and American astrophysicists claim the universe we inhabit contains an infinite number of other universes like our own, called O-regions, that we will someday be able to contact.

Jaume Garriga, of the University of Barcelona, and Alexander Vilenkin, of Tufts University, call the concept "many worlds in one."

As they explained to United Press International, these universes are likely similar to our own - share similar life forms, for instance - because they share a key feature with our world: a finite number of distinct histories. A history is the way something has evolved in time and will continue to evolve. Until now, physicists have never been able to make such an assertion.

The team will publish their hypothesis this fall in the journal *Gravitation and Quantum Cosmology*.

Are these ideas far-fetched? Alan Guth says no.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology physicist told UPI, "Do I think that the ideas are viable? Definitely yes. In fact, I very much admire the precision with which the ideas are expressed. I consider the work of Alex Vilenkin and his collaborators to be the leading work in this field."

He explained, "What is new in their article is the realization that the total number of possible histories for each universe is finite."

An infinite number of universes like our own is a concept Guth - one of the foremost authorities on a concept called the inflationary universe - finds startling.

"That's a pretty mind-boggling conclusion," Guth told UPI from his Cambridge, Mass. office.

The idea that an infinite number of universes exist gives rise to some interesting, and troubling, implications.

"Whenever a thought crosses your mind that a terrible calamity might have happened," Vilenkin told UPI, "you can be assured that it has happened in some of the other O-regions."

Furthermore, since some O-regions have histories identical or nearly identical to our own, "if you nearly escaped an accident here, then you were not so lucky in some of the O-regions with the same prior history," he said

The worlds Garriga and Vilenkin imagine are not entirely calamitous, and may even be amusing.

"Distant copies of ourselves play all sorts of different roles" in these other worlds, Vilenkin said. In fact, "there are infinitely many O-regions where Al Gore is president and - yes - Elvis Presley is still alive!"

According to Vilenkin, Guth's work gave rise to the idea of many worlds in the first place. Guth formulated the now well-accepted idea that the universe is expanding - or inflating - and published the best-selling book "The Inflationary Universe" in 1997.

As the visible universe expands, or inflates, it gives birth to new universes. Since inflation is eternal, new universe creation is also eternal.

"In an eternally inflating universe, anything that can happen will happen; in fact, it will happen an infinite number of times," Guth told UPI.

Guth also believes the many-worlds hypothesis has profound philosophical implications.

"We already know that our planet is merely a tiny speck in a vast cosmos, but now we are being told that we do not even hold a unique copyright on our own identities," Guth told UPI. "Instead, each of us is actually only a single copy of an infinite number of beings that are completely identical to ourselves."

Copyright 2001, United Press International
All Rights Reserved

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

AA Time Warp

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 14:49:04 -0500
Subject: AA Time Warp

Hello, all....

An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

Here's the Q&A of interest:

Question #10: How did you keep the film after shooting and who developed it?

Answer: I kept all the film with me, went back to the base and I processed it.

Question #11: What happened to the remains of the UFO after delivery?

Answer: Where did it go? Give me the question again.

Now the freaks were taken by the medical team to a lab that had been set up at Fort Worth; the debris and craft were taken to Wright Field.

Question #12: When was (the) spaceman cut up after the crash?

Answer: The first autopsy took place about three weeks later. I filmed some at a small lab in Fort Worth.

So here's the rub:

AA proponents claim that the conditions seen in AA are the result of spontaneous decisions. The lack of adequate preparations and documentation being the by-product of something that was all very hurried and unplanned.

Yet, as my astute reader pointed out, the cameraman clearly indicates that the first autopsy wasn't filmed until three weeks after the crash! Man, they had enough time to get all the best equipment they needed!

35mm! Lights! A bigger room! Catering! Beer!

As far as I'm concerned, this is the last straw in a very weak camel's back. Again, I look at the AA footage and wonder why something so important was given such poor handling. Now that I know they had three weeks to prepare - to get the finest surgeons, the finest pathologists, the finest cameraman, the best equipment - three weeks and what we see in AA is the best they could come up with?

Hell, entire low budget movies are made in three weeks!

AA is a fraud.

King Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 00:07:57 EST
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:01:06 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:10:04 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the 30% of UFO
>>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>Whence cometh this 30% statistic? Maybe your own experience, but
>I doubt seriously that it is based on anything broader.

Dick, List:

1) - On April 30, 1948 Astronomer J. Allen Hynek turned in to the Air Force the following breakdown of his sighting investigations under Project Sign (See reference 1):

Class	No. of Incidents	Approx. %
Astronomical		
high probability	42	18
fair or low probability	33	14
Total	75	32%
Non-astronomical but suggestive of other explanations		
Balloons or ordinary aircraft	48	20
Rockets, flares, falling bodies	23	10
Miscellaneous (reflections, auroral streamers, birds, etc.)	[13]	[5]
Total	84	35%
Non-astronomical, with no evident explanation		
Lack of evidence precludes explanation	30	13
Evidence offered suggests no explanation	48	20
Total	78	33%

2) Hynek and an assistant analyzed reports during Project Grudge, which ended on December 27, 1949. An appendix to the project's final report gave their breakdown (2):

Astronomical	32%
Balloons	12
Misidentified aircraft, hoaxes or reports too sketchy to identify	33
Unknowns	23

3) - Project Blue Book breakdown of "Identified" (3):

Type of IFO	Number	Percentage
Astronomical	3,421	26.0%
Aircraft	2,237	17.0
Balloons	1,223	9.3
Radar Phenomena	152	1.2
Psychological	63	.5
Hoax	116	.9
Meteorological	44	.3
Birds	85	.6
Insufficient Information	2,409	18.3
Other	2,807	21.4

4) Allan Hendry was a full-time investigator for Hynek's Center for UFO Studies for more than a year during 1976-7. He studied 1307 UFO reports and noted that the single largest category of IFOs were stars and planets, representing 35% of Nocturnal Light IFOs. He gave the following breakdown (4):

Astronomical/reentries		
Stars & planets	360	27.5%
Meteors & reentries	113	8.7
Total	473	36.2%

>And, as usual, it depends on how you define "UFO" in the first place.

Of course, the "keeper of the List" problem.

>IFOs of astronomical objects generally are very easy to weed out
>as essentially irrelevant to the argument.

What difference does it make how easy it is for us to weed these out? (BTW, I seriously doubt the ability of many self-styled, or even "accredited" investigators, to competently deal with astronomical stimuli. I have found that even senior investigating officials of two UFO groups, who shall remain nameless here, apparently did not even know that as the Earth turns during the day and night, all astronomical objects appear to move across the sky. I can provide you with the details of their actual published notions in an off-line message, if you really wish to know. This whole subject is another essay for another day.)

UFO reports are not generated by you or me, or ufologists. They are generated by those who make the reports. What the witnesses report is what defines UFO phenomena.

If astronomical IFOs are, "essentially irrelevant to the argument", as you say, why do they represent the single largest category of IFOs?

It is because, apparently, the largest single sub-group of UFO sighters are unable to correctly identify these phenomena as astronomical, or have experienced them in circumstances which cause them to misidentify them, or the sighters are believers who attribute these things to UFOs.

Of course, historically, astronomers have been among the most critical of the entire subject. I wonder if this is the real reason you dismiss their expertise as "essentially irrelevant to the argument." It's gonna be hard squeezing any science in here if you rule out scientists as essentially irrelevant.

But then, this is UFology, right?

>But investigating UFO reports scientifically is not only possible,
>it is highly desirable and some of us have been doing it for a
>long time. Only to be met with glib, and quite false, "statistics."

References:

- (1) The Hynek UFO Report by J. Allen Hynek, Dell, 1977, pp. 17-18.
- (2) Ibid., p. 18
- (3) Ibid., Table 11.2, p. 259.
- (4) The UFO Handbook by Allan Hendry, Doubleday/Dolphin, 1979, p. 24.

Clear skies,
Bob Young

An expert may be defined as someone who can make you feel stupid
for offering your opinion. Fortunately, as physicist Philip
Morrison once said, ufology "is a field in which there aren't
any experts".

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base'

From: **Ralph O. Howard Jr.** <rhjr@speedfactory.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 06:48:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:08:07 -0500
Subject: Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base'

I was reading through a recent edition of Lucius Farish's UFO Newsclipping Service for January 2001, and noticed two photographs being used to illustrate an article in the LaFarge/Viola (WI) "Epitaph-News" newspaper (page 2 of this issue of UFONS).

The story says they were "taken from" Timothy Good's recent book 'Alien Base'. The photos are two of the famous Paul Villa specials, which I thought was a group of known hoax pictures from the early 60s.

I've seen them described as hoaxes in Allen Hendry's UFO Handbook among other places, based on Wm. Spaulding's 1974-75 digital computer study at GSW (which from what I've read was not without fault, but still. There sure looks to be a line coming across holding up that model.)

I had Good's book on my list to buy, but now I wonder.

First, is Good arguing that the photos were legit?

And second, why: are there reasons the Villa photos should be seen as having any value or validity?

Or does 'Alien Base' not make any reference to the Villa photos; it's possible the newspaper story is the problem?

Other than buying/reading Good's book, my interest is really only from the 'history of ufology' perspective.

Any thoughts or info would be appreciated.

Ralph O. Howard, Jr.
FI - MUFON of Georgia
FI - ISUR, Atlanta GA
<rhjr@speedfactory.net>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Mantle

From: Philip Mantle <pmquest@dial.pipex.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 13:06:21 +0000
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:11:32 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School - Mantle

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 19:04:41 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School

>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 18:50:46 +0000
>>From: Philip Mantle <pmquest@dial.pipex.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: UFO Materials Wanted For Local School

>>I wonder if you might possibly be able to help me. In recent
>>weeks I have been involved at Batley Boys High School in West
>>Yorkshire, who run their own 'Mystery Club' in their own time.
>>So far I have made one presentation at the school with others
>>planned.

<snip>

>If you care to give me an address I will happily send two free
>copies of the CD-Rom that I produce, or I could post them to
>you.

Dear Sean,

I much appreciate your most generous offer of the 2 CD-ROMs. My
address is:

Philip Mantle,
1 Woodhall Drive,
Batley, West Yorkshire,
England, WF17 7SW.

I would like to thank you on behalf of all the boys at the
'Mystery Club' at Batley Boys High School and hope that othes on
the list will be as generous as yourself.

Yours Sincerely,

Philip Mantle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 29](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:20:24 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:33:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hale

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:51:03 +0100

<snip>

>You can jump to whatever dubious conclusions you like, if they
>help.

Hi,

Please forgive me, but I simply asked you a question. I was not jumping to any conclusions. My question is based upon your stance throughout your research years, which to me is one of a sceptic. We can dance around the maypole all day with words, but I think from where I stand you seem unable to accept, that most of the books you have written on this subject are leaning towards the sceptical side of the alien visiting earth question, or as some prefer the ETH.

Perhaps as someone who has 25 years of study into this UFO subject, you would be one person who could validate the ETH question?

As I asked you last year on updates, after 25 years of UFO study both in lecture, video and book presentation (of which I respect and admire) the question I asked was: In your opinion after 25 years of UFO study, is Earth being visited by ET? And you told this list NO.

>I don't pin labels on myself. I investigate cases as objectively
>as possible - based on the premise that any outcome is possible
>at the start of the enquiry. In this way I try to find answers
>whenever I can. If I can find a reasonable answer then I am
>happy to say so, and if I cannot find one then I am happy to say
>so as well.

This isn't a case of pinning labels on anyone, can I call you a professional UFO researcher? Or would this label offend you?

>Sometimes I do. Sometimes I don't. That's the way it is in UFO
>land.

This is a label you put out yourself: UFO LAND sounds like an ET theme park to me... hope no-one picks this one up!

>So what's the point of inventing names to cover either
>contingency that might arise?

I think you can take some of that blame for creating names for this subject, one only has to read some of your past books to find the UFO subject compartmentalized with names for each UFO reference, to me 'names in UFO research can help those who are new to the subject. UFOs is a mammoth topic, which has a wide berth of people covering all aspects of research. I am staggered I have to point this out to yourself, as someone who has given many lectures world-wide, and who will often be presented on to the stage by the compare as a UFO Researcher.

The problem we are dealing with is the human condition: It is not the fact that data is hard to come by, it is that little room in the back of everyone's mind, which makes them all the more eager to state their mindset on this topic.

>I don't have a mind set about UFOs beyond a simple quest for
>truth - wherever that truth may lie and wherever the facts may
>lead in the getting there. You can call that perspective by
>whatever fancy name - or derogatory term - you like. I wont be
>offended. But it probably wont adequately cover the truth.

Now I shall pull my chair a little closer to where the teacher is standing. This kind of language does intrigue me somewhat, considering the fact that I asked you a very simple question! Your widening of this question tells me , you feel very uncomfortable with my question. And why would that be?

I am not here to offend anyone, why are you screaming blue murder from the basis of a simple question?

>This has always been my stance and it has not suddenly changed.
>I don't especially perceive this way of doing things as being
>commensurate with the position of either a believer or a skeptic
>- in the sense that I think we all understand the normal usage
>of these words.

Jenny in 25 years, how many books have you written with pro-ETH Authors?

>I am not sure why you would do so. But if it makes you feel
>better to build neat picket fences around people, then please be
>my guest.

So I take it from this statement, you will not be referring to researchers on this list as either sceptic or believer again?

>Just don't require me to live down to your expectations.

>Best wishes,

>Jenny Randles

Thank you Jenny - taken full on the chin.

Regards,

Roy..

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:21:59 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 06:29:59 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 01:57:35 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>Hello Roy!

>Just a quick note to say thank you, I have received the surprise
>book; Graham Hancock, The Mars Mystery.

>It will take some time to read it of course, and a quick scan
>indicates I might not find it the epitome of credibility.
>(Cydonia, pyramids on Mars, reinvented astronomy etc., etc.)

>I hope I didn't hurt anyone's feelings with my careless
>references to cattle diseases. Frankly, ranchers here are scared
>shitless of both plagues, now much in the news.

Hi Larry,

Glad you got the book OK. No offence was taken, the farmers
here in the UK have been through the mill, and it isn't
getting better!

To all other UpDates readers, you too can have a go at the Lost
Haven UFO Quiz by clicking here:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

Who knows, you could win the book prize!

Please also note, I am getting a lot of feedback to Authors who
have published articles on my site, which is very good. They are
receiving e-mails from around the world, on their written work.
If you would like your article to be read and to also receive
feedback on your articles, then please drop me a line :
royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk

Best regards,

Roy..

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk>

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 10:40:26 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 06:31:58 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 11:12:27 -0500

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the
>>30% of UFO
>>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>Bob, nobody says astronomers aren't qualified to identify
>astronomical IFOs. The only question is whether they're
>qualified to make pronouncements about the totality of UFO
>reports.

No more or no less that anybody else, I guess.

>As in: "Well [this is the voice of a TV newscaster] we've heard
>from Jeremy Otter, the famed UFO researcher. And now a comment
>from Susan Celestina, professor of astronomy at the state
>university: 'Many of those purported UFOs turn out to be
>misidentifications of Venus. There's nothing to this UFO
>business; all sightings can be explained.'"

Otter, of course, has generally recognizable academic
credentials in UFOlogy, or maybe just "acceptable life
experiences". And what gives him "fame". A lot of people in and
around UFOlogy have got fame, usually of their own making. I
know the point you are trying to make, that a lot of people have
different things to bring to the problem.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 10:40:27 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:09:31 -0500
Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact - Young

>From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 16:49:40 EST
>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: ET Hypothesis & ET Fact
>>Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:35:53 -0600

<snip>

> A full scientific study of UFO's since Arnold should have had
>something on the order of 5,400 scientist man-years of effort.
>Instead we've had maybe 50 man-years of scientists on it,
>possibly 100. And the results are consistent with the level of
>scientific effort applied: Barely scratching the surface.

Brad, Dennis, List:

This assumes that there is some sort of currently insurmountable
problem, such as building an atomic bomb. The claims of UFOlogy
are that there are, what, dozens, hundrends, or tens of
thousands of _events_ happening all the time, or at some time in
the recent past.

It shouldn't take 5,400 scientist/years to find proof of events
currently taking place, should it?

<snip>

>In the philosophy and methodology of science, it is understood
>that data are only "relevant" to a particular theory or
>hypothesis being tested. For example, in meteorological optics,
>the most "relevant" piece of data is the size of the grazing
>elevation angle to a possible inversion layer or supra-lapsed
>layer, something that is often not obtained by UFO
>investigators. You can have all the inversion you want but if
>the angle is greater than about 1/2 degree you won't have a
>mirage image to pose as a UFO.

This 1/2 degree was obtained by observation in the 19th Century.
Depending upon the atmospheric condiction, mirages have been
photographed at angles of 1 1/2 degree. But, granted, these are
not your typical mirage.

As you pointed out, most of the time the real problem is that
useful measurements have never been obtained, or may not be
possible after the lapse of time.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 13

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:15:37 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:15:16 -0500
Subject: UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 6 Number 13

Posted on behalf of Joseph Trainor.

<Masinaigan@aol.com>

=====

UFO ROUNDUP
Volume 6, Number 13
March 29, 2001
Editor: Joseph Trainor

<http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>

MIR SPLASHES DOWN IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

The Russian space station Mir went out Friday," March 23, 2001, "in glory, blazing to a public, harmless death over the Pacific Ocean."

Mir (Russian for peace or world--J.T.) was the largest man-made object ever to re-enter Earth's atmosphere. The space station weighed a total of 140 tons.

"As it had while battling a series of near-disasters in space, Mir captured the world's attention with a re-entry that even Russian officials acknowledged had the potential to go very, very wrong. Instead, it went flawlessly."

'Guided by practiced hands at Mission Control outside Moscow, Mir broke from its orbit early Friday with a 30-minute burst of its engines that changed the station's trajectory and spelled its doom.'

"The nearly 149-ton Mir crashed into Earth's atmosphere, breaking apart and burning up. Chunks that survived, some of them huge, gave onlookers in the South Pacific islands of Fiji a fireworks show they will likely never forget."

"'We saw five or six fragments with a huge smoke trail that lasted for 10 to 15 seconds, followed some time later by a couple of sonic booms,' said Reuters photographer Mark Baker. 'It was a once-in-a-lifetime experience.'"

"The twenty tons of debris landed smack on target in a space junk cemetery of the Pacific, about 1,800 miles (3,000 kilometers) southwest of Pitcairn Island."

"'It occurred in the exact area that the Russian space agency had predicted, between Australia and Chile,' said David Templeman, a civil defense official from Australia, one of several countries in Mir's potential flight path. 'I'm relieved.'"

"Russian officials hailed the operation as a triumphant end to Mir's 15-year mission. Not only did the Russians prove what they had been saying all along--that Mir hysteria was ridiculous--but they also burnished the image of a remarkable flying machine that had become the punch line of many jokes."

