



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



**Our Bookstore is OPEN**

*Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!*

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1996](#) -> [Dec](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>  
Date: Sun, 15 Dec 1996 12:24:09 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 16 Dec 1996 14:32:36 -0500  
Subject: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

> From: Greg Sandow <GSANDOW@prodigy.net>  
> Subject: Re: UFO Update: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

> The debate John Powell and I are having should really be conducted in  
> public, with a very sharp moderator. The moderator could force out  
> some of the assumptions both he and I make, and focus the discussion.

Excellent idea.

> John wrote,

> > I find it convenient to point the  
> > finger at the hypnotist especially when there exists different  
> > themes of concurrence (Boylan, Sprinkle, etc., believe in benevolent  
> > aliens and that is reflected in their subjects; Hopkins, Jacobs,  
> > etc., believe in malevolent aliens and that is reflected in their  
> > subjects).

> John, what's the evidence that this is actually true? Have studies  
> been done?

I don't know if an actual study has been done or not, I think I remember mention of this in one or two articles. My opinion, which is a better way to describe my statement, is simply based on reading about a hundred abduction/contactee books from all of those folks over the years.

> I don't know about abductees that Boylan and Sprinkle work with, but  
> the abductees I've met who work with Budd seem to split 50/50 on the  
> aliens' intentions. Plenty of his people take a Sprinkle-esque New Age  
> view. I think, John, that you're perpetuating a myth.

I don't recall any Sprinkle-esque New-Agey Space Brother books from Hopkins or Jacobs... So, who is perpteuating the myth??? <grin>

Until its referenced let's just call it my opinion that there is a thematic concurrence among abductionologists.

> We differ on whether Elvis sightings are as consistent as abduction  
> reports. I think not, after reading unopened mail about Elvis  
> sightings at the Weekly World News, and unopened mail about abductions  
> at Budd Hopkins's house.

(How do you read unopened mail???)

We can agree to disagree on that.

> But John writes:

> > How do [the Elvis sightings] vary? Elvis was seen with breasts?

> > *Elvis was seen as an Afroamerican or Hispanic. Elvis was seen with  
> > four arms and a tail?*  
> > *Sorry, Elvis is almost always 'seen' as Elvis, the 'basic' Elvis  
> > that we've all seen pictures of at one time or another and that is  
> > specifically the point I'm trying to make.*

> *Elvis might still have black hair, in these letters, or he might have  
> let his hair go gray. He might have grown a beard, or be clean shaven.  
> He might have shaved off his sideburns, or still be wearing them. He  
> might have a mustache. He might limp, due to an auto accident. He  
> might be preparing a musical comeback, or have given up music forever.  
> He might be living in Atlanta, or Detroit, or California, or be  
> drifting. He might have no money, or might be living off funds he  
> deposited in a Swiss bank account. He might be married again, or he  
> might be single. He might be fat or thin.*

Do you see these differences (as opposed to having breasts, being Afroamerican or Hispanic, having four arms and a tail) as major or minor differences? I see them as very minor differences.

With alleged alien descriptions we have the entire color spectrum with a number of subtle variations of gray - Elvis is always Caucasian. With aliens we have very short (two feet) to very tall (seven feet or more) - Elvis is always, within a few inches, appropriately Elvis-sized.

Since Elvis at different times was both fat and thin is it a major difference that we see that variation or a minor difference?

With alleged aliens we have an entire morphological shift from the nearly pure Insectoid-like description to the somewhat classic Grey to the dwarf or troll-like stubby creatures. By comparison I dare say Elvis sightings don't offer anything like that in their range of morphological differences.

> *Many people don't even offer details. They just swear they  
> saw him at the mall on Friday. "He's grown a beard, but I <know> it  
> was him."*

Perhaps they have not yet been hypnotized <GRIN>.

> *About Eddie Bullard's work, John writes:*

> > *The observable fact that there appears to be a  
> > consistency in certain details comes from merely a handful of  
> > abduction hypnotists and that is where his work began.*

> *Bullard also uses accounts from researchers who don't use hypnosis.  
> That has been one big point of his studies.*

> > *I guarantee you that if he skipped the assumption that there is some  
> > consistency in detail and instead tried to find consistency in  
> > detail among contactee stories he would find it...*

> *Are you sure he <assumed> there was consistency of detail? I thought  
> that was the result of his study, and I'd also understood his initial  
> assumption was that the tales could be dismissed as folklore.*

That was misleading wording on my part. There is an assumption among most folks I've talked to that there isn't a similar amount of consistency in contactee stories (as there is in abductee stories). Actually there is a similar amount of consistency. I don't know if Bullard made assumptions either way but I do remember reading that he was favoring a folklore-based solution at the outset. I don't find that surprising.