"'Mir proved that Russia cannot just build things but can operate them, too,' said Yuri Koptov, chief of the Russian Space Agency. 'Russia is and will remain a space power.'"

"'We want to show the world today that we could still do things well,' said Alexander Lazutkin, a former Mir cosmonaut who was one of more than 500 people who crammed into Mission Control to bid the station goodbye. 'For 15 years, Mir did a lot of important work, not only for us, but for the whole world.'"

"Vladimir Solovyov, the first commander on board Mir and now Mission Control chief said, 'Everybody wants me to cry but I won't.'"

"Russian television and newspapers gave Mir a fond and respectful send off. Cosmonauts served up anecdotes about life the so-called joys of life aboard a cramped and stuffy space vessel that was put together in pieces after its first module was launched in 1986."

"The station was supposed to last for 'no more than a few years.' But it survived for fifteen." (See the Chicago Tribune for March 24, 2001, "Mir's demise safe, stunning," page 3.)

TWO USAF FIGHTER JETS VANISH OVER SCOTLAND

Two U.S. Air Force F-15 C Eagle fighter jets vanished over the Scottish Highlands Monday, March 26, 2001.

Air controllers at the RAF Lakenheath air base discovered "that two F-15C fighters were overdue at their home base at Lakenheath in southern England," UK.

"The jets had been conducting low-level flight training over Scotland."

"Several hours later, the (U.S.) Air Force said there had been no word from the two F-15 pilots nor any confirmation of their fate. The lack of communication suggested a strong possibility that that they had crashed, officials said."

"The two single-seat F-15s left Lakenheath for a three-hour sortie over the Scottish Highlands. The jets were over the Cairngorm Mountains in the Scottish Highlands when they lost contact with ground controllers. at Lakenheath 75 miles (120 kilometers) northeast of London, Lakenheath spokeswoman Major Stacey Bako said."

"Air Force spokeswoman Captain Almarah Belk at the Pentagon said a search-and-rescue mission had been launched from RAF Kinloss in Scotland."

"A Royal Air Force spokeswoman said two RAF Nimrod reconnaissance planes and three Sea King helicopters were searching, helped by two RAF mountain rescue teams on the ground."

On Tuesday, March 27, 2001, according to the 2 p.m. report on USA Radio News, USAF and RAF search-and-rescue efforts in the Cairngorm Mountains "have been hampered by severe weather," including winds of up to 50 miles per hour (80 kilometers per hour) and heavy snowfall. Cold and fog in the area also "caused severe whiteout conditions, limiting visibility," the report stated.

As of this writing, the two missing aircraft have not been found. (See USA Today for March 27, 2001, "For U.S. military aviation, a dark day," page 10A.)

(Editor's Comment: Uh-oh! Let's keep an eye on this case. It sounds like another Sheffield case.)

(NOTE: This bulletin was obviously typed up before the discovery of the wreckage was found - J.H. UFOINFO)

CHUPACABRA KILLS CHICKENS IN MAYAGUEZ, PUERTO RICO

"Felix Rodriguez and Noris Lozada complained to police that in the early morning hours of Wednesday, March 21, 2001, they

heard a noise coming from the chickens they keep in the backyard of their residence located in the Bonest sector of the barrio Miradero" in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico "and 26 dead birds were found in the dawn hours."

"Officer Wilson Montes of the Mayaguez police district responded to the scene where the dead chickens were found while Carlos Diaz and Ferdinand Avila of the Recinto Universitario de Mayaguwz (RUM) examined the animals carefully and even took one of them to perform a necropsy and establish a cause of death."

"Diaz told (the Puerto Rican newspaper) Primera Hora that it could be the handiwork of an ape weighing between 12 and 15 pounds, given that primate hair was found near the chicken corpses."

"Furthermore, the prints of a two-legged, hooved animal were found in the backyard, and one of the chickens displayed a bite mark from a rounded tooth in its breast."

"The residents' backyard is near the Mayaguez Zoological Gardens."

Diaz "explained that the scenario was not compatible with the attack of a wild dog but rather with the presence of a primate since the dead chickens were aligned next to each other, single file, and were not eaten."

"Several weeks ago, another resident of Mayaguez's barrio Miradero identified as Rodriguez Lozada complained to Officer Montes, who has become a 'Chupacabra researcher' as a result of years of investigating such cases, that she had seen one.

Last year, another resident of barrio Miradero complained that she had seen an ape looking into her window. It later turned out that apes had been jumping the fence at the Mayaguez zoo and stealing bananas and other fruit from the homes of neighbors.

(Editor's Note: A similar case occurred a few years ago near the Monkey Jungle just south of Miami, Florida.)

Montes's investigation is continuing. (See the newspaper Primera Hora of San Juan, P.R. for March 23, 2001, "Chupacabra exsanguinates chickens." Muchas gracias a Scott Corrales, autor de los libros Chupacabras and Other Mysteries and Forbidden Mexico para eso articulo de diario.)

DAZZLING UFO SEEN BY TWO IN CAGUAS, PUERTO RICO

On Monday, March 12, 2001, at 2 a.m., two men spotted a dazzling UFO near the intersection of Routes 1 and 172 in Caguas, Puerto Rico.

The two witnesses, men named Serrano and Leon, were sitting on a porch in the barrio Beatriz of Caguas, facing the intersection, "when they saw a bright light heading towards them from the mountains near Aguas Buenas and over Highway (Route) 1."

"The object's brightness increased as it approached. It flew at low altitude over a farm located some 15 meters (50 feet) from where the witnesses sat. The object was flying from north to south, and then vanished over Cerro Las Pinas (hill)."

"The witnesses did not notice any unusual smells related to the event, but reported that the sighting left an odd taste in their mouths, like 'holding a battery between one's lips.' They also heard an imperceptible buzzing sound, like that of bees, which accompanied the event."

Strangest of all, Serran and Leon saw that the object "appeared to have something like luminous mirrors clinging to the bottom section which seemed to rotate. They estimated that the size of the object was 10 meters (33 feet) in length."

The men complained that the UFO's brightness was "painful to look at" and therefore could not make out any definite shape. (Muchas gracias a Orlando Pla y Lucy Guzman, y tambien Scott Corrales, para esas informaciones.)

THREE UFOs RENDEZVOUS NEAR HONOLULU, HAWAII

On Sunday, March 18, 2001, at 7:43 p.m., Eben Lekson was at his parents' home in the Niu Valley near Honolulu, the state capital of Hawaii, when he spotted a strange bright light in the sky.

I was looking up towards the sky because it was such a clear night," Eben reported, "and I saw an object approaching from the west. So I swung around and saw another object approaching from the east. And then I saw yet another object approaching from the north."

"Immediately I told my parents, who came outside and saw the objects. I called my friend, whose parents are astronomers, and they were stumped because they had not heard of any meteor shower or the (International) Space Station passing over." Also it was not a plane because it had no lights flashing, and their altitude was at least just outside the atmosphere," about 100 miles or 160 kilometers overhead. (Email Form Report)

MYSTERY BOOM, UFO SPOOK WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

On Thursday, March 15, 2001, just after 9 p.m., residents of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, not far from Pittsburgh, were "jolted by a loud mysterious boom. Residents from Level Green, Pa. and Harrison, City, Pa. in Penn Township reported hearing and feeling what appeared to be an explosion."

"Emergency personnel responded to the area after Westmoreland County 911 began receiving reports from local residents. The event reportedly caused local people to run outside to see what had caused the event."

"No natural gas leaks were found by the local utility firm. The National Weather Service in Pittsburgh had located some lightning in the area between 8 and 9 p.m. but to my knowledge no active thunderstorms were occurring in the area at that time."

On Monday, March 19, 2001, at 7:50 p.m., a UFO was sighted in Homer City, Pa., southwest of Pittsburgh "A witness observed an odd light source in the sky towards the south and was described as 'a wide band of bright light,' This band of light began to move east. It then made a clockwise loop and it continued to rotate until it had returned to the point at which it had started the loop movement. At this point, the band immediately changed and became just a white dot, a steady white light which quickly turned to a red color. The red light then began a series of 10 to 12 zigzagging maneuvers as it moved towards the southeast. Suddenly the red light vanished." (Many thanks to Pennsylvania ufologist Stan Gordon for these reports.)

ARMY ELINT PLANE CRASHES NEAR NUREMBERG, GERMANY

A U.S. Army RC-12 twin-engine propeller aircraft "used to identify and locate enemy radar (i.e. gather electronic intelligence or ELINT--J.T.) and electronic communications crashed in a forest about 8 miles (13 kilometers) from Nuremberg," a city in Germany's Bayern (Bavaria) region. The crash, which took place on Monday, March 26, 2001, killed both Army pilots aboard, according to Army spokeswoman Hilde Patton from Fifth Corps headquarters at Heidelberg.

"German and American authorities at the scene were attempting to recover the pilots' remains from the crash scene, Patton said.

"There was no initial indication of what caused the crash." (See USA Today for March 27, 2001, "For U.S. military aviation, a dark day," page 10A.) (Editor's Comment: Two fighter jets missing in Scotland. An ELINT plane downed in Germany. It could simply be a coincidence. Then again, there may be something going on, saucer wise, in Europe.)

PREDICTIONS OLD AND NEW HOLD SURPRISES

New Age psychic Steve Jones has made his predictions for the

year 2001 available to readers of UFO Roundup.

Jones is a researcher of UFOs, crop circles and other paranormal phenomena. He has a show, on the Psychic Growth channel.

And he has a "big bad bear story" for stock market investors.

"There will be panic in the world economy as one country has its monetary establishment on the verge of collapse," Jones wrote, "That country is Japan, and it will take the rest of the world to bring some measure of salvation to that economy. However, the seeds of fear will be deeply planted and many countries will shrink back from over-committing themselves."

There will be a worldwide collapse of the Internet sometime in June," he added, "due to the introduction of a near-invisible virus. The Internet will be forced to shut down until an anti-virus can be found."

Around the world, the weather will continue to cause concern , as droughts, foods and tornados increase. Doomsters will say that this is the beginning of the end, but there is a light at the end of the tunnel. Towards the end of the year, the weather will settle down and normal patterns will re-emerge."

Jones does see hope for the future.

"A young boy will appear during the coming year with a knowledge and understanding far beyond his years. He will become the new hope for the future. of the world and the environment. Could this be the Second Coming? In just a few years, I foresee him becoming the first World President. There will be those who want him out of the scene, but the public will take him into their hearts."

Speaking of "bears," last week's fall of the Russian space station Mir fulfilled an ancient Hopi prophecy.

The Hopi are an indigenous people of the southwestern USA. According to Chief White Feather of the Hopi's Bear Clan, there are Nine Prophecies that will be fulfilled before "the end of the Fourth World and the beginning of the Fifth World."

(Editor's Note: The Nokaig are the Bear Clan of the Anishinabe people. The words for bear are makwah in Anishinabe and mato in Lakota.)

Chief White Feather said, "The Fourth World will end soon, and the Fifth World shall begin. This the (tribal) elders everywhere know. The Signs over many years have been fulfilled and only a few are left."

For example, the Fourth Sign of the Hopi states, "The land will be crossed with snakes of iron."

This prophecy was fulfilled at Promontory Point, Utah in 1869 with the linkup of the first transcontinental railroad in the USA.

Amazingly, the Hopi elders seem to have predicted the coming of the chemtrails a couple of years ago. "This is the Fifth Sign--the land will be criss-crossed by a giant spider's web."

But the fall of Mir clearly fulfills one of the last Signs.

"And this is the ninth and Final Sign--you will hear of a dwelling-place in the heavens, above the earth, that shall fall with a great crash. It will appear as a blue star. Very soon after this, the ceremonies of the Hopi people will come to an end."

Finally, during the past couple of weeks, your editor has had two identical dreams of what I call the "Great Lakes Disaster."

The first dream took place in the early morning hours of Wednesday, March 14, 2001. I dreamed I was at a motel. and I was on my way to breakfast. I asked the desk clerk if they had a cafeteria on the premises, and he said there was one "at the Convention Center on the point."

So I stepped out of the motel into a cold overcast march morning. It was cold, and there was still an inch of snow on the parking lot, but it wasn't as cold as it gets in mid-winter. I can still see the center in my mind's eye--a multi-story light gray building on a sandspit overlooking one of the Great lakes. But I do not know which lake. I have never been to this place before. There's only one stretch of Lake Superior shore I haven't visited, and that's the Ontario shore from Nipigon through Thunder Bay down to the Pigeon River and the USA border. But it wasn't Thunder Bay. From the shore, you can see the "Sleeping Giant," or Sibley Peninsula, and in the dream there was only open lake beyond the building.

On my way across the parking lot, I noticed the wind picking up and saw many whitehorse waves offshore. Waves about six feet high were hitting the beach and the breakwall on the far side of the center. Then bigger waves started coming in, right over the sand beach and gushing across the parking lot. People began getting in their cars and driving away. I waited until a wave washed within three feet of my snowboots, and then I abandoned all desire to eat breakfast at the center.

I started running down a two-lane street, past many one-story frame houses with bare-limbed maples and elms and evergreen trees in the yard. Fleeing cars were going by me on my left. I could hear the surf getting louder behind me. I saw some people standing on the porch of a yellow house. Gasping for breath, I joined them. A guy in his twenties with close-cropped blond hair and wearing a Green Bay Packers jacket asked me what was going on. I told him, "The lake is flooding the parking lot. And the water's rising."

"Let it rise," he replied, "It'll never get this far. We're a quarter-mile from the beach."

Breathing hard, I listened carefully. The surf was getting louder. I gasped, "Yes, it will!" And I started running again.

A few blocks later, I stopped and looked back. I could see waves on the horizon, at about the point where the yellow house stood. Three cars were barreling towards me. I tried to flag them down, but they went right by--a red Ford pickup truck and two compact sedans. I started running again.

Then I saw two steel booms poking above the houses ahead. A bridge! I thought. I hung a left and ran down a small side street, past a red-and-white barrier and onto a steel ramp. Whoops! My mistake! It wasn't a bridge--it was a ferry dock. But the ferry was long gone. I looked across the channel, maybe a mile or two wide, and saw the whitecapped waves rolling ashore, battering the forested mainland.

Then I woke up.

The second dream took place during the early morning hours of Friday, March 23, 2001. This one was much shorter. This time, I dreamed I was back in that lakeside parking lot again. Right in front of me, much closer, was the exact same light gray convention center. Frightened and shouting people were running up from the beach, trying to get away from the incoming waves, running to their cars. I watched the lake water surge right up the sand, over the rock wall and gush onto the asphalt.

Dodging the icy-cold spray, I ducked inside the spacious lobby of the convention center. The people at the concession stand were shutting down all of the electrical equipment--cookers, popcorn machine, microwave ovens. The noise of the surf was deafening. The building shook every time it was hit by a wave. I knew it couldn't stand up to the full fury of the lake.

A crowd of people emerged from one of the ballrooms or banquet halls, with the children in the front. They were terrified. The children dug in their heels, afraid to go outside. Some of the adults hesitated, too. "No, no!" I shouted, "You've got to run for it. Get going! Run across the lot--now! You must get to the high ground."

And then I woke up.

One "Big Wave" dream is scary enough. But two in the same week, featuring identical locales unknown to me, is really strange. I

don't know where this gray convention center is. It could be somewhere in Ontario or perhaps in the USA's states of Michigan or Wisconsin. But one thing is certain. If those dreams ever come true, that building is not a good place to be, believe me! (Many thanks to Steve Jones and Maggie Pym for their emails.)

From the UFO Files...

1957: AN UNUSUAL UFO IN HOPE, NEW JERSEY

This report was submitted at the time by Mrs. Donna Blaisdell (actual name on file at the Center for UFO Studies in Chicago--J.T.) and was reprinted in Dr. J. Allen Hynek's book.

"Even at the risk of being called hysterical, hallucinated or worse, I feel I must make record, on my oath as a woman, an American and a member of the human race, of the following:"

"That I was in full possession of my senses and my sanity at the time, and all during the time, of my seeing this object, which lasted for at least one minute."

"That I saw the object at a distance of not more than 150 yards at about 2 p.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 1957, first from a rear window and then from the back yard of our home on the road from Great Meadows to Hope, New Jersey."

"That the weather was clear under a low overcast and the position of the object hovering in the air over the slope below our house was such that I could see it--with absolute certainty and with concentrated effort to observe and remember every detail."

"That my attention was first drawn to the object's presence by our dogs barking in their pens behind the house, and by their looking upward at the object, as they and I continued to do so easily until the object departed."

"That the shape of the object closely resembled that of a huge derby hat but with a rounded domelike crown 30 to 40 feet (9 to 12 meters) high and at least 50 feet (15 meters) in horizontal diameter above a slightly curled-up 'brim' that extended outward for 12 to 15 feet (4 to 5 meters) from the bottom of the crown. The brim or bottom surface of the object appeared to be sealed over smoothly and completely to a gentle curve, with no holes or ports or windows or vents of any kind, of which I could see none anywhere else on the entire object."

"That, in the absence of any openings into it, I could see no beings, humans or otherwise, inside the object who might be operating and riding in it, and no crew or passengers were visible on the object's exterior during its visit."

"That the color of the object, all over, was uniform white, dull but clean, with no spots, stripes or other markings whatsoever. Its texture was apparently non-metallic but reminded me strongly of pipe clay."

"That a moderate breeze, from the northeast, I think, was blowing in which the object hovered quite stationary except for a gentle rocking motion, like a boat at anchor on water. As the object rocked and in the same cadence it made a low growling or rumbling sound that rose or fell irregularly."

"That beneath the object, extending vertically toward the ground, I seemed to see, and then not see, and then see again a lot of streamers or lines of some material (or force) that twinkled like the fragile strands of tinsel with which one decorates a Christmas tree."

(Editor's Note: Critics might say Mrs. B was watching too much Star Trek. Yet she wrote this description in 1957, nine years before Star Trek premiered on NBC in September 1966. This "dazzle field" effect has been described by other UFO eyewitnesses, too.)

"That without any marked change of sound except a soft rush of air, sucking away and not blowing toward me, the object abruptly ascended almost vertically, slightly northeasterly at immense speed into thick cloud (maybe 300 feet up?) and was

instantly gone from sight and hearing." (See the book The Hynek UFO Report by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Dell Books, New York, N.Y., third printing March 1978, pages 153 and 153.)

Well, that's it for this week. Join us in seven days for more UFO and paranormal news from "the paper that goes home--UFO Roundup." See you next week!

UFO ROUNDUP: Copyright 2001 by Masinaigan Productions, all rights reserved. Readers may post news items from UFO Roundup on their websites or in newsgroups provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue in which the item first appeared. E-Mail Reports to: Joseph Trainor <Masinaigan@aol.com> or use the Sighting Report Form at:

http://ufoinfo.com/forms/form_sighting.htm

Website comments: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>

UFOINFO: <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives of the UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences,
UFO + PSI Magazine also available, plus archives of
Filer's Files and Oz Files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 10:52:21 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:16:57 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 16:03:08 +0100

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 16:16:32 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>I was trying to get Ufology (in all its
>facets) to define those cases that are the most suggestive of
>the ETH. They must exist if the ETH is to have any basis other
>than a dreamt up idea without evidential support. So it makes
>sense - surely - to agree which cases best match that
>possibility. Then put these cases to the relevant scientific
>experts in that field for them to comment on how well they
>perceive that these cases are in scientific terms suggestive of
>the ETH.

Jenny:

This would be reasonable, if it could be done. But, I wonder what has prevented this from being done to date, and how will this effort be different?

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Hamilton

From: **Bill Hamilton** <skywatcher22@space.com>
Date: 29 Mar 2001 09:07:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:19:41 -0500
Subject: Re: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp - Hamilton

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:22:22 -0500
>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>

>Subject: Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp

>Source: The National Post

><http://www.nationalpost.com/>

>Wednesday March 28, 2001, p. A1

>N.S. town's new postmark pays homage to UFO visit

>Les Perreux
>National Post

>Residents of Shag Harbour, N.S., will be mailing an image of a
>flying saucer with every letter and package after Canada Post
>approved a new postmark commemorating a visit 34 years ago by an
>unidentified flying object.

>The crash has become the subject of popular lore, including a
>book, and has also made the town a tourist draw.

<snip>

I, for one, would like to purchase one of these stamps.

I just finished reading "Dark Object". Excellent presentation
and kudos to Don Ledger. As he says in the last chapter, "the
mystery continues..."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Bolivian UFO Was MIR Balloon

From: **Scott Corrales** <lornis1@juno.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:11:20 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:22:47 -0500
Subject: Bolivian UFO Was MIR Balloon

SOURCE: Los Tiempos de Bolivia
DATE: March 29, 2001

UFO WAS THE MIR-3 BALLOON

It was seen by thousands of Bolivians as it crossed the skies over Cochabamba, Oruro and La Paz. And they'll be seeing two more. The "Unidentified Flying Object" that caused a commotion during the week is nothing more than a weather balloon, specifically the MIR-3. Confirmation was provided through the research of astronomer German Morales Chavez, a specialist with the Sigma Octante Astronomical Center of the Universidad Catolica Boliviana (UCB).

Luis Eduardo Pacheco de Caseros, a Buenos Aires based researcher, played a significant role in being able to determine the identity and origin of the object.

MIR-3 (whose initials stand for Montgolfiere Infra Rouge, not to be mistaken with the fallen Russian space station), is a balloon aimed at researching concentrations of ozone and compounds of nitrogen, carbon, iodine and oxygen at stratospheric altitudes for the inter-tropical regions. Its equipment package was developed in the UK, Italy and France. This project is one among many being developed by a number of countries, many of them belonging to the European Community and the U.S. as well.

The balloons were launched by the Center for Space Studies (France) and the Balloon Launching Group of the State University of Sao Paulo (Brazil)--the organizations conducting the research. The launch took place at Bauru, 340 kilometers away from Sao Paulo. MIR-3, the source of alarm for so many Bolivians, was launched on February 21 and has circumnavigated the Earth for over 50 days. Its circumnavigation takes approximately 17 days.

Translation (C) 2001. Institute of Hispanic Ufology.
Special Thanks to Luis Eduardo Pacheco and Gloria Coluchi.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:25:07 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Source: The Los Angeles Times

><http://www.latimes.com/news/state/20010327/t000026482.html>
>Tuesday, March 27, 2001

>Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific
>May Have Been Meteor

>A bright red and green light that appeared to plunge into the
>Pacific Ocean on Monday night may have been a meteor, an
>astronomer said.

>About 30 people from Santa Barbara to Marina del Rey called U.S.
>Coast Guard and law enforcement officials about 8:20 p.m. to
>report what they thought was a meteorite, a flare or a downed
>aircraft, authorities said.

>Troy Powers, a museum guide at Griffith Observatory, said that
>judging from the descriptions, "it could have been a meteor."

Poor man. He clearly isn't up on his pelican science.
Consequently, he fails to understand that eyewitness testimony
has no value whatever and can be discarded without a second
thought.

We may rest assured that the stimulus for this mass
perception/hysteria was either

(a) a flaming pelican possibly ignited by a meteorite, a flare,
or an aircraft, or

(b) a psychosocial phenomenon triggered by hysteria from a
culture/political/psychic crisis yet to be determined, but
addressing the deep-seated psychic needs of the witnesses.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 12:42:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:27:02 -0500
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Velez

>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 17:45:10 EST
>Subject: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>Filer's Files #13 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>March 27, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>Webmaster Chuck Warren <http://www.filersfiles.com>,

>ARE UFOs A THREAT TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY?

>In this weeks files we review UFOs and aircraft safety. UFOs
>were observed in Pennsylvania, Maryland, South Carolina,
>Florida, Alabama, Illinois, Washington, Puerto Rico, Bolivia,
>and France. The Bolivian Air Force chased a UFO with a jet over
>La Paz. Leonard Stringfield one of the greatest Ufologists of
>all time told me of his meeting with Robert C. Gardner an UFO
>investigator who had interviewed General Benjamin Chidlaw, then
>in charge of US Eastern Air Defense. Later General Chidlow
>became head of the Air Defense Command. In his book "Saucer
>Post.. 3-0 Blue" by Leonard Stringfield reveals in the course of
>the half hour interview General Chidlaw stated the following,

>"We have stacks of reports about flying saucers. We take them
>seriously when you consider we have lost many men and planes
>trying to intercept them."

Hola George, hi All,

A few years ago when I first posted some of the "sphere & disc"
sightings I was reporting I mentioned concern over the fact that
the 'sightings' were taking place in airspace that is used for
take offs and landings at JFK International Airport which is
within walking distance from my home.

I also mentioned that Lee & Brit Elders had interviewed (on tape)
two gentlemen who man the radar screens at the control tower
of Mexico City's airport. They reported many radar contacts
with the "UFOs" and they have even taken to 'chasing them off'
with a helicopter when the "UFOs" are inside designated landing
or take-off airspace. They, (and the pilot and navigator of the
flight in question) reported one actual "collision" with a UFO that
left a healthy dent on the airplane's underbelly. See the tape.

I wonder if any of our Mexican researchers can shed any further
light on that testimony? The "interviews" appear in the video
titled, "Messengers of the Sixth Sun" by Lee & Brit Elders. If
anyone can add to what is known (verify the stories) it would
be greatly appreciated.

In the video Brit Elders comments that the "UFOs" appearing
in the skies over Mexico City seem to have a 'curiosity' about
their earthly counterparts. They also present a serious danger
when you consider that much of the air traffic at airports
like the one in Mexico City and JFK manage hundreds of
'commercial passenger flights' daily.

Regards,

John Velez

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:50:10 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:30:15 -0500
Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories? - Velez

>From: KarolineLouise@aol.com
>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 05:16:09 EST
>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 12:03:50 -0500
>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Karoline Louise <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 06:24:17 EST
>>>Subject: Re: A Lifetime Of Conscious Memories?
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

Hi Karoline,

You wrote:

>First I'd better make it clear I _don't_ have any of the
>experiences I outlined in my last post. I have no memory of
>being abducted into an 18th C house or of talking to dead
>people. I was positing a 'typical' experience of that kind,
>based on the myriad reports of such things by apparently honest
>and sincere people.

That's why I was having trouble 'connecting' to what you were saying. I thought you were relating your own experiences. Also, although the items you are mentioning do come up in abduction reports, when I am talking about "abduction cases" I am referring strictly to those reports involving (conscious) recollection of uncomfortably close-up UFO encounters that involve an "abduction", and/or missing time, and preferably have some physical evidence such as ground traces or something on/in the body of the witness/ victim.

That is the (limited) set of criteria I use to 'label' a case an "abduction" or whether it belongs in the more questionable category of the kinds of experiences you are referring to. That's what I meant when I told you that I suspect that some folks are having experiences that can be interpreted using just about any reasonable explanation you can come up with.

Again, when I say "abduction" I'm only referring to the hard core of cases involving:

- a. UFO contact.
- b. Contact with UFO occupants
- c. UFO or occupant sighting accompanied by "missing time."
- d. Abduction cases where there is physical evidence of some kind. Either on the body or on the ground.
- e. Any or all of the above while the witness/victim is fully conscious and able to recall the event with some degree of certainty especially if multiple witnesses are involved.

Just about everything else that begins with, "I was sleeping and then..." I have a tendency to place into the "questionable" category. And by "questionable" I mean that if it doesn't involve fully conscious recollection, it literally 'could be' just about anything. It is the 'hard core' cases I mentioned above that need/beg for further investigation/explanation.

Personally, I have enough of the 'other kind' of experiences to fill a book, but you'll only ever hear me discussing the ones that I was wide awake and fully conscious for. The ones that I have -no doubt- happened just as I report them. I consider the rest to be to difficult to verify to even bother with. If some of the 'other stuff' gets corroborated along the way, fine. I place importance/value on the more tangible recollections of actual/fully conscious events.

That, is where we have been talking at cross purposes! Otherwise, regarding the "owls" and other more symbolic recollections we are in complete agreement. That stuff could be just about anything.

There is a difference between that, and cases where the person reports that; "me and my sister were driving home from the market when we encountered a UFO,... the car stopped all by itself... the UFO landed... "people" got out... I think 'something' happened, but I can't recall... we lost two hours of time, and my sister had a strange mark on her leg afterward that was never there before."

See what I mean? A report with several of the components listed above is worth investigating as an abduction.

"I dreamt I saw an owl staring at me" is not. ;)

>The point I am making is that while there seems undoubtedly to
>be something very strange going on - we presently have no idea
>what that something is.

On that we can agree.

>I am suggesting that the 'alien abduction' thesis gives way to a
>broadly less category-obsessed understanding of this phenomena,
>which recognises that a large percentage of its own cases
>involve neither 'aliens' nor 'abduction'.

Then why consider them "abduction" cases? No UFO, no aliens, no forced kidnap, it's not a UFO abduction. Simple. Must be/may be, 'something else.'

>If we go back to the beginning of my post and remember our three
>experiencers. I suggest that instead of telling person A he was
>abducted, and person B he has a temporal lobe problem, and
>person C he is a mystic (ie he's nuts), we try instead to find
>out why these people are all experiencing missing time,
>encounters with throbbing lights, manifest strange marks on
>their bodies and all seem to see very different but equally
>impossible things.

>Because I think that's the key. The one thing that unites them
>all. They touch the impossible and it burns them.

Depends on how flexible your criteria for labelling it a "UFO abduction experience" is. Like I said.....

no UFOs, no aliens, no kidnap... then no "abduction."

Regards,

John Velez
"UFO/alien" abductee

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

US Congress Joins Cloning Debate

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:00:41 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:33:23 -0500
Subject: US Congress Joins Cloning Debate

http://my.aol.com/news/news_story.psp?type=1&cat=0200&id=0103271656020731

Congress Steps Into Human Cloning Debate
Reuters
Mar 27 2001 4:55PM

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The debate over human cloning comes to the U.S. Congress on Wednesday at a hearing featuring a fertility doctor and a believer in extraterrestrials who both say they are intent on producing people with identical copies of another person's genes.

The prospect of human cloning has horrified many scientists and religious groups who say it raises ethical dilemmas and may lead to babies born with serious deformities.

A hearing before a House subcommittee is set to explore safety and ethical issues as well as the U.S. government's ability to control human cloning attempts. Information gathered there could lead to legislation to ban such experiments.

A featured witness is Panos Zavos, a Kentucky fertility specialist who is part of an effort to provide infertile couples with children who are clones of either parent. More than 700 couples have volunteered to participate in the project set to take place in a Mediterranean country, Zavos has said.

Also scheduled to testify is Rael, leader of a group that claims to be the world's largest UFO-related organization. Rael says his group plans to clone a couple's dead child at a secret lab in the United States.

A Web site for the Raelian movement says a 4-foot-tall extraterrestrial with almond-shaped eyes visited Rael, previously known as Claude Vorilhon, in 1973 and told him that life was deliberately created by scientifically advanced extraterrestrials using DNA.

Lawmakers invited Rael to speak because they feel a duty to shed light on the kind of groups claiming to have the scientific know-how and funding to clone people, said House Energy and Commerce Committee spokesman Ken Johnson. Part of the hearing's aim, Johnson said, is to find out "are they just a fringe nut group or are they really going to do it?"

Scientists, including researchers who have cloned animals, also are scheduled to speak.

Animal cloning has seen a high percentage of failures and deformed clones in the four years since scientists announced they had cloned a sheep named Dolly, leading to fears that human attempts could be fraught with difficulties.

Ethicists and religious groups are set to debate what would happen when a child has the same genetic make-up as a parent.

Rep. James Greenwood, the Pennsylvania Republican who chairs the House subcommittee holding the hearing, also plans to ask Food and Drug Administration officials what they can do to stop

people- cloning attempts.

If federal authority appears limited, there is "a very good possibility" that Congress would move toward banning human cloning in the United States, Johnson said.

RTR/SCIENCE-CLONING-DC/
Copyright 2001 Reuters Limited. All rights reserved.

--

In an infinite universe, infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 21:58:16 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 08:36:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 00:07:57 EST
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:10:04 -0000

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the 30% of UFO
>>>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>>Whence cometh this 30% statistic? Maybe your own experience, but
>>I doubt seriously that it is based on anything broader.

>Dick, List:

>1) - On April 30, 1948 Astronomer J. Allen Hynek turned in to
>the Air Force the following breakdown of his sighting
>investigations under Project Sign (See reference 1):

>Class	No. of Incidents	Approx. %
>Astronomical		
> high probability	42	18
> fair or low probability	33	14
> Total	75	32%

>Non-astronomical but suggestive of other
>explanations

> Balloons or ordinary aircraft	48	20
> Rockets, flares, falling bodies	23	10
> Miscellaneous (reflections, > auroral streamers, birds, etc. [13])	[13]	[5]
> Total	84	35%

>Non-astronomical, with no evident
>explanation

> Lack of evidence precludes > explanation	30	13
> Evidence offered suggests no > explanation	48	20
> Total	78	33%

>2) Hynek and an assistant analyzed
>reports during Project Grudge, which
>ended on December 27, 1949. An appendix
>to the project's final report gave their
>breakdown (2):

>Astronomical 32%

>Balloons	12
>Misidentified aircraft, hoaxes or >reports too sketchy to identify	33
>Unknowns	23

>3) - Project Blue Book breakdown of "Identified" (3):

>Type of IFO	Number	Percentage
>Astronomical	3,421	26.0%
>Aircraft	2,237	17.0
>Balloons	1,223	9.3
>Radar Phenomena	152	1.2
>Psychological	63	.5
>Hoax	116	.9
>Meteorological	44	.3
>Birds	85	.6
>Insuficient Information	2,409	18.3
>Other	2,807	21.4

>4) Allan Hendry was a full-time investigator for Hynek's Center
>for UFO Studies for more than a year during 1976-7. He studied
>1307 UFO reports and noted that the single largest category of
>IFOs were stars and planets, representing 35% of Nocturnal Light
>IFOs. He gave the following breakdown (4):

>Astronomical/reentries		
> Stars & planets	360	27.5%
> Meteors & reentries	113	8.7
> Total	473	36.2%

>>And, as usual, it depends on how you define "UFO" in the first place.

Bob,

Okay, so you choose to cite very early Hynek figures when he was
point man for the Air Force rather than his later figures, and
Hendry's sample which "took on all comers."

>Of course, the "keeper of the List" problem.

>>IFOs of astronomical objects generally are very easy to weed out
>>as essentially irrelevant to the argument.

>What difference does it make how easy it is for us to weed these
>out? (BTW, I seriously doubt the ability of many self-styled, or
>even "accredited" investigators, to competently deal with
>astronomical stimuli. I have found that even senior investigating
>officials of two UFO groups, who shall remain nameless here,
>apparently did not even know that as the Earth turns during the
>day and night, all astronomical objects appear to move across
>the sky. I can provide you with the details of their actual
>published notions in an off-line message, if you really wish to
>know. This whole subject is another essay for another day.)

Then you choose to wave off as unimportant the strongly
established fact that these - quite arbitrary - percentages that
are cited as if they were important scientific data are totally
dependent on the screening standards to determine what should be
considered worth futher study in the first place.

As is so typical of "debunkers," you then equate the most
ignorant UFO proponents with the best case that UFO advocates
can advance. Sorry, that just won't wash. What difference does
it make about ability to weed out obvious UFOs? All the
difference in the world in the credibility of the arguments that
debunkers constantly advance.

>UFO reports are not generated by you or me, or ufologists. They
>are generated by those who make the reports. What the witnesses
>report is what defines UFO phenomena.

Wow, that's profound! Except that, quite typically, you overlook
the fact that some witnesses are far superior and better
qualified than others.

>If astronomical IFOs are, "essentially irrelevant to the
>argument", as you say, why do they represent the single largest
>category of IFOs?

Because as we both know, a lot of people are poor observers, but

these numbers and percentages are essentially irrelevant to the question of whether or not UFOs represent something new and different. Do you evaluate any other aspect of your life (doctors, dentists, stock investments) on the basis of what poorly informed people say, or do you seek out--as any rational person would do--more credible sources of information?

>Of course, historically, astronomers have been among the most >critical of the entire subject. I wonder if this is the real >reason you dismiss their expertise as "essentially irrelevant to >the argument." It's gonna be hard squeezing any science in here >if you rule out scientists as essentially irrelevant.

Let's face it, most astronomers don't know diddley-shit about fireball meteors or much of anything else that occurs within the Earth's atmosphere, much less anything about human psychology, evaluation of witness testimony, or most other factors that have a direct bearing on UFO reports.

>>But investigating UFO reports scientifically is not only possible, >>it is highly desirable and some of us have been doing it for a >>long time. Only to be met with glib, and quite false, "statistics."

>References:

>(1) The Hynek UFO Report by J. Allen Hynek, Dell, 1977, > pp. 17-18.

>(2) Ibid., p. 18

>(3) Ibid., Table 11.2, p. 259.

>(4) The UFO Handbook by Allan Hendry, Doubleday/Dolphin, >1979, p. 24.

Highly selective citations.

>Clear skies,
>Bob Young

Clear thinking,

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:19:27 -0000
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:20:35 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:20:24 +0100
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:51:03 +0100

><snip>

>>You can jump to whatever dubious conclusions you like, if they
>>help.

>Hi,

>Please forgive me, but I simply asked you a question. I was not
>jumping to any conclusions. My question is based upon your
>stance throughout your research years, which to me is one of a
>sceptic. We can dance around the maypole all day with words, but
>I think from where I stand you seem unable to accept, that most
>of the books you have written on this subject are leaning
>towards the sceptical side of the alien visiting earth question,
>or as some prefer the ETH.

>Perhaps as someone who has 25 years of study into this UFO
>subject, you would be one person who could validate the ETH
>question?

>As I asked you last year on updates, after 25 years of UFO study
>both in lecture , video and book presentation (of which I
>respect and admire) the question I asked was : In your opinion
>after 25 years of UFO study, is Earth being visited by ET? And
>you told this list NO.

>>I don't pin labels on myself. I investigate cases as objectively
>>as possible - based on the premise that any outcome is possible
>>at the start of the enquiry. In this way I try to find answers
>>whenever I can. If I can find a reasonable answer then I am
>>happy to say so, and if I cannot find one then I am happy to say
>>so as well.

Etc., etc.

Roy,

I am a strong UFO advocate or proponent, depending on how you
define these terms (and you better be careful because I have
actually studied semantics and logic). I want to go firmly on
record here as saying that I consider Jenny Randles to be the
absolute best example of a true (and I will use the British
spelling in her honor) sceptic in the best sense of that word. I
have great respect for her entire approach to this messy
subject.

As I keep trying to say, don't use the term sceptic pejoratively
without further defining what you mean. Read my article
"Conceptualizing UFOs" for what I am talking about. Jenny

doubts, but she doesn't scoff. She suspects the ETH may be wrong, but she investigates--specific cases, far more than most people. Though few people believe either of us, both she and I are quite willing to follow where the trail of evidence leads.

By way of contrast, I have been very unimpressed by the response of scoffers and debunkers to Jenny's effort to do a meaningful study of case evidence and whether or not it supports an ETH interpretation. Their made-up minds shine through and tend to preclude any meaningful study that would, by open invitation, include their perspectives on individual cases.

What do they want? Apparently a confession that they are right and we are wrong without bothering to study the issues further.

Dick Hall

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Louise

From: **Karoline Louise** <KarolineLouise@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 17:22:58 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:23:25 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Louise

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:20:24 +0100
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 13:51:03 +0100

Jenny Randles wrote:

>>You can jump to whatever dubious conclusions you like, if they
>>help.

Roy Hale wrote:

>Please forgive me, but I simply asked you a question. I was not
>jumping to any conclusions. My question is based upon your
>stance throughout your research years, which to me is one of a
>sceptic. We can dance around the maypole all day with words, but
>I think from where I stand you seem unable to accept, that most
>of the books you have written on this subject are leaning
>towards the sceptical side of the alien visiting earth question,
>or as some prefer the ETH.

The strange thing is that all the 'sceptics' think Jenny is a
'believer'.

The poor lady must feel terribly picked on.

But you know what I think she really is?

I think she's that extraordinarily rare and undervalued thing -
an open-minded observer with no a priori belief-system and no
agenda beyond trying to find the truth.

I have just been chatting with John Velez about the careful
selection of evidence that goes into creating the case for
'alien abduction', and it reminded me of this very wise saying:

"the human wish to believe in any given thing always
increases in inverse proportion to the amount of evidence
there is to support it"

I think the biggest puzzle we all have to face is why does
believing in something (aliens or pelicans, or anything), so
often matter more to us than finding out whether or not it's
true?

Does anyone have any ideas?

KL

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:47:32 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:27:48 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Time Warp

>Hello, all....

>An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found
>in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

>http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

Roger,

I am well aware of the above interview and agree that it should be read by one and all. Are you now accepting that these are the words of the cameraman who shot the AA footage? And you're using this interview to prove your point. Am I correct in that assumption?

>Here's the Q&A of interest:

>Question #10: How did you keep the film after shooting and who
>developed it?

>Answer: I kept all the film with me, went back to the base and I
>processed it.

>Question #11: What happened to the remains of the UFO after
>delivery?

>Answer: Where did it go? Give me the question again.

>Now the freaks were taken by the medical team to a lab that had
>been set up at Fort Worth; the debris and craft were taken to
>Wright Field.

>Question #12: When was (the) spaceman cut up after the crash?

>Answer: The first autopsy took place about three weeks later. I
>filmed some at a small lab in Fort Worth.

>So here's the rub:

>AA proponents claim that the conditions seen in AA are the
>result of spontaneous decisions. The lack of adequate
>preparations and documentation being the by-product of something
>that was all very hurried and unplanned.

As one AA proponent, I have no idea what prompted the decision makers to act as they did. One cannot tell from the footage that anything was hurried or unplanned. It may have been, but this line of reasoning is not in any way important or relevant to what we're working toward. This is all theorizing on your part. You need to open the AA CDs and see if you can find examples of the "lack of adequate preparations". Are they missing an instrument that you would have expected to find? Do their actions seem hurried and unsure? Can you show examples of "shaky cam" or purposely unfocused shots? Explain in some fashion, how

you think this footage was made. Give examples from the footage so we all can view what you're seeing.

>Yet, as my astute reader pointed out, the cameraman clearly >indicates that the first autopsy wasn't filmed until three weeks >after the crash! Man, they had enough time to get all the best >equipment they needed!

>35mm! Lights! A bigger room! Catering! Beer!.

Who says they didn't have what they wanted? Perhaps they thought they did have the best doctors. Who would you have suggested? Do you find any errors in their work. Which mistake? Where? Why would they need a bigger room? That room did have everything they needed, including sound and an adjoining room for the medical stenographer.

The room was most likely isolated from the other hospital facilities. If the cameraman is correct, he was used because they trusted him and his work. I agree that they would have wanted to assemble the best team they could, under the circumstances.

>As far as I'm concerned, this is the last straw in a very weak >camel's back. Again, I look at the AA footage and wonder why >something so important was given such poor handling.

What footage are you looking at and where are the examples of "such poor handling".

>Now that I know they had three weeks to prepare

I can't believe that you had never read the cameraman's interview. Have you examined any of the evidence?

>- to get the finest >surgeons, the finest pathologists, the finest cameraman, the >best equipment - three weeks and what we see in AA is the best >they could come up with?

You should open the CDs before you make a statement like the one above. The quality of the AA CDs is quite striking.

>Hell, entire low budget movies are made in three weeks!

I visited your web site last week. Could you point out the example of special effects that you indicated was on a "par" with the AA?

>AA is a fraud.

>King Roger

You're wrong about that and we intend to prove it; but it would really help if you would get down off your camel's back and open the AA CDs and tell us where you find these mythical problems to which you're always alluding .

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:12:35 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:29:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Greg Sandow <greg@gregsandow.com>
>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 11:12:27 -0500
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sandow

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Sue, Greg, Don, List:

>>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the
>>30% of UFO
>>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>Bob, nobody says astronomers aren't qualified to identify
>astronomical IFOs. The only question is whether they're
>qualified to make pronouncements about the totality of UFO
>reports.

>As in: "Well [this is the voice of a TV newscaster] we've heard
>from Jeremy Otter, the famed UFO researcher. And now a comment
>from Susan Celestina, professor of astronomy at the state
>university: 'Many of those purported UFOs turn out to be
>misidentifications of Venus. There's nothing to this UFO
>business; all sightings can be explained.'"

>Professor Celestina, in this invented but all too familiar
>example, would be talking through her hat. Unless she's made a
>deep study of UFOs, which in most cases her real-world
>equivalents haven't, she should, more honestly, say: "Many UFO
>reports turn out to be misidentifications of Venus, or other
>astronomical objects. I can't say anything about the rest."

Everyone,

This all stems from a misunderstanding. On March 20 James Easton selectively posted an anti-UFO excerpt from a lengthy master's thesis by NASA official Diana Hoyt, which thesis is mainly about 100 pages of criticism of Condon and the AF, a fact he conveniently did not mention. The excerpt contained the following allegation which is where all this "astronomy and astrophysics" stuff on this sub-thread have come from, and it is a patently false and absurd claim:

Hoyt p. 94: "Most UFO investigators do not have credentials in astronomy or astrophysics and are considered to be charlatans by the pedigreed scientific community. In fact, the entire field of ufology is tainted by the lack of credentials of the UFO hunters".

I tried to point all this out in my posting on March 24:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m24-004.shtml>

Hoyt misinterpreted a comment by Sturrock that because astronomy and astrophysics study patterns of phenomena they are more

appropriate to the scientific study of UFO's than physics which seeks crucial experiments. She then somehow misapplied this to UFO field investigations.

Brad

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Sergey Korolyov

From: Paul Stonehill <rurc@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 19:48:18 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:32:11 -0500
Subject: Sergey Korolyov

Greetings,

I recently learned that Sergey Korolyov's daughter is seeking a publisher for her book about the life of her famous father. For those who do not know:

Sergey Korolyov was one of the founders of Moscow Group for the Study of Reactive Motion and participated in the Soviet Union's first launch of a liquid-propellant rocket in 1933.

The man was the most famous Soviet rocket designer and pioneer of cosmonautics, for years he was known only by his code name "Chief Constructor".

He was the source of the Soviet successes with the first artificial satellite of the Earth Sputnik-1, and the first man in space Yuri Gagarin.

In January of '99, I compiled and published a few UFO-related episodes of his life. Hopefully, his daughter will reveal more, if there is anything to reveal.

An English translation of her book would be most welcome. Just like the translation of another prominent Soviet scientist's (Professor Burdakov) books.

I mention some of his ideas in my book (we corresponded years ago); but Western researchers deserve to read more of this great scientist's writings.

My piece can be found here:

<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/a1999/feb/rus2.htm>

Paul Stonehill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base' -

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 20:26:50 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:35:23 -0500
Subject: Re: Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base' -

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 06:48:23 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Ralph O. Howard Jr. <rhjr@speedfactory.net>
>Subject: Paul Villa Photos In Good's 'Alien Base'

<snip>

>The story says they were "taken from" Timothy Good's recent book
>'Alien Base'. The photos are two of the famous Paul Villa
>specials, which I thought was a group of known hoax pictures
>from the early 60s.

<snip>

>I had Good's book on my list to buy, but now I wonder.

>First, is Good arguing that the photos were legit?

Remarkably enough, yes. "Alien Base" is a strange book; Good essentially comes to the defense of about every "contactee" you can name. Villa's case is treated in extreme detail. It's very interesting reading, but not persuasive (at least, not to me) that the Villa photos are anything but hoaxes.

=====
Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Gates

From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 23:45:37 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:37:16 -0500
Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01 - Gates

>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:47:45 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Bobbie Felder <jilain@ebicom.net>
>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01

>>From: Robert Gates <RGates8254@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 14 Mar 2001 22:13:34 EST
>>Subject: Re: The Watchdog - 03-13-01
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Date: Tue, 13 Mar 2001 11:09:31 -0500
>>>Subject: The Watchdog - 03-13-01
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>

>><snip>

>>I would suggest that if somebody got a copy of the script from
>>that episode, they would find that the writer (who is writing
>>fiction) is the one who gave John Glenn those words.

>>Bottom line is it has nothing to do with disclosure or
>>otherwise, its just a Hollywood writer trying to put a new angle
>>in having a real celeb guesting on a show.

>I could not possibly agree with you more. I have been amazed at
>how "much ado about nothing" this whole Frasier episode has
>become around the UFO circles on the internet. I saw the episode
>in question. I thought it was very funny.

>I think a lot of UFO Community people just so desperately want
>some sort of official disclosure statement, they are reading
>more into this than there actually is.

Hi Bobbie,

Sadly, exactly what you describe has been going on for years.
Almost ludicrous to the point of somebody farts and it sounds
like "UFO disclosure" and instantly we are duluged with drivial
about how this is the precursor to the big disclosure blah blah.
I suspect it will go on in the future as well.

Cheers,

Robert

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: Serious Research - Sparks

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 01:27:39 EST
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:41:26 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Sparks

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 00:07:57 EST
>Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:01:06 -0500
>Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 22:10:04 -0000

>>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>>Date: Mon, 26 Mar 2001 16:27:36 EST
>>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>Well, if astronomers aren't qualified to identify the 30% of UFO
>>>_reports_ which turn out to be astronomical IFOs, who would be?

>>Whence cometh this 30% statistic? Maybe your own experience, but
>>I doubt seriously that it is based on anything broader.

>Dick, List:

Bob, Dick, List,

Again, I keep pointing out this whole argument began with a selective quotation by Easton on March 20 from a master's thesis by NASA official Diana Hoyt. See my posting on March 24:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/2001/mar/m24-004.shtml>

And Hoyt misunderstood something Sturrock said about astronomy and astrophysics being more suited to scientific study of UFO's than Condon's specialty, physics, and she applied this to UFO field investigations, which wasn't what Sturrock was saying. He was pointing out that astronomy-astrophysics is accustomed to searching for patterns in masses of data -- meaning aggregates of _many_ observations. That is not a comment directed to field investigations of single UFO sightings. But Hoyt misinterpreted it as such. (I don't entirely agree with the original point because physics does look for patterns in masses of data, but it is true that astronomy has more of biology's natural history-style of cataloging of phenomena in it, with typologies of galaxies, supernovas, stars, nebula, etc.)

>1) - On April 30, 1948 Astronomer J. Allen Hynek turned in to the Air Force the following breakdown of his sighting investigations under Project Sign (See reference 1):

Slight correction. It was 1949. Hynek's first contract, AF No. 33(038)-1118, did not start until Dec 16, 1948.

>>And, as usual, it depends on how you define "UFO" in the first place.

>Of course, the "keeper of the List" problem.

>>IFOs of astronomical objects generally are very easy to weed out as essentially irrelevant to the argument.

>What difference does it make how easy it is for us to weed these
>out? (BTW, I seriously doubt the ability of many self-styled, or
>even "accredited" investigators, to competently deal with
>astronomical stimuli. I have found that even senior investigating
>officials of two UFO groups, who shall remain nameless here,
>apparently did not even know that as the Earth turns during the
>day and night, all astronomical objects appear to move across
>the sky. I can provide you with the details of their actual
>published notions in an off-line message, if you really wish to
>know. This whole subject is another essay for another day.)

By the same token I question whether the astronomy IFO
statistics, investigations and analyses from your Ref 4 can be
trusted because that reference demonstrates a complete ignorance
and misunderstanding of the difference between compass direction
and elevation angles. How can one determine the positions of
celestial bodies with respect to alleged UFO's if one is
confused between azimuth and elevation and calls one the other?
Or how can one trust that the IFO identifications have been
correctly made given that the investigator doesn't know his
azimuth from his... well, you get the picture.

Also, I think it is true that the statistics are slanted by
being weighed down with easily screened IFO's and by Blue Book's
"numbers game" of converting Possible and Probable categories of
IFO's into Certain. The Condon Committee had a much higher
Unexplained ratio to IFO's (taking IFO to include all
conventional explanations, for simplicity), about 40% of the
total published cases (I exclude unpublished case analyses)
because there was a certain amount of prescreening despite
Condon's and Low's efforts to swamp the effort with IFO's by
defining UFO to mean whatever the witness says it is. Hynek
complained that the Condon Committee, for example, wasted time
and resources investigating 14 cases that Blue Book had already
explained (UFO Experience p. 232).

Saunders pointed out that Blue Book's database seemed to be
weighted down with extremely brief and extremely long duration
sightings which tend to be astronomical or balloon IFO's,
whereas the better screened NICAP database had more of the
middle range of durations from genuinely Unexplained cases (p.
113).

>UFO reports are not generated by you or me, or ufologists. They
>are generated by those who make the reports. What the witnesses
>report is what defines UFO phenomena.
<SNIP>

As Hynek pointed out many times, the proper definition of a UFO
is a sighting that has passed a competent scientific
investigation, and is not "defined" by the witness. The witness
should not have to be the scientist on his/her own case. A UFO
could very well be one that the witness claims is an IFO -- what
counts most is the observational details not the opinions or
conclusions of the witness. Witnesses often draw the wrong
conclusions about what they have seen but are more accurate
about factual observational details that are not stretched
beyond their abilities. It is the job of the UFO investigator to
coax out the most accurate details and to not put witnesses in
the awkward position of having to guess or speculate about
things they cannot possibly perceive, e.g., pressing the witness
to guess the size or distance to a distant object for which
there are no visual cues to establish such. It is especially
perverse for an investigator to then turn around and accuse the
witness of incompetence for making such guesses as if the
witness is expected to have the knowledge of a Ph.D. astronomer
or atmospheric physicist or perceptual psychologist.

Brad

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Kaeser

From: **Steven Kaeser** <Steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 06:37:49 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:44:38 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Kaeser

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Time Warp

>Hello, all....

>An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found
>in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

>http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

>Here's the Q&A of interest:

>Question #10: How did you keep the film after shooting and who
>developed it?

>Answer: I kept all the film with me, went back to the base and I
>processed it.

>Question #11: What happened to the remains of the UFO after
>delivery?

>Answer: Where did it go? Give me the question again.

>Now the freaks were taken by the medical team to a lab that had
>been set up at Fort Worth; the debris and craft were taken to
>Wright Field.

>Question #12: When was (the) spaceman cut up after the crash?

>Answer: The first autopsy took place about three weeks later. I
>filmed some at a small lab in Fort Worth.

>So here's the rub:

>AA proponents claim that the conditions seen in AA are the
>result of spontaneous decisions. The lack of adequate
>preparations and documentation being the by-product of something
>that was all very hurried and unplanned.

>Yet, as my astute reader pointed out, the cameraman clearly
>indicates that the first autopsy wasn't filmed until three weeks
>after the crash! Man, they had enough time to get all the best
>equipment they needed!

>35mm! Lights! A bigger room! Catering! Beer!

>As far as I'm concerned, this is the last straw in a very weak
>camel's back. Again, I look at the AA footage and wonder why
>something so important was given such poor handling. Now that I
>know they had three weeks to prepare - to get the finest
>surgeons, the finest pathologists, the finest cameraman, the
>best equipment - three weeks and what we see in AA is the best
>they could come up with?

Roger,

Unless someone comes up with additional evidence to the

contrary, I think you're beating the proverbial dead horse.

Your logic is just as valid as the rest, but since we're primarily dealing in speculation when it comes to intent there's a lot of room for error.

This has been argued to death on this and other Lists, and another statement of "proof" that the AA was a hoax merely adds to torrent of opinions that have gone before.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 04:24:22 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:47:53 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hatch

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 15:21:59 +0100
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 01:57:35 -0800
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>>Just a quick note to say thank you, I have received the
>>surprise book; Graham Hancock, The Mars Mystery.

>>It will take some time to read it of course, and a quick
>>scan indicates I may not find it the epitome of credibility.
>>(Cydonia, pyramids on Mars, reinvented astronomy etc., etc.)

>>I hope I didn't hurt anyone's feelings with my careless
>>references to cattle diseases. Frankly, ranchers here are
>>scared spitless of both plagues, now much in the news.

>Hi Larry,

>Glad you got the book OK. No offence was taken, the farmers
>here in the UK have been through the mill, and it isn't
>getting better!

>To all other UpDates readers, you too can have a go at the
>Lost Haven UFO Quiz by clicking here:

><http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

>Who knows, you could win the book prize!

>Please also note, I am getting a lot of feedback to Authors who
>have published articles on my site, which is very good. They are
>receiving e-mails from around the world, on their written work.
>If you would like your article to be read and to also receive
>feedback on your articles, then please drop me a line :
>royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk

Hello Roy:

May I nominate Matthew Williams and Richard Conway?

Philip Mantle wrote a nice review of one of their 04AUG97
speaking engagement in Scotland:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1997/aug/m20-003.shtml>

...in which I find the passage:

"After the guard slide we got some air vents and then more
concrete. Williams now explained how he and his team sneaked
into Rudloe, moved along lift shafts, stood in large concrete
bay areas, photographed these, set off alarms, heard shots
fired and made their escape with a camera load of interesting
pictures."

Mantle follows that with suggestions he finds "more likely".

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 30](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 09:48:48 -0600
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:00:22 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Evans

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:47:32 -0800
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: AA Time Warp

Previously, I had written:

>>An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found
>>in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

>>http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

>>Question #12: When was (the) spaceman cut up after the crash?

>>Answer: The first autopsy took place about three weeks later. I
>>filmed some at a small lab in Fort Worth.

Ed replied:

>Roger,

>I am well aware of the above interview and agree that it should
>be read by one and all. Are you now accepting that these are the
>words of the cameraman who shot the AA footage? And you're using
>this interview to prove your point. Am I correct in that
>assumption?

Hi, Ed, all...

As usual, Ed, you seem to miss the point. There was an entire thread dedicated to the issues of why the footage seen in AA looked so bad. The reasons given by AA proponents explained that this was all a very "make do" and spontaneous event. Now you act as if it had never been brought up!

No, I do not believe that the cameraman is telling the truth. I believe that this was a mistake in his make-believe story. I remember reading the interview long ago, but had not made a note of this error until it was brought to my attention again by someone else. The fact that you've been well aware of this part of the interview only adds to my belief that you ignore the more obvious problems with AA in favor of any straw to grasp at. More to the point, you obviously kept quiet about this aspect of the interview while the discussions regarding the "hurried" state of AA were in full swing. I wonder why? If you are, indeed, in search of "the truth", then why be afraid to discuss something as pertinent to the validity of AA as the three week lag between discovery of the craft and the autopsy?

It is real simple:

They had three weeks to prepare for the autopsy.

The resources of the richest nation on earth were at their disposal.

And the best they could do was grainy, black and white film, out of focus and underexposed by what is, arguably, the worst cameraman in the military?

Come on, Ed. To ignore the three week preparation period is simply selective reasoning. This was a major event handled in the most sloppy way imaginable. Given three weeks to prepare, the results are inexcusable. I just don't buy it.

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: iler's Files #13 -- 2001 - Cuthbertson

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <bdc@fc.net>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 10:51:22 -0600 (CST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 08:53:46 -0500
Subject: Re: iler's Files #13 -- 2001 - Cuthbertson

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 12:42:19 -0500
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>

>>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 17:45:10 EST
>>Subject: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Filer's Files #13 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>>March 27, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>>Webmaster Chuck Warren <http://www.filersfiles.com>,

>>ARE UFOs A THREAT TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY?

>I also mentioned that Lee & Brit Elders had interviewed (on tape)
>two gentlemen who man the radar screens at the control tower
>of Mexico City's airport. They reported many radar contacts
>with the "UFOs" and they have even taken to 'chasing them off'
>with a helicopter when the "UFOs" are inside designated landing
>or take-off airspace. They, (and the pilot and navigator of the
>flight in question) reported one actual "collision" with a UFO that
>left a healthy dent on the airplane's underbelly.

It strikes me as very odd that entities advanced enough to build the type of craft reported above airports like Mexico City would not have the ability to completely analyze our comparatively primitive air-traffic patterns and aircraft, and the consequent common sense to avoid situations that might result in collisions.

Chasing them off with helicopters is almost equivalent to police chasing kids on bicycles off busy streets. The offender should know better in both cases. But of course that's just my human-centered view... common sense need not apply here I suppose.

-Brian

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Velez

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 12:06:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 08:55:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Velez

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Source: The Los Angeles Times

>><http://www.latimes.com/news/state/20010327/t000026482.html>
>>Tuesday, March 27, 2001

>>Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific
>>May Have Been Meteor

>>A bright red and green light that appeared to plunge into the
>>Pacific Ocean on Monday night may have been a meteor, an
>>astronomer said.

>>About 30 people from Santa Barbara to Marina del Rey called U.S.
>>Coast Guard and law enforcement officials about 8:20 p.m. to
>>report what they thought was a meteorite, a flare or a downed
>>aircraft, authorities said.

>>Troy Powers, a museum guide at Griffith Observatory, said that
>>judging from the descriptions, "it could have been a meteor."

>Poor man. He clearly isn't up on his pelican science.
>Consequently, he fails to understand that eyewitness testimony
>has no value whatever and can be discarded without a second
>thought.

>We may rest assured that the stimulus for this mass
>perception/hysteria was either

>(a) a flaming pelican possibly ignited by a meteorite, a flare,
>or an aircraft, or

>(b) a psychosocial phenomenon triggered by hysteria from a
>culture/political/psychic crisis yet to be determined, but
>addressing the deep-seated psychic needs of the witnesses.

Hi Jerry, hi All,

You're a pisser Jerry. But it's funny because it's true. I can't believe that any rational person would entertain balderdash like that unless it was motivated by a burning need to sublimate deep (primal) fear.

The louder and more irrational they are, the deeper the fear.

They are driven to irrationality by fear.

Warmest regards,

John Velez ;)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena

'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Secrecy News -- 03/30/2001

From: Steven Aftergood <saftergood@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:25:55 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 08:58:02 -0500
Subject: Secrecy News -- 03/30/2001

SECRECY NEWS
from the FAS Project on Government Secrecy
March 30, 2001

**DANIEL KING: THE NAVY'S WEN HO LEE?
**DIA'S FOUR THRUSTS
**CIA DUSTUP IN ARGENTINA

DANIEL KING: THE NAVY'S WEN HO LEE?

The case of US Navy Petty Officer Daniel M. King has emerged as yet another espionage horrorshow and a cautionary tale of prosecutorial authority run amok.

King was a Navy cryptanalyst who, following an inconclusive polygraph examination in 1999, was accused of committing espionage. He was subjected to an arduous and coercive interrogation involving sessions of up to 19 hours over a three week period, culminating in a confession that he would later recant. Despite intensive efforts, Navy investigators were unable to develop any significant corroborating evidence that the alleged espionage had ever taken place.

Sometimes described as the Navy's version of Wen Ho Lee, Petty Officer King spent an extraordinary 520 days in pretrial confinement before the charges against him were finally dropped.

The decisive moment in the case came on March 9 when Commander James P. Winthrop, the military judge who served as "investigating officer," recommended that the case be dismissed.

"It has become apparent to me ... that the government has not been able to effectively prosecute this case," Winthrop wrote. "The espionage charge... is based exclusively on a confession that the accused subsequently contradicted on several occasions." Moreover, "there are several fundamental extenuating and mitigating facts relevant to the charge."

Cmdr. Winthrop's remarkable memorandum, which loosely recalls Judge James A. Parker's expression of disgust at the government's handling of the Wen Ho Lee case, is posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/ops/ci/king/winthrop.html>

The dismissal of the case is a credit to King's tenacious and energetic civilian attorney Jonathan Turley. Turley's peculiar strategy involved, among other things, an attempt to turn the tables on the government by relentlessly accusing the military judge and opposing counsel of security violations both large and small (such as using a cellular telephone inside a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility, failing to use cover sheets on classified documents, etc.). Several of Mr. Turley's complaints, submitted to DCI George Tenet and others, are posted here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/ops/ci/king/index.html>

These items provide some fascinating insights into the conduct

of the case, which is otherwise mostly classified. One of Turley's complaints notes, for example, a settlement offer made by the government to drop all charges against Petty Officer King if he would agree not to pursue a lawsuit against the Navy or officials in the case. The offer was rejected.

The outcome of the King case is particularly remarkable because the government almost never loses an espionage case once a decision is made to bring it to trial. The 1986 case of former army civilian Richard Craig Smith is perhaps the only instance in the last several decades in which an espionage trial ended in an acquittal of the defendant.

If Jonathan Turley is the kind of attorney you want nearby when you are falsely accused of a hideous crime, then Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Richard Shelby seems like someone who should be avoided if at all possible.

Senator Shelby lashed out at the Navy, not for its cruel interrogation or its trouncing of an American sailor's constitutional rights, but because it failed to win a conviction.

"I believe it was a very strong case -- and it was bungled," Senator Shelby told the Washington Post yesterday.

A Pentagon press briefing yesterday noted that both the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Navy have begun "reviews" of the case.

A reporter asked whether any disciplinary action has been taken against the investigators who were involved in the case. "Have they been suspended from duty or anything like that?" Pentagon spokesman Adm. Craig R. Quigley replied, "Not that I'm aware of."

See excerpts from yesterday's press briefing here:

<http://www.fas.org/irp/news/2001/03/dod032901.html>

DIA'S FOUR THRUSTS

On March 8, the Senate Armed Services Committee received its annual worldwide threat briefing from DCI George Tenet and Defense Intelligence Agency Director Vice Admiral Thomas R. Wilson. Their prepared statements, presented in closed session, were almost identical to those provided at a Senate Intelligence Committee hearing a month earlier.

One substantive exception is a concluding section by DIA Director Wilson captioned "The Bottom Lines." This new text includes a description of DIA's so-called "Four Thrust" initiative, designed to respond to the challenges of the day.

The four priority areas for thrusting are described as follows: "improving the quality of our military intelligence data bases, ensuring our intelligence systems 'plug and play' in the computer and decision networks of our military customers, shaping to meet the asymmetric threat, and revitalizing/reshaping the work force."

See Director Wilson's discussion of "The Bottom Lines" in his prepared statement here:

http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2001_hr/s010308w.html#bottom

CIA DUSTUP IN ARGENTINA

The CIA Chief of Station in Argentina was recalled to the United States after his name and photograph were published in the Buenos Aires newspaper Pagina/12 on January 7, according to Argentine press reports.

The disclosure of the CIA Station Chief's identity, blamed on Argentine officials, reflected existing tensions between the CIA and Argentine intelligence and further exacerbated them. The two services share an active interest in Islamic terrorists, the Russian mafia, and other intelligence topics. But they have also been riven by personality clashes and various petty disputes.

See:

<http://www.pagina12.com.ar/2001/01-01/01-01-07/pag15.htm>

"For the first time in the history of this country, the photo of the CIA chief in Buenos Aires was published in the news media," wrote Miguel Bonasso in Pagina/12. Bonasso, a former Montonero guerrilla turned muckraking journalist, is somewhat well known as the author of *Recuerdo de la Muerte*, a novel concerning the Argentine military dictatorship.

"For 'the Company' -- the most powerful espionage agency in the world -- it is a most serious penetration of its security system," he wrote.

Bonasso reviewed the rather convoluted aftermath of the disclosure last January 14:

<http://www.pagina12.com.ar/2001/01-01/01-01-14/pag03.htm>

To subscribe to Secrecy News, send email to <majordomo@fas.org> with this command in the body of the message: subscribe secrecy_news [your email address]

Secrecy News is archived at:

<http://www.fas.org/sqp/news/secrecy/index.html>

Steven Aftergood
Project on Government Secrecy
Federation of American Scientists
<http://www.fas.org/sqp/index.html>
Email: saftergood@igc.org

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:36:04 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:00:03 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Tonnies

>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:47:32 -0800

<snip>

>As one AA proponent, I have no idea what prompted the decision
>makers to act as they did. One cannot tell from the footage that
>anything was hurried or unplanned. It may have been, but this
>line of reasoning is not in any way important or relevant to
>what we're working toward. This is all theorizing on your part.
>You need to open the AA CDs and see if you can find examples of
>the "lack of adequate preparations". Are they missing an
>instrument that you would have expected to find? Do their
>actions seem hurried and unsure? Can you show examples of "shaky
>cam" or purposely unfocused shots? Explain in some fashion, how
>you think this footage was made. Give examples from the footage
>so we all can view what you're seeing.

First of all, I think the AA is almost certainly a fake, but I
still haven't dismissed it.

One interesting bit in the film that suggests that the
"pathologists" _were_ prepared is their immediate understanding
that the black eye coverings are removable.

Watch the tape: they haul out the tweezers and pluck them right
off like it's an everyday routine!

At the very least, this detail would suggest that the "doctors"
had dissected at least one previous entity with similar eye
coverings.

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: US Congress Joins Cloning Debate - Tonnies

From: **Mac Tonnies** <macbot@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:46:38 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:01:44 -0500
Subject: Re: US Congress Joins Cloning Debate - Tonnies

>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:00:41 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: US Congress Joins Cloning Debate

<snip>

>A Web site for the Raelian movement says a 4-foot-tall extra-
>terrestrial with almond-shaped eyes visited Rael, previously
>known as Claude Vorilhon, in 1973 and told him that life was
>deliberately created by scientifically advanced
>extraterrestrials using DNA.

Ha! Take a look at "Rael's" original book and you'll see a tall,
blond "space brother," not a 4-ft. "gray".

I guess you've got to change with the times...

=====

Mac Tonnies (macbot@yahoo.com) 816-561-0190
105 Ward Parkway #900, Kansas City, MO 64112
Me: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/mtvi.html>
Cydonia: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/cydonia.html>
Books: <http://www.geocities.com/macbot/bookreviews.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Debunkers' Guidebook

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 20:40:23 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:40:32 -0500
Subject: Debunkers' Guidebook

Debunkers' Guidebook

(First Draft)

How to debunk UFOs and Discredit UFO Proponents:

1. Point out that very large percentages of things reported as UFOs turn out to have conventional explanations (but don't talk about individual observers' varying abilities or how believers screen and investigate cases).
2. Always refer to them as UFO believers or ETH believers, implying that their position is faith-based.
3. Argue that any given case could have been something conventional and we will never know because we never have all the facts (but don't acknowledge that well-qualified observers have reported unexplained craft-like objects displaying extraordinary performance totalling in the hundreds or thousands).
4. (Corollary to 3): Avoid any mention of the patterns of appearance and behavior in unexplained cases worldwide for many decades.
5. Focus on the well-known problems and limitations of human perception (but never mention that people are incarcerated on the basis of eye-witness testimony, that our court systems could not function without it, and that if human perception were as inadequate as claimed, nobody would dare to cross a busy street or fly an airplane).
6. Comment regularly on human credulity and wishful thinking, in a desire for saviours from space (just don't mention that it applies only to cultists on the fringes of ufology, nor that close encounter cases typically scare the pants off of the witnesses rather than inspire them).
7. Always act as if no one before you has really conducted a thorough investigation in classic UFO cases so that it's only a matter of time and diligence before the answers will be found (but avoid mentioning that the suggested answers you propose either have already been found wanting or fail to account for the salient features of the case).

Richard H. Hall,
Strategist

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Rimmer

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 23:18:42 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:53:04 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Rimmer

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Troy Powers, a museum guide at Griffith Observatory, said that
>>judging from the descriptions, "it could have been a meteor."

>Poor man. He clearly isn't up on his pelican science.
>Consequently, he fails to understand that eyewitness testimony
>has no value whatever and can be discarded without a second
>thought.

>We may rest assured that the stimulus for this mass
>perception/hysteria was either

>(a) a flaming pelican possibly ignited by a meteorite, a flare,
>or an aircraft, or

>(b) a psychosocial phenomenon triggered by hysteria from a
>culture/political/psychic crisis yet to be determined, but
>addressing the deep-seated psychic needs of the witnesses.

A while ago I suggested that Jerome Clark should go into a quiet room and have a lie down. From his reply I think he suspected that 'a lie down' was some sort of obscure British double-entendre, but I would strongly suggest he does so again, perhaps with a cold flannel on his forehead, for he is clearly suffering from the strains of a Minnesota winter spent in a town with no decent beer.

Perhaps while he's lying there he could think back and try to remember where I, or any of my pelicanist colleagues ever made such comments as "eyewitness testimony has no value whatever and can be discarded without a single thought". Perhaps he could then think of reasons why sceptical ufologists such as Andy Roberts, David Clarke, Hilary Evans, His Grace the Duke of Mendoza, and even in a small way myself, have spent so much time talking to eyewitnesses and listening carefully to what they have to tell us?

Or is he suggesting, yet again, that reports of eyewitnesses are invariably unflinchingly accurate, that everything happened exactly as they initially reported it, and that no UFO witness has ever, ever, ever (especially if they are a pilot or (US) policeman) ever, made a mistake in perception, estimated a distance wrongly, or misjudged an angle?

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Magonia Supplement 35

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 23:34:35 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:57:47 -0500
Subject: Magonia Supplement 35

MAGONIA Supplement

No. 35 21 March 2001

EDITORIAL

In our previous issue Kevin McClure remarked that Georgina Bruni had confused him with someone called Bob Easton concerning early investigations of the Rendlesham affair. Bruni, on reading this article, seems to have got the impression that "Bob Easton" was a pseudonym for Kevin McClure. However, Jenny Randles has pointed out that both Bob Easton and Kevin McClure are mentioned in her book Sky Crash, so Bruni cannot have read it very carefully. It should be noted that Bob Easton is not to be confused with James Easton, who has conducted extensive investigations into the Rendlesham stories and documentation, but whose name is conspicuously and curiously absent from Bruni's book. I hope you can make some sense of this; the Rendlesham business is far too complicated for your poor old Editor . . .

CLARION SCRAWL

Martin S. Kottmeyer

When I was a teen, I subscribed to a now long defunct glossy magazine called Intellectual Digest. I never mentioned it to friends for, where I live - a farming community - few people took an interest in the life of the mind. Teens were supposed to be interested in sports, cars, girls, and videogames. It was a little guilty pleasure. I say this as an emblem of evidence that I am not, by inclination, anti-intellectual. I like them. I respect them. Yet, I do think there are things they should probably keep out of. One of those things is the subject of UFOs.

It's an empirical thing. Call it some branching corollary from Clarke's First Law: "When a distinguished hi-brow intellectual deigns to write about UFOs, the result is usually an embarrassment." The evidence has accumulated gradually and I won't say it will convince everyone, but let me pull together some items from my files. In an essay, "We've All Studied Lifton," I showed that a paragraph written by Yale-man Robert J. Lifton suggesting abductions were a "mythic version of child abuse" was speculation based on hearsay.(1) Jung's book on the saucer myth has some historic value, but the distinctive idea that readers took away from it: UFO = mandala, is controverted by elementary logic. Fearful saucer encounters are inconsistent with a symbol that otherwise always manifests with tranquility and feelings of becoming whole.(2)

Philip Taylor has already noted that Oxford and Cambridge prolific philosopher Gerald Heard offered the idiosyncratic notion that super-bees from Mars piloted saucers.(3) Arthur Koestler offered a short appendix on UFOs in Janus: A Summing Up

(1978) which has a couple of howlers like the word 'ufology' being coined in 1946 and ending on a line that makes Koestler sound like he respects the opinion of a UFO maven who hears cats talk.(4) (That this person - Aimé Michel - was being tongue-in-cheek is true enough, but many could hardly know this from the lack of explanatory context.) The bulk of his discussion re- tells the story of the Low memorandum and how the staff would try to trick the public into thinking it is objective while making scientists think they were hard-nosed. But Koestler is writing nearly a decade after the Condon study was done and the issue was moot. The Low memo 'exposé' had no impact even at the time it first played.(5) Steve Allen, creator of the PBS "Meeting of Minds" series, digresses in the middle of a critique of religion to speak of the bizarre nature of flying saucer belief. But it stumbles on an elementary matter of chronology: "The first UFO was reportedly sighted in the early fifties."(6) I'm sure other examples will spring to mind.

What at last stimulated me to suggest this law is a new example that was recently brought to my attention. I had mentioned my admiration of Weston La Barre's *The Ghost Dance* to someone while expressing some disappointment that I could not think of any connection the book had to UFO study. He pointed out to me I had overlooked some lines La Barre made about Festinger's famous study *When Prophecy Fails*. I quickly pulled it off the shelf and confirmed that I had somehow passed over or forgot this material. I sort of wished I could have continued to miss it. It measures one paragraph and one footnote.

The paragraph in the main text summarizes Festinger fairly and urbanely. The main points are that Festinger's book confirms that religious proselytising increases in intensity when prophecy fails - "no doubt growing out of a naively democratic epistemology which holds that the more believers, the higher the truth value of the belief." Marian Keech got messages from outer space, specifically "Sanandra of the planet Clarion," predicting an end of the world flood. The saucer cavalry did not come for their rescue, despite their pious fasting and cutting of worldly ties. They sought out the press to get a larger clientele rather than hide in shame. La Barre adds, "the psychiatrist might make the relevant remarks on the characteristic impermeability of paranoia to cognitive feedback."(7) I would guess he regarded the prophetic cataclysm as reason enough to offer such a diagnosis. That the alien is misspelled twice as Sanandra - there's no r - is at worst a cosmetic gaffe.

It is the footnote that makes me groan: "The difficulty of locating Sanandra on Clarion is that this hitherto unreported planet must be beyond the orbit of the farthest one known, Pluto. To converse with Sanandra and get an answer back would take two times the light years that Clarion is distant from the earth for each response, which must make colloquy something of a bore. At this rate, Clarion could not be, as it sounds, a daily newspaper; still 'Clarion' has an odd clang with 'Marian' - but this leaves in some doubt the identity of Sanandra, though he or she evidently speaks good middle-western American English."(8)

The most blatant goof here is the effort to draw significance out the fact that Clarion rhymes with Marian. Seasoned ufologists all know that 'Marian Keech' was a pseudonym. The lady who channels Sananda actually went by the name of Dorothy Martin.(9) Festinger did not hide the fact that he had disguised the names of the people in the book.(10) Almost as bad, 'Clarion' was not even invented by 'Marian'. Some will recognize the name Clarion from the earlier Truman Bethurum contact. Bethurum alleged his contact occurred either 27 or 28 July, 1952 and spoke of it in newspaper articles as early as 25 September 1953. The book was selling as early as 1 April 1954.(11) D.M. starts talking about Clarion sometime in the spring of 1954 and Sananda, more specifically, is known to be first channelled in mid-April.(12)

It is not clear from Festinger's book that D.M. thought Clarion existed at interstellar distances. It is grouped with worlds like Venus and Uranus in some lines.(13) Bethurum indicated Clarion was "entirely invisible from earth, since it was on the other side of the moon".(14) By the time of the Condon report, some folks had relocated Clarion to the opposite side of the Sun.(15) This is reminiscent of the notion of counter-Earths found in many systems of myth. Ancient Greek astronomy offers a prominently known example.

This would likely be thought moot by new-agers on other principles. One, some communications explicitly involved beings on flying saucers and thus already close by. Two, these communications involve telepathy which, new age tenets allow, travels at the speed of imagination and that is not limited to c. Three, the beings also exist at a higher "vibratory frequency" and thus the whole world may exist at "a vibratory rate that the dense people of Earth cannot see them".(16) This is, after all, a belief system grown out of theosophy.(17)

La Barre's comment about the contacts involving good midwestern English strikes me as more expectant than observant. D.M. lived in New York before coming to the midwest and the locutions often owe much to the stylings and religious bafflegab of the culture of spiritualism. How midwestern does this message sound to you? -- "So shall ye be at the altar at the time of the evening when there is a tola directly over you."(18) I, a midwesterner, should probably be offended to think we talk channel-goo like the stuff on display in Festinger. La Barre's pointed humour is aimed in the wrong direction.

To show there are no hard feelings, let's try to answer that question La Barre couldn't quite figure out. Who is Sananda? I looked through a number of texts devoted to mythology and confirmed the name is evidently modern and has not been used before in any prominent ancient myths. Plugging the name into the Google search engine turned up an alarming 6670 items. Needless to say, I only skimmed through some of the more hopeful looking documents in the first 300 listed. It impressed me that the name has become quite popular among those who channel. This seems to be a way to put forward religious teachings and ascribe them to someone who, by D.M.'s precedent and subsequently theosophic tradition, both is and is not Jesus. Some put him in the category of an Ascended Master and he is repeatedly found hanging around in the same circles as Ashtar. Some of the people involved with channelling Sananda include Linda Bardino, Janisel, Eric Klein, Karana Palmer, Sister Thedra, Paul Walsh-Roberts, Jeannie Weyrick, and Andrew Whalley, if you are interested in such things. Call it peculiar that this name who should be thought a false prophet has gained such a following.

The name seems plausibly Eastern and it concerns me that Dorothy Martin might have picked it up from prior theosophic works. It is in none of those I've consulted, but it is not a genre I have extensive knowledge about, so, no guarantees. I have two guesses.

One: It is derived from California's infamous San Andreas Fault. We know the initial newspaper account of her prophecy spoke of the Clarionites having "observed fault lines in the earth's crust that foretold the deluge". Her cataclysm "will submerge the West Coast from Seattle, Washington to Chile in South America."(19) Obviously, if Sananda appears earlier in theosophical literature and in a context that excludes the involvement of the West Coast, this idea is vulnerable to disproof.

Guess Number Two: It is derived from San-tana Dharma. This is a term that appears in the Bhagavid Gita referring to the eternal laws of family and seems to mean in Sanskrit 'eternal right,' truth, religion. Eastern thinkers are said to use it nowadays as a term for the religion of Hinduism.(20) The meaning seems especially suitable to form the footing of a theosophical malapropism. This clearly requires a bad bit of garble, but I've already indicated I don't find the charge that Clarionites speak good midwestern as credible. If Sananda appears before Dorothy Martin began channelling him, this may be the better notion. Naturally, this may also be subject to disproof if a memoir or confession turns up disclosing the line of reasoning.

Not being a theist, the presence of fallibility in one of my intellectual heroes does not exactly shake my faith in the nature of the world. The Ghost Dance remains a masterpiece, even if I am now sure it is not absolutely perfect in all things. I'll excuse him on the hypothesis that high-brows are obliged by natural law to get the UFO thing wrong and they are better on the subjects that really matter.

References

1. "We've All Studied Lifton", REALL News, 3, 7, July 1995, 1, 5-6

2. "Realities Bite", MUFON UFO Journal, No. 322, February 1995, 16-17
3. Taylor, Philip, "The Mystic and the Spy", Magonia, No. 61, November 1997
4. Koestler, Arthur, Janus: A Summing Up, Hutchinson, 1978, 319-325
5. Quintanilla, Hector, UFOs: An Air Force Dilemma, National Institute for Discovery Science Website, 2001, 79-80. <http://www.nidsci.org>
6. Steve Allen on the Bible, Religion and Morality, Prometheus Books, 1990, 155
7. La Barre, Weston, The Ghost Dance, Delta, 1972, 286-287
8. La Barre, 297
9. MacDougall, Curtis D., Superstition and the Press, Prometheus, 1983, 608-609
10. Festinger, Leon; Reiken, Henry W. and Schachter, Stanley, When Prophecy Fails, Harper Torchbooks, 1964 (1956) foreword
11. "Redondoan Tells of Visiting Space Ship", Redondo Beach Daily Breeze, clipping in Truman Bethurum's Personal Scrapbook, Arcturus Book Service reproduction, 1982
12. Festinger, 36
13. Festinger, 53, 62
14. Bethurum, Truman, Aboard a Flying Saucer, DeVorss, 1954, 83
15. Condon report, 30-31, 853-854
16. Festinger, 45
17. Festinger, 33, 40
18. Festinger, 184
19. Festinger, 30-31
20. Parrinder, Geoffrey, A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions, Westminster Press, 1971, 243

Editor: John Harney - harney@harneyj.freemove.co.uk
Letters and short articles welcome

--

John Rimmer
Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

NASA Acquires 2001 HAL Computer

From: Kurt Jonach <ewarrior@electricwarrior.com>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 18:25:37 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:03:59 -0500
Subject: NASA Acquires 2001 HAL Computer

NASA ACQUIRES 2001 HAL COMPUTER

The Electric Warrior : News March 30, 2001
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0015.htm>

science & technology news
by The Electric Warrior

NASA's Langley Research Center has acquired a desktop supercomputer called HAL-15 from a company that says its novel approach to high performance architecture means the age of reconfigurable computers has arrived.

According to NASA, "The system is said to be faster and more versatile than any supercomputer on the market and will change the way we think about computational methods."

The HAL (Hyper Algorithmic Logic) computer system from Star Bridge Systems replaces traditional CPUs (central processing units) with reconfigurable FPGAs (field programmable gate arrays).

A comment once made by Intel's Andy Grove, "Silicon is simply frozen software," provides an apt analogy: the Star Bridge Systems 'hypercomputing pensa processors' are not frozen or static, but rather theoretically fluid or dynamic.

Aptly still, steamy hype about the new software-based computer architecture-on-demand might be questioned as unrealistic vapor-ware.

NASA's press release says the FPGA specialty chips can reconfigure themselves hundreds or thousands of times a second. "This makes it possible for multiple applications to run at the same time on the same chips making them 1000 times faster than traditional commercial CPUs."

Star Bridge Systems, primarily a software development company, says their proprietary algorithms can implement whatever function is needed at the moment.

An online UK high-tech news agency, with email ties into California's Silicon Valley, questioned whether the FPGA chips can really do what NASA's press release claims.

"No word yet on how well the gizmo works, if at all; but if it's a total bust we have every confidence that Intel will promptly let us know," says The Register.

In case you were wondering, the mnemonic HAL 9000 from '2001: A Space Odyssey' means Heuristic ALgorithmic. The acclaimed author, Arthur C. Clarke, once wrote about HAL's Legacy:

"Although I've never considered 2001 as a strict prediction -- but as more of a vision, a way thinks could work -- I have long kept track, informally, of how our vision compares with computer science reality. Some things we got right -- even righter than

we ever had a reason to suspect. Others, well, who could have known?"

RELATED RESOURCES

NASA Langley to test New Hyper Computer System Computing Faster Than Engineers Can Think
http://oea.larc.nasa.gov/news_rels/2001/01-021.html

NASA's new supercomp sits on a desktop
<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/2/17979.html>

HAL's Legacy
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/e-books/Hal/>

THE ELECTRIC WARRIOR
March 30, 2001
Silicon Valley, CA
<http://www.electricwarrior.com>

Web developers, the URL address for this content is:
<http://www.electricwarrior.com/news/ewNews0015.htm>

Permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this article or any portion thereof, provided The Electric Warrior is cited as the source.

Images are created exclusively for the Electric Warrior Website. They can be downloaded and cached for individual use, but may not be reproduced or used in any other context without permission.

eWarrior@electricwarrior.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 05:13:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:06:49 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hale

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:19:27 -0000

<snip>

>I am a strong UFO advocate or proponent, depending on how you
>define these terms (and you better be careful because I have
>actually studied semantics and logic). I want to go firmly on
>record here as saying that I consider Jenny Randles to be the
>absolute best example of a true (and I will use the British
>spelling in her honor) sceptic in the best sense of that word. I
>have great respect for her entire approach to this messy
>subject.

Hello Richard,

Can we please now move this debate on? Let us not worry about names and personalities, let us address the fundamentals of this debate.

The ETH / Are we having contact or not? Or are their thousands of confused and bewildered people walking around this planet reporting contact with Aliens - and Metallic and shiny machines just for the sake of it?

This subject has been dragged down to pages and pages of rhetoric. Everyone now has an opinion, everyone needs to make an impression in the mud, and what are we left with? Zilch. No one agrees, new avenues are appearing, and to be frank' ufology is now considering setting up a council of people to tell us in their opinion that Mr Smith saw what he saw, because these people on the council all agree with each other! Lucky Mr Smith!

>As I keep trying to say, don't use the term sceptic pejoratively >without further defining what you mean. Read my article >"Conceptualizing UFOs" for what I am talking about. Jenny >doubts, but she doesn't scoff. She suspects the ETH may be >wrong, but she investigates--specific cases, far more than most >people. Though few people believe either of us, both she and I >are quite willing to follow where the trail of evidence leads.

Like I mentioned in my mail (and no one picked up) I respect and admire Jenny's work in ufology, but let us not think that Jenny Randles is all ufology. UFO research is about the people who see these machines, the people who also wake up and find alien beings staring at them from the end of their beds. Its about those people who confess after years of keeping this experience wrapped inside their minds' that they had a far out experience with a UFO and their occupants.

>By way of contrast, I have been very unimpressed by the response >of scoffers and debunkers to Jenny's effort to do a meaningful >study of case evidence and whether or not it supports an ETH >interpretation. Their made-up minds shine through and tend to >preclude any meaningful study that would,

by open invitation, >include their perspectives on individual cases.

Richard if you believe that at least one Alien Space ship has visited this planet, would you think it possible another could have done so?

>What do they want? Apparently a confession that they are right
>and we are wrong without bothering to study the issues further.

You mention "we", is this council already in place?

Best Regards,

Roy..

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 05:19:55 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:09:04 -0500
Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner - Hale

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 04:24:22 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: The Lost Haven Quiz Winner

>Hello Roy:

>May I nominate Matthew Williams and Richard Conway?

Dear Larry,

If you feel you have an answer to my UFO Quiz question please send it direct to me. I wouldn't want UpDates to get inundated with answers for my quiz. I hope you understand where I am coming from on this.

For anyone entering my UFO Quiz:

<http://www.thelosthaven.co.uk/UFOQuiz.html>

please e-mail me your answer direct:

royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk

Best Regards,

Roy..

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Deschamps

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <ufoman@ican.net>
Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 01:53:53 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:12:02 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Deschamps

>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: AA Time Warp

>Hello, all....

>An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found
>in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

>http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

>Here's the Q&A of interest:

>Question #10: How did you keep the film after shooting and who
>developed it?

>Answer: I kept all the film with me, went back to the base and I
>processed it.

>Question #11: What happened to the remains of the UFO after
>delivery?

>Answer: Where did it go? Give me the question again.

>Now the freaks were taken by the medical team to a lab that had
>been set up at Fort Worth; the debris and craft were taken to
>Wright Field.

>Question #12: When was (the) spaceman cut up after the crash?

>Answer: The first autopsy took place about three weeks later. I
>filmed some at a small lab in Fort Worth.

>So here's the rub:

>AA proponents claim that the conditions seen in AA are the
>result of spontaneous decisions. The lack of adequate
>preparations and documentation being the by-product of something
>that was all very hurried and unplanned.

>Yet, as my astute reader pointed out, the cameraman clearly
>indicates that the first autopsy wasn't filmed until three weeks
>after the crash! Man, they had enough time to get all the best
>equipment they needed!

>35mm! Lights! A bigger room! Catering! Beer!

>As far as I'm concerned, this is the last straw in a very weak
>camel's back. Again, I look at the AA footage and wonder why
>something so important was given such poor handling. Now that I
>know they had three weeks to prepare - to get the finest
>surgeons, the finest pathologists, the finest cameraman, the
>best equipment - three weeks and what we see in AA is the best
>they could come up with?

>Hell, entire low budget movies are made in three weeks!

>AA is a fraud.

>King Roger

Roger,

Here's my five cents worth....

Saying it's a fraud does not make it so...

Still no smoking gun, though, one way or the other.

Who's the hoaxer?

Name, Rank and Serial Number needed, please!

Then, and only then, will I accept that the AA is a fake.

Cordially,

Michel M. Deschamps

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Aurorae As IFOs

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:07:07 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:14:00 -0500
Subject: Aurorae As IFOs

Ladies & Gents:

Perhaps you've seen the news about the aurorae and solar storms. Here's a picture from the POES satellite about 2 A.M. this morning. Notice how the auroral oval is shifted south over the States:

<http://sec.noaa.gov/pmap/UserPass.cgi>

Here's are images of the Sun today for the Mt. Wilson 150-ft solar tower:

<http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~obs/intro.html>

Including the daily white light (unfiltered) drawing at the bottom, which you can enlarge:

http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~obs/images/cur_drw.jpg

Spectacular.

Now for your investigator's files, for possible identification of aurorae as IFOs:

Today's space weather, with a current auroral image:

<http://sec.noaa.gov/SWN/index.html>

Auroral plots for the last 3 or 4 days:

<http://sec.noaa.gov/pmap/Pmap1.cgi>

This later one should let you check on possible aurorae at the time of a report. The images are usually updated every 15 minutes.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

False Memories

From: **Kevin Randle** <KRandle993@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:32:43 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 10:15:13 -0500
Subject: False Memories

Good Morning, all -

For those interested, the Learning Channel (aka TLC) is presenting a program tonight on False Memories. Given some of the discussion on this list, it might be worth watching.

KRandle

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Hatch

From: **Larry Hatch** <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 08:14:16 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:02:49 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Hatch

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:36:04 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:47:32 -0800

><snip>

>>As one AA proponent, I have no idea what prompted the decision
>>makers to act as they did. One cannot tell from the footage that
>>anything was hurried or unplanned. It may have been, but this
>>line of reasoning is not in any way important or relevant to
>>what we're working toward. This is all theorizing on your part.
>>You need to open the AA CDs and see if you can find examples of
>>the "lack of adequate preparations". Are they missing an
>>instrument that you would have expected to find? Do their
>>actions seem hurried and unsure? Can you show examples of "shaky
>>cam" or purposely unfocused shots? Explain in some fashion, how
>>you think this footage was made. Give examples from the footage
>>so we all can view what you're seeing.

>First of all, I think the AA is almost certainly a fake, but I
>_still_ haven't dismissed it.

>One interesting bit in the film that suggests that the
>"pathologists" _were_ prepared is their immediate understanding
>that the black eye coverings are removable.

>Watch the tape: they haul out the tweezers and pluck them right
>off like it's an everyday routine!

>At the very least, this detail would suggest that the "doctors"
>had dissected at least one previous entity with similar eye
>coverings.

Dear Mac, Ed and all:

I suggest we put this to a vote; if for no other reason than to
preserve bandwidth.

Resolved: The AA Film, as presented by Ray Santilli is:

- a) A shameless fake for monetary gain.
- b) A poorly made fake which nevertheless turned a tidy profit
for Ray Santilli.
- c) A hastily made fake with many loose ends.
- d) A complete waste of bandwidth.
- e) A real tape of a real event proving that aliens are
not only among us, but allow their fallen comrades to be cut
up by humans, on film, much to the pecuniary benefit of the

same R. Santilli.

Please send your votes to Ed Gehrman. I'm much too busy to keep count.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Debunker's Guidebook - Ledger

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 12:34:37 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:10:33 -0500
Subject: Re: Debunker's Guidebook - Ledger

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Debunker's Guidebook
>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 20:40:23 -0000

>Debunker's Guidebook

>(First Draft)

>How to debunk UFOs and Discredit UFO Proponents:

>1. Point out that very large percentages of things reported as
>UFOs turn out to have conventional explanations (but don't talk
>about individual observers' varying abilities or how believers
>screen and investigate cases).

>2. Always refer to them as UFO believers or ETH believers,
>implying that their position is faith-based.

>3. Argue that any given case could have been something
>conventional and we will never know because we never have all
>the facts (but don't acknowledge that well-qualified observers
>have reported unexplained craft-like objects displaying
>extraordinary performance totalling in the hundreds or
>thousands).

>4. (Corollary to 3): Avoid any mention of the patterns of
>appearance and behavior in unexplained cases worldwide for many
>decades.

>5. Focus on the well-known problems and limitations of human
>perception (but never mention that people are incarcerated on
>the basis of eye-witness testimony, that our court systems could
>not function without it, and that if human perception were as
>inadequate as claimed, nobody would dare to cross a busy street
>or fly an airplane).

>6. Comment regularly on human credulity and wishful thinking, in
>a desire for saviours from space (just don't mention that it
>applies only to cultists on the fringes of ufology, nor that
>close encounter cases typically scare the pants off of the
>witnesses rather than inspire them).

>7. Always act as if no one before you has really conducted a
>thorough investigation in classic UFO cases so that it's only a
>matter of time and diligence before the answers will be found
>(but avoid mentioning that the suggested answers you propose
>either have already been found wanting or fail to account for
>the salient features of the case).

Excellent Dick.

These are really telling comments and observations. Somewhere I discovered a website-unrelated to UFOs-that looks into the curious psyche of the debunker and the near fanatical pursuit of his or her point of view. It concluded that there were two reasons for such an attitude. Irrational fear of the premise being debunked and the

unabashed self interest of the debunker or the interests which they represent.

It noted that those who don't have the two motivations mentioned above then don't care one way or the other and pursue interests that do command their attention. They don't waste time on it.

In my case, for instance, I don't support the basic tenants of religion or the so-called teachings of the bible other than whatever limited historical value it might have. No offence to anyone that does. I think there are many things portrayed and proposed there that are harmful to the general human condition but I don't spend my time on various religious lists trying to debunk the miracles therein, dispute its inaccuracies and the basic shortcomings of its geological timeline.

The other point that this essay made [BTW I'm still trying to find that site-it got lost in the meltdown of last November] was that debunkers always raise the bar. When one of their points has been knocked down-up comes another. They can never be convinced by any amount of evidence. I've been able to discount many sightings due to evidence that has come forth, and simply blown off many sightings, particularly NLS, simply because I consider them noise. There are plenty of in-your-face sightings to look into.

I now find myself having another look at Rendlesham which I had delegated to the "probably-solved" bin simply because I've found James Easton's reasoning wanting in other cases and do not trust his findings anymore. This is one instance when the debunker has converted one of his supporters due to a credibility meltdown in other areas.

Over simplification is the mainstay of the debunker's thrust. Pick one point to the exclusion of all others and try to make it work. Make a snap judgement on the basis of some existing evidence that might or might not have value - ie if there is a UFO sighting, no matter how large, close and anomalous it is-if Venus was in the sky that night - it was likely that planet that was seen. The attempt then is to blunt the point of what might be a good sighting. When this happens it diverts resources away from it due to the fact that maybe others that might have been able to bring something valuable to the table, but do not have the particulars of the sighting, are shunted away thinking that the debunker knows something they do not.

Recently on this List Bill Hamilton mentioned an old piece of film he had viewed some years ago with a very good object captured in it. Without any hesitation whatsoever one of our skeptics stated it was probably a lens flare??? That is so obviously a blunting ploy that it is laughable. He knows who he is and is a likable fellow to boot.. very forgiving.

This has gotten longer than I planned - almost eastonian in length.

I'll try and find this site again. Some of you may already have stumbled across it.

Again Dick, very good.

Best,

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Hatch

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 12:49:29 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:12:50 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Hatch

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 12:06:28 -0500
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>Source: The Los Angeles Times

>>><http://www.latimes.com/news/state/20010327/t000026482.html>
>>>Tuesday, March 27, 2001

>>>Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific
>>>May Have Been Meteor

>>>A bright red and green light that appeared to plunge into the
>>>Pacific Ocean on Monday night may have been a meteor, an
>>>astronomer said.

>>>About 30 people from Santa Barbara to Marina del Rey called U.S.
>>>Coast Guard and law enforcement officials about 8:20 p.m. to
>>>report what they thought was a meteorite, a flare or a downed
>>>aircraft, authorities said.

>>>Troy Powers, a museum guide at Griffith Observatory, said that
>>>judging from the descriptions, "it could have been a meteor."

>>Poor man. He clearly isn't up on his pelican science.
>>Consequently, he fails to understand that eyewitness testimony
>>has no value whatever and can be discarded without a second
>>thought.

>>We may rest assured that the stimulus for this mass
>>perception/hysteria was either

>>(a) a flaming pelican possibly ignited by a meteorite, a flare,
>>or an aircraft, or

>>(b) a psychosocial phenomenon triggered by hysteria from a
>>culture/political/psychic crisis yet to be determined, but
>>addressing the deep-seated psychic needs of the witnesses.

>Hi Jerry, hi All,

>You're a pisser Jerry. But it's funny because it's true. I can't
>believe that any rational person would entertain balderdash like
>that unless it was motivated by a burning need to sublimate deep
>(primal) fear.

>The louder and more irrational they are, the deeper the fear.

>They are driven to irrationality by fear.

It's curious how this museum guide was elevated to the status of astronomer in the space of ten lines. I wonder if the press checked with the parking attendant at the front gate.

If the Coast Guard was alerted, you can be sure they did a check for possible aircraft involvement by passing the observaytion along to various TRACONS and they in turn to Flight Service Stations.

Don

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Serious Research - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 16:54:05 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:15:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Hall

>Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 05:13:34 +0100
>From: Roy J Hale <royjhale@netscapeonline.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Serious Research

>>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 22:19:27 -0000

>Hello Richard,

>Can we please now move this debate on? Let us not worry about
>names and personalities, let us address the fundamentals of this
>debate.

Roy,

I am having difficulty understanding just what you are talking about or what point you are trying to make. Will you please define for me what you see as the matter under debate? I was simply responding to the reactions to and criticism of Jenny, which seems to me a perfectly legitimate thing to do.

>The ETH / Are we having contact or not? Or are their thousands
>of confused and bewildered people walking around this planet
>reporting contact with Aliens - and Metallic and shiny machines
>just for the sake of it?

Why do you ask this kind of question, and then if I (or someone else) obligingly gives an opinion you say, in effect, that's just your opinion? If you don't want my opinion, don't ask for it. Of course I am convinced that thousands of people are reporting "machines" and what appear to be "aliens," and I consider that hypothesis to be a perfectly reasonable explanation.

>This subject has been dragged down to pages and pages of
>rhetoric. Everyone now has an opinion, everyone needs to make an
>impression in the mud, and what are we left with? Zilch. No one
>agrees, new avenues are appearing, and to be frank' ufology is
>now considering setting up a council of people to tell us in
>their opinion that Mr Smith saw what he saw, because these
>people on the council all agree with each other! Lucky Mr Smith!

If you don't like the idea and don't consider it worthwhile, ignore it and leave it to the folly of those who think it would be worthwhile. Have you some better approach to going beyond Zilch or are you just taking a nihilist position?

>>As I keep trying to say, don't use the term sceptic
>>pejoratively without further defining what you mean. Read my
>>article "Conceptualizing UFOs" for what I am talking about.
>>Jenny doubts, but she doesn't scoff. She suspects the ETH may
>>be wrong, but she investigates--specific cases, far more than
>>most people. Though few people believe either of us, both she
>>and I are quite willing to follow where the trail of evidence
>>leads.

>Like I mentioned in my mail (and no one picked up) I respect and
>admire Jenny's work in ufology, but let us not think that Jenny
>Randles is all ufology.

No one said she was, only that she is very experienced and
knowledgable, and that her Council idea is worth considering.

>UFO research is about the people who see
>these machines, the people who also wake up and find alien
>beings staring at them from the end of their beds. Its about
>those people who confess after years of keeping this experience
>wrapped inside their minds' that they had a far out experience
>with a UFO and their occupants.

Well, of course it is. And your point is...?

>>By way of contrast, I have been very unimpressed by the
>>response of scoffers and debunkers to Jenny's effort to do a
>>meaningful study of case evidence and whether or not it
>>supports an ETH interpretation. Their made-up minds shine
>>through and tend to preclude any meaningful study that would,
>>by open invitation, include their perspectives on individual
>>cases.

>Richard if you believe that at least one Alien Space ship has
>visited this planet, would you think it possible another could
>have done so?

Huh?

>>What do they want? Apparently a confession that they are right
>>and we are wrong without bothering to study the issues further.

>You mention "we", is this council already in place?

What kind of quibble is this? My meaning is quite clear.

- Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark

From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 11:29:36 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:17:39 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Clark

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 23:18:42 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

John,

>A while ago I suggested that Jerome Clark should go into a quiet
>room and have a lie down. From his reply I think he suspected
>that 'a lie down' was some sort of obscure British
>double-entendre, but I would strongly suggest he does so again,
>perhaps with a cold flannel on his forehead, for he is clearly
>suffering from the strains of a Minnesota winter spent in a town
>with no decent beer.

First of all, I emphatically resent the slander that my
Minnesota town has no decent beer. Clearly, John needs to
accompany me to the Canby Liquor Store. Or, if he doesn't want
to be seen on the streets of what he once characterized as a
"hick town," he is urged to examine the contents of my
refrigerator. There his heretofore-naive eyes will fall on the
tasty, well-brewed Leinenkugel's Northwoods Lager and the
magnificent Summit Extra Pale Ale, both products (Wisconsin and
Minnesota, respectively) of the region of the planet where I, a
lover of fine beer, am fortunate enough to dwell. Then, as John
and I consume said products together, I will endeavor to talk
some sense into him, and the warm glow of same will, with any
luck, melt some heretofore frozen portions of a blocked head.

>Perhaps while he's lying there he could think back and try to
>remember where I, or any of my pelicanist colleagues ever made
>such comments as "eyewitness testimony has no value whatever and
>can be discarded without a single thought". Perhaps he could
>then think of reasons why sceptical ufologists such as Andy
>Roberts, David Clarke, Hilary Evans, His Grace the Duke of
>Mendoza, and even in a small way myself, have spent so much time
>talking to eyewitnesses and listening carefully to what they
>have to tell us?

Of course it is characteristic of the pelicanist to want to have
it both ways: to deny the validity of eyewitness testimony and
to howl in outrage when that fact is pointed out. In fact, there
are circumstances under which eyewitness testimony can be shown
to be flawed (as in the perception of nebulous light sources in
the night sky), and others in which eyewitness mistakes are
rather less easily demonstrated, as when multiple and/or
independent witnesses observe, in daylight, a structured craft,
at close range, exhibiting extraordinary performance

characteristics. It is the dubious contribution of the pelicanist to blur the difference between the two.

>Or is he suggesting, yet again, that reports of eyewitnesses are
>invariably unflinchingly accurate, that everything happened
>exactly as they initially reported it, and that no UFO witness
>has ever, ever, ever (especially if they are a pilot or (US)
>policeman) ever, made a mistake in perception, estimated a
>distance wrongly, or misjudged an angle?

It is also characteristic of the pelicanist, when losing the argument (as frequently happens), to resort to the sort of crude, witless caricature expressed above.

John, a word of advice: give it a rest (or, if you prefer, a lie down). The psychosocial era of ufology is over.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: False Memories - Mortellaro

From: **Jim Mortellaro** <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 13:23:57 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:19:38 -0500
Subject: Re: False Memories - Mortellaro

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:32:43 EST
>Subject: False Memories
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Good Morning, all -

>For those interested, the Learning Channel (aka TLC) is
>presenting a program tonight on False Memories. Given some
>of the discussion on this list, it might be worth watching.

Dear All:

Thank you, Kevin, for the invitation to watch a show covering the subject most interesting to me and so many others, a show on falsies. It's what Gesundt calls them. Memories falsely inflated, created and blown all out of proportion to the real thing, which lies underneath, weak, weary and shriven, shriveled, sorry. Damn! Or is it shroved?

Whatever!

Anyway, I look forward to this show, in part because it should reveal the truth, the absolute truth, la verite' com portfolio. And in further part because of the source. Le Source Perrier of truth itself, the real thing, The Learning Channel. Not hype, but hyper-hype. Not truth, but hopeful sales of (no, not books) - of soap suds, feminine hygiene products, long acting medicine for social disease and last but not least... condoms. The ones what come (no pun intended) in colors.

I shall recommend that Gesundt buy time on the Learning Channel for his latest product. Feminine Hygiene Gripple. It tickles.

With only my most satirical smirk,

Jim Mortellaro

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Evans

From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 12:40:12 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:21:56 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Evans

>From: Michel M. Deschamps <ufoman@ican.net>
>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 01:53:53 -0500
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Deschamps
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>Subject: AA Time Warp

>>Hello, all....

>>An astute reader sent me this info. The following can be found
>>in the interview with the alleged AA cameraman at:

>>http://www.soc.org/opcam/a_autopsy/alienautopsy.html

<snip>

>>So here's the rub:

>>AA proponents claim that the conditions seen in AA are the
>>result of spontaneous decisions. The lack of adequate
>>preparations and documentation being the by-product of something
>>that was all very hurried and unplanned.

>>Yet, as my astute reader pointed out, the cameraman clearly
>>indicates that the first autopsy wasn't filmed until three weeks
>>after the crash! Man, they had enough time to get all the best
>>equipment they needed!

>>35mm! Lights! A bigger room! Catering! Beer!

>>As far as I'm concerned, this is the last straw in a very weak
>>camel's back. Again, I look at the AA footage and wonder why
>>something so important was given such poor handling. Now that I
>>know they had three weeks to prepare - to get the finest
>>surgeons, the finest pathologists, the finest cameraman, the
>>best equipment - three weeks and what we see in AA is the best
>>they could come up with?

>>Hell, entire low budget movies are made in three weeks!

>>AA is a fraud.

Michel replied:

>Here's my five cents worth....

>Saying it's a fraud does not make it so...

>Still no smoking gun, though, one way or the other.

>Who's the hoaxer?

>Name, Rank and Serial Number needed, please!

>Then, and only then, will I accept that the AA is a fake.

Hi, Michel!

Practice what you preach, dude. You once wrote:

>I am 200% sure that the AA film is real.

You also wrote:

>Frankly, I don't care that much since I've had so many
>sightings; I am kind of casual about it because I know Flying
>saucers are real.

>It took me a long while to accept what I had seen, and each
>time, I had a hard time believing what my eyes saw or what my
>camcorder captured on tape.

So what we have here is a situation where you are sure that flying saucers are real because you have video tape of them (even though you won't share said images with this list). On the other hand, you are 200% sure that AA is real without any confirming evidence what so ever!

You're right. Simply declaring something valid or invalid does not make it so. What is needed is solid, physical evidence. Of course, if only we knew someone that had video tape of a real flying saucer, then maybe we could clear this whole UFO mystery once and for all. Until then, your 200% assurance really doesn't amount to much, does it?

Roger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Mass Hysteria as a Myth

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 14:45:47 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:25:14 -0500
Subject: Re: Mass Hysteria as a Myth

Several months ago I read an article in a newspaper that reported on a study done about panic and mass hysteria. It concluded that both were a myth. The study included war, earthquakes, other natural disasters, boat sinkings, fires in hotels and theaters, terrorist attacks, and airline crashes or incidents. Apparently people don't panic and don't suffer from mass hysteria.

Since the myth of mass hysteria has been a staple of the sceptical community and debunkers for many years now, I'd like to see some proof that there is such a thing as mass hysteria. First of all examples then proof that this was proven mass hysteria.

Maybe we can shoot down this silly excuse for explaining away UFO sightings once and for all. I for one have never given mass hysteria any credibility since I first came across it many years ago.

It's a convenient scapegoat and buzzword with little or no value.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Aurorae As IFOs - Hayes

From: John Hayes <webmaster@ufoinfo.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 20:22:53 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:26:45 -0500
Subject: Re: Aurorae As IFOs - Hayes

>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 09:07:07 EST
>Subject: Aurorae As IFOs
>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Ladies & Gents:

>Perhaps you've seen the news about the aurorae and solar storms.
>Here's a picture from the POES satellite about 2 A.M. this
>morning. Notice how the auroral oval is shifted south over the
>States:

><http://sec.noaa.gov/pmap/UserPass.cgi>

For those who have not visited the above URL it looks like you
need to go to:

<http://sec.noaa.gov/pmap/Pmap1.cgi>

first, select a date and time then click on the submit button.

I'm sure Bob will correct me if there is another URL.

Regards,

John Hayes

webmaster@ufoinfo.com

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>

Official Archives for UFO Roundup, UK UFO Network Bulletin,
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences, UFO + PSI
Magazine plus archives of Filer's Files and Oz Files.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 17:01:32 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:28:44 -0500
Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging - Young

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 12:06:28 -0500
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>Source: The Los Angeles Times

>>><http://www.latimes.com/news/state/20010327/t000026482.html>
>>>Tuesday, March 27, 2001

>>>Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific
>>>May Have Been Meteor

>>>A bright red and green light that appeared to plunge into the
>>>Pacific Ocean on Monday night may have been a meteor, an
>>>astronomer said.

>You're a pisser Jerry. But it's funny because it's true. I can't
>believe that any rational person would entertain balderdash like
>that unless it was motivated by a burning need to sublimate deep
>(primal) fear.

>The louder and more irrational they are, the deeper the fear.

>They are driven to irrationality by fear.

Hi, John, Jerry:

Paranoia and irrationality aside, can either of you guys tell me
in 30 or 40 words how this report differs from the report of a
meteor fireball?

Please be specific.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Debunker's Guidebook

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 17:09:10 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:30:52 -0500
Subject: Re: Debunker's Guidebook

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Debunkers' Guidebook
>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 20:40:23 -0000

>Debunkers' Guidebook

>(First Draft)

>How to debunk UFOs and Discredit UFO Proponents:

<snip>

Hi Dick:

Here's Young's ETH Corellary to Halls Debunkers' Guidebook:

No matter what the believers say about statistics, generalities, theories or whatever, always ask for one proven example of a spaceship from another world; where you can go to see it, or the evidence that it was here.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

ETH Council

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 23:10:53 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:34:17 -0500
Subject: ETH Council

Hi,

I just wanted to thank all those who have contributed to the debate in the past couple of weeks regarding the creation of an ETH council.

I also want to remind you all of tomorrows date.

Although the idea was itself perfectly genuine, the debate always sincere and I would have been delighted had the Council actually gotten off the ground - I never expected that to happen. So it wasn't really what this project was about.

In fact this experiment began when I dropped that pebble into the pond that is UpDates when posting my first message. I just monitored the ripples that have expanded from there to see how this idea would develop within UFOlogy.

Like I have said a few times in recent days (mentioning that I was learning useful things from this debate) I wanted to see how ufology would react to a suggested project that would polarise the battlelines.

I deliberately took part myself so that you can all analyse my own responses if you wish. I gave truthful answers each time. So my own replies should be taken sincerely - as indeed, I trust, should all the others. There was nothing phoney about what happened. I just didnt tell you that I expected Ufology not to agree on the concept and that the very way by which Ufology deigned to disagree was expected by me to offer interesting insights .

So I do apologise if you feel that I have cheated you. That truly wasn't what I was up to. It was a genuine experiment (a word that I used several times in my postings as a bit of a hint). I picked the two weeks leading up to 1 April so even if you hate what I did you can try to laugh it off and realise that it wasnt as cynical as some of the spoofs you will all get to see in the media tomorrow.

Oh, and be assured I won't be quoting you from this debate without your permission. This wasn't a way to sollicit material for a book or paper, in case you were thinking that it was.

This debate served a genuine purpose that you can all assess by following the development of the discussion.

And at least a lively discussion ensued that - hopefully - made it worthwhile.

And - who knows - some positive steps towards a 'new initiative' might even emerge . And if they do I shall be more than delighted.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

The Moon Landing Hoax

From: **Bob Young** <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 17:31:45 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:38:22 -0500
Subject: The Moon Landing Hoax

Everybody:

Please note this excellent site for teachers debunking the recent nonsense on the Fox network claiming that NASA faked the Apollo program:

www.thursdaysclassroom.com

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 14:09:06 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:40:17 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:36:04 -0800 (PST)
>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>First of all, I think the AA is almost certainly a fake, but I
>_still_ haven't dismissed it.

Mac,

I've asked you this before but what makes you think that the AA
"is almost certainly a fake"? What is your evidence?

I think you'll change your mind once you view the AA CDs. Email
your address off line and I'll send you a set and a Flatland. I
value your opinion.

>One interesting bit in the film that suggests that the
>"pathologists" _were_ prepared is their immediate understanding
>that the black eye coverings are removable.

>Watch the tape: they haul out the tweezers and pluck them right
>off like it's an everyday routine!

>At the very least, this detail would suggest that the "doctors"
>had dissected at least one previous entity with similar eye
>coverings.

Yes I agree this is very curious.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 14:50:33 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:43:16 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman

>>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 20:12:41 -0600
>>>From: Roger Evans <shooter@afterimagephoto.tv>
>>>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>>>Subject: AA Time Warp

>As usual, Ed, you seem to miss the point. There was an entire
>thread dedicated to the issues of why the footage seen in AA
>looked so bad.

As you may recall I never agreed with that assessment. You were the only person saying that the AA "looked so bad". I think the AA, once it's viewed with the clarity that the AA CDs bring, has excellent quality and what you'd expect for the conditions and the period.

>The reasons given by AA proponents explained that
>this was all a very "make do" and spontaneous event. Now you act
>as if it had never been brought up!

I followed your arguments closely and found them unconvincing. We have absolutely no way of knowing what was going through the minds of the folks making these decisions. All I know from viewing the footage is that it seems professional, unhurried, and fascinating.

>No, I do not believe that the cameraman is telling the truth. I
>believe that this was a mistake in his make-believe story.

This makes no sense at all. If the cameraman is telling the truth, then everything happened as he says...end of story. He was there and he should know! If he's not telling the truth, then how can you use his testimony to determine that there were three weeks between the crash and the autopsy?

>remember reading the interview long ago, but had not made a note
>of this error until it was brought to my attention again by
>someone else. The fact that you've been well aware of this part
>of the interview only adds to my belief that you ignore the more
>obvious problems with AA in favor of any straw to grasp at.

I have been aware of this testimony for several years, but is it my responsibility to make sure you too are aware of it? As far as I'm concerned there are no problems with the AA except that Ray hasn't/won't have the film stock dated. Other than that, there are no problems. You certainly haven't proved any of your contentions or theories.

>to the point, you obviously kept quite about this aspect of the
>interview while the discussions regarding the "hurried" state of
>AA were in full swing.

I never agreed with the "hurried state" discussions. You created the strawman that the AA was somehow of poor quality but when I've asked you to show us what you meant by these poor "quality problems", you've refused to do so. Now you have a perfect opportunity to give the list examples of these "problems" and you still refuse. What's that all about?

>I wonder why? If you are, indeed, in

>search of "the truth", then why be afraid to discuss something
>as pertinent to the validity of AA as the three week lag between
>discovery of the craft and the autopsy?

I think they were as prepared as they needed to be. Again, where
is your proof that they weren't? Did they forget something?

>They had three weeks to prepare for the autopsy.
>The resources of the richest nation on earth were at their disposal.
>And the best they could do was grainy, black and white film, out
>of focus and underexposed by what is, arguably, the worst
>cameraman in the military?

Its not grainy, or out of focus and it seems to me the cameraman did
an admirable job under the circumstances.

>
>Come on, Ed. To ignore the three week preparation period is
>simply selective reasoning. This was a major event handled in
>the most sloppy way imaginable. Given three weeks to prepare,
>the results are inexcusable. I just don't buy it.

Why would I bring into the discussion the cameraman's interview
when you don't think the cameraman exists. Everyone who has
studied the history of the AA is aware of this interview. That
you aren't tells me that you haven't looked closely at the
evidence.

Ed

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Mortellaro

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:10:01 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:47:37 -0500
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001 - Mortellaro

>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 10:51:22 -0600 (CST)
>From: Brian Cuthbertson <bdc@fc.net>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001

>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 12:42:19 -0500
>>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
>>>Date: Tue, 27 Mar 2001 17:45:10 EST
>>>Subject: Filer's Files #13 -- 2001
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>Filer's Files #13 -- 2001, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
>>>George A. Filer, Director, Mutual UFO Network Eastern
>>>March 27, 2001, Sponsored by Electronic Arts; Majorstar@aol.com.
>>>Webmaster Chuck Warren <http://www.filersfiles.com>,

>>>ARE UFOs A THREAT TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY?

>>I also mentioned that Lee & Brit Elders had interviewed (on tape)
>>two gentlemen who man the radar screens at the control tower
>>of Mexico City's airport. They reported many radar contacts
>>with the "UFOs" and they have even taken to 'chasing them off'
>>with a helicopter when the "UFOs" are inside designated landing
>>or take-off airspace. They, (and the pilot and navigator of the
>>flight in question) reported one actual "collision" with a UFO that
>>left a healthy dent on the airplane's underbelly.

>It strikes me as very odd that entities advanced enough to build
>the type of craft reported above airports like Mexico City would
>not have the ability to completely analyze our comparatively
>primitive air-traffic patterns and aircraft, and the consequent
>common sense to avoid situations that might result in
>collisions.

>Chasing them off with helicopters is almost equivalent to police
>chasing kids on bicycles off busy streets. The offender should
>know better in both cases. But of course that's just my human-
>centered view... common sense need not apply here I suppose.

Dear Brian et al and of course, EBK,

Under ordinary circumstances of my not having experienced this
phenom, I would agree with you a thousand percent. However in
19XX I was on two flights, going to and coming from, Europe. As
a former consultant to the Government and present consultant to
Law Enforcement in the area of RF and Data Communications, I was
on assignment there, on military aircraft. This was during the
Kosovo operations, FYI.

Whilst en route to a military communications center on the
continent, we were approached by and followed by a triangular
UFO. We were up front and personal with the flight deck in this
aircraft, and watched with amazement as the flight crew was
notified by us (three passengers, me, one military person of
unknown association and one of our own military) that we were

being shadowed by what seemed to be a huge object of unknown origin. Triangular, lit up like a freaking pin ball machine with solids and strobes and God knows what all else. Each member in turn, of the flight crew, looked outside the plane (to port) and saw the aircraft, blinked not even once, turned back to what they were doing, and proceeded for the rest of the flight, to operate their airplane with the flight deck doors closed and locked. Not a word. Nuttin. Each of us sat there with mouths wide open, asking questions of each other like, "Whatdaf*ck izzat!???" and "Why the crap don't them up-front dudes wanna talk to us!??!"

Believe it or not, doesn't matter. Time, place and actual events regarding location etc., are not available. Not from me anyway. I may be Gripple addled, I may be Sicilian. But crazy I am not. And no uncle of mine's got enough juice, enough Motts, to do enough kneecaps to keep me safe. This was during one of the early Conferences given by Budd Hopkins' Intruders Foundation. I missed the conference and the dinner. But that's another story.

Maybe there's more to this stuff than meets the intellect. Maybe. And maybe they want us to know about them in ways they decide are appropriate. Maybe.

Or maybe they are intimidating us. Or maybe as Jerry Clark opined, it is:

>(a) a flaming pelican possibly ignited by a meteorite, a flare, or an aircraft, or

>(b) a psychosocial phenomenon triggered by hysteria from a >culture/political/psychic crisis yet to be determined, but >addressing the deep-seated psychic needs of the witnesses.

Maybe.

I was not drinking Gripple, taking substances (not even a mood alterer). But it could have been flashback.

Jim

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: Serious Research - Young

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 18:11:07 EST
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 19:19:02 -0500
Subject: Re: Serious Research - Young

>From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
>To: updates@sympatico.ca
>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 21:58:16 -0000

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 00:07:57 EST
>>Subject: Re: Serious Research
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>Okay, so you choose to cite very early Hynek figures when he was
>point man for the Air Force rather than his later figures, and
>Hendry's sample which "took on all comers."

Dick,

Well, what is your breakdown for IFOs vs UFOs, and how many are
astronomical in nature?

>As is so typical of "debunkers," you then equate the most
>ignorant UFO proponents with the best case that UFO advocates
>can advance.

Holy Cow. Errol, clear the airwaves. Get a cup of coffee, or a
brew, folks.

Dick, please sit down, take a deep breath and tell us:

What is the best case that UFO advocates can advance?

>>Of course, historically, astronomers have been among the most
>>critical of the entire subject. I wonder if this is the real
>>reason you dismiss their expertise as "essentially irrelevant to
>>the argument." It's gonna be hard squeezing any science in here
>>if you rule out scientists as essentially irrelevant.

>Let's face it, most astronomers don't know diddley-shit about
>fireball meteors or much of anything else that occurs within the
>Earth's atmosphere,

Probably one of the most silly-assed statements I've ever read,
and final proof that this notion of serious ufology in the form
of some kind of self-appointed "Council" coming up with anything
that will ever get the attention of the wider world of science
is a pipedream.

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: AA Time Warp - Hall

From: Richard Hall <hallrichard99@hotmail.com>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 23:26:04 -0000
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 19:21:16 -0500
Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Hall

>Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 08:14:16 -0800
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp

>>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 11:36:04 -0800 (PST)
>>From: Mac Tonnies <macbot@yahoo.com>
>>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp - Gehrman
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>>From: Ed Gehrman <egehrman@psln.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: AA Time Warp
>>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 16:47:32 -0800

>><snip>

>>>As one AA proponent, I have no idea what prompted the decision
>>>makers to act as they did. One cannot tell from the footage that
>>>anything was hurried or unplanned. It may have been, but this
>>>line of reasoning is not in any way important or relevant to
>>>what we're working toward. This is all theorizing on your part.
>>>You need to open the AA CDs and see if you can find examples of
>>>the "lack of adequate preparations". Are they missing an
>>>instrument that you would have expected to find? Do their
>>>actions seem hurried and unsure? Can you show examples of "shaky
>>>cam" or purposely unfocused shots? Explain in some fashion, how
>>>you think this footage was made. Give examples from the footage
>>>so we all can view what you're seeing.

>>First of all, I think the AA is almost certainly a fake, but I
>>_still_ haven't dismissed it.

>>One interesting bit in the film that suggests that the
>>"pathologists" _were_ prepared is their immediate understanding
>>that the black eye coverings are removable.

>>Watch the tape: they haul out the tweezers and pluck them right
>>off like it's an everyday routine!

>>At the very least, this detail would suggest that the "doctors"
>>had dissected at least one previous entity with similar eye
>>coverings.

>Dear Mac, Ed and all:

>I suggest we put this to a vote; if for no other reason than to
>preserve bandwidth.

>Resolved: The AA Film, as presented by Ray Santilli is:

- >a) A shameless fake for monetary gain.
- >b) A poorly made fake which nevertheless turned a tidy profit
> for Ray Santilli.
- >c) A hastily made fake with many loose ends.
- >d) A complete waste of bandwidth.

>e) A real tape of a real event proving that aliens are
> not only among us, but allow their fallen comrades to be cut
> up by humans, on film, much to the pecuniary benefit of the
> same R. Santilli.

>Please send your votes to Ed Gehrman. I'm much too busy to keep
>count.

My vote is all of (a) through (d). Of course, I could be wrong
and am willing to consider any evidence to the contrary provided
it comes from professionally qualified people, not "believers"
in alien autopsy lore just because they want to believe it.

Dick

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

Re: rilliant Light Plunging - Hatch

From: Don Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 19:36:17 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 19:23:39 -0500
Subject: Re: rilliant Light Plunging - Hatch

>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 11:29:36 -0600

>>Date: Fri, 30 Mar 2001 23:18:42 +0100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging

>>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>
>>>Subject: Re: Brilliant Light Plunging
>>>Date: Thu, 29 Mar 2001 11:30:23 -0600

>>>>Date: Wed, 28 Mar 2001 07:46:21 -0500
>>>>From: Kelly <kellymcc@attcanada.ca>
>>>>Subject: Brilliant Light Plunging Into Pacific May Be Meteor
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>John,

>>A while ago I suggested that Jerome Clark should go into a quiet
>>room and have a lie down. From his reply I think he suspected
>>that 'a lie down' was some sort of obscure British
>>double-entendre, but I would strongly suggest he does so again,
>>perhaps with a cold flannel on his forehead, for he is clearly
>>suffering from the strains of a Minnesota winter spent in a town
>>with no decent beer.

>First of all, I emphatically resent the slander that my
>Minnesota town has no decent beer. Clearly, John needs to
>accompany me to the Canby Liquor Store. Or, if he doesn't want
>to be seen on the streets of what he once characterized as a
>"hick town," he is urged to examine the contents of my
>refrigerator. There his heretofore-naive eyes will fall on the
>tasty, well-brewed Leinenkugel's Northwoods Lager and the
>magnificent Summit Extra Pale Ale, both products (Wisconsin and
>Minnesota, respectively) of the region of the planet where I, a
>lover of fine beer, am fortunate enough to dwell. Then, as John
>and I consume said products together, I will endeavor to talk
>some sense into him, and the warm glow of same will, with any
>luck, melt some heretofore frozen portions of a blocked head.

>>Perhaps while he's lying there he could think back and try to
>>remember where I, or any of my pelicanist colleages ever made
>>such comments as "eyewitness testimony has no value whatever and
>>can be discarded without a single thought". Perhaps he could
>>then think of reasons why sceptical ufologists such as Andy
>>Roberts, David Clarke, Hilary Evans, His Grace the Duke of
>>Mendoza, and even in a small way myself, have spent so much time
>>talking to eyewitnesses and listening carefully to what they
>>have to tell us?

>Of course it is characteristic of the pelicanist to want to have
>it both ways: to deny the validity of eyewitness testimony and
>to howl in outrage when that fact is pointed out. In fact, there
>are circumstances under which eyewitness testimony can be shown
>to be flawed (as in the perception of nebulous light sources in

>the night sky), and others in which eyewitness mistakes are
>rather less easily demonstrated, as when multiple and/or
>independent witnesses observe, in daylight, a structured craft,
>at close range, exhibiting extraordinary performance
>characteristics. It is the dubious contribution of the
>pelicanist to blur the difference between the two.

>>Or is he suggesting, yet again, that reports of eyewitnesses are
>>invariably unfailingly accurate, that everything happened
>>exactly as they initially reported it, and that no UFO witness
>>has ever, ever, ever (especially if they are a pilot or (US)
>>policeman) ever, made a mistake in perception, estimated a
>>distance wrongly, or misjudged an angle?

>It is also characteristic of the pelicanist, when losing the
>argument (as frequently happens), to resort to the sort of
>crude, witless caricature expressed above.

>John, a word of advice: give it a rest (or, if you prefer, a lie
>down). The psychosocial era of ufology is over.

Hi Jerry and John,

Re the pilot...

>>and that no UFO witness
>>has ever, ever, ever (especially if they are a pilot or (US)
>>policeman) ever, made a mistake in perception, estimated a
>>distance wrongly, or misjudged an angle?

John, you better hope that such a pilot is not landing the plane
you are travelling in. All three come in really handy when
setting a "heavy" onto the runway at 125 knots and with a
350-400 ft per minute rate of decent.

Reading this post has made me really thirsty. Gotta check out
the fridge.

Don Ledger

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [2001](#) > [Mar](#) > [Mar 31](#)

The Watchdog - 03-31-01

From: Royce J. Myers III <ufowatchdog@earthlink.net>
Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 15:37:15 -0800
Fwd Date: Sat, 31 Mar 2001 19:26:44 -0500
Subject: The Watchdog - 03-31-01

UFOWATCHDOG.COM "Don't Trip On Your Open Mind"
<http://www.ufowatchdog.com>

NEWS <http://www.ufowatchdog.com/news.html>

~ Reed Hoax Exposed ~ Site Debunks So-Called Moon Landing Hoax ~
Shag Harbour Gets UFO Stamp ~ Bolivian UFO High Altitude Balloon
~ Researchers Alrich and Hall Blast Greer, CSETI

MEDIA

UFOWATCHDOG.COM editor on "Strange Days...Indeed" tonight:

<http://cfrb.com/>

OF INTEREST

~ UFO Dirtbag(s) of the Month for April 2001 - "The Dead Alien,
The Doctor And The Deception" - Jonathan Reed, Robert Raith, The
Reed Hoax

~ The Morton Files - Archive and updates on UFO fraud Sean David
Morton

Your comments are always welcomed! ufowatchdog@earthlink.net

[[Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com