> *How can you guarantee what he'd find if he studied something else? Do  
> you have his expertise in folklore? And even if you do, he's not you.  
> He might come to conclusions of his own.*

I can pretty much guarantee that he'd find a significant level of consistency in contactee story elements. I have no idea if he would find consistent folkloric themes or not. I'm not aware of anybody doing that type of work with contactees and their stories.

> *About samples of alleged alien writing -- which I've seen, and which  
> are essentially identical -- John asks:*

> > *Why aren't these alleged samples in the public domain where they can  
> > be independently analyzed?*

> *Eventually they will be. For now, though, there's a kind of catch-22.*

> To publish them would contaminate any future witness who claims to  
> have seen the same writing.

> But you're right. There's no reason for you to take them seriously  
> when you only have my word that they even exist, let alone that  
> they're significantly similar.

> At this point in the discussion, however, I'd love it if a moderator  
> asked: "John, Greg agrees that these alleged writing samples haven't  
> been verified. Would you, in turn, concede that if they had been, and  
> were clearly all but identical, they might suggest that the abductees'  
> supposed experience was real?"

Okay, let's pretend the Moderator just cleared his throat, tapped the microphone a time or two and asked me that very question.

I try to avoid the style of debate where, because one person was swayed by the blazing light of a tightly phrased logical argument and conceded the point that I must therefore concede a point out of politeness...<grin>

I already think something is happening to abductees and I think its very, very important. I just don't think, because there's no such evidence, that's its aliens or that they were necessarily even abducted.

If the handwriting, or just writing or characters or icons or whatever, was firsthand I'd be a lot more inclined to want to study it. But it isn't firsthand. Its someone's representation of what they claim they saw, sometimes the claim is unaided recall and sometimes the claim is based on hypnosis. We don't know how often the claim is made in the presence of someone who already claims to have the baseline handwriting with which to make comparison.

I think those are all serious issues that need to be addressed. (No, I'm not dodging your question <grin>.)

A proper analysis would either eliminate or separate from the dataset all items recovered through hypnosis, all items referencing previously published examples. For each item in our accepted dataset an independent interview would have to be conducted and another ('fresh') sample from the claimant would be acquired.

We compare the two samples (the fresh one from the claimant and the original one from the claimant) and statistically on a character by character basis we'd expect equal or better than 80% similarity to advance that example further in our dataset.

The work done above should be as 'blind' as possible. The people acquiring the 'fresh' handwriting example should not have seen anybody's previous examples, the person holding the references samples should not yet see the 'fresh' samples, etc.

Ok, NOW, we have a dataset that is workable. I arbitrarily picked 80% character by character statistical concurrence to ensure that we have a fairly 'stationary' target. For the actual analysis maybe you like 75%, maybe 95% concurrence. I'm not sure it matters all that much. If we had a pretty 'blind' study up to this point then anything over about 65% would tweak my interest substantially. I'm assuming that at least two independent symbology analyses would be performed each with 65% or better.

Of course, I don't know what kind of symbology we're talking about here. It could be letter and/or number-like, could be iconic or figurine-like, could be predominantly linear or predominantly swirled. Could be any combination of them and other stuff... Is the symbology in any way similar to known human-based symbology?

So, to answer your question, if a reliable study was performed and we got better than 65% concurrence I'd willingly state that these people have very likely been exposed to the same original source input.

By the way, such 'evidence' would be the first such evidence ever acquired in abduction research. It certainly wouldn't prove that aliens are abducting people but it would elevate the debate significantly.

Since we would have done this research on the dataset that we restricted out the hypnosis subjects, since we had multiple independent persons unfamiliar with the original sample acquiring the 'fresh' sample, I think we could make a few additional statements. We could state that telepathy (if it exists) or confabulation didn't contaminate the 'fresh' sample. We could state that (but this would be subject to the specific

symbology involved) that lying/hoaxing was extremely unlikely.

Did I answer the question?

> *Because, in the end, that's all this dispute is really about. I know  
> very well that the reality of abductions hasn't been proved.*

I don't know what real purpose is served if one or the other of us moves the other an inch in any direction when we have miles to go in terms of doing real research. I don't mean that in a negative way, I just mean that it is irrelevant that someone thinks so-called alien abductions are likely or unlikely.

> *But these items, along with the writing (which I've seen, John, so,  
> speaking purely for myself, I don't need it to appear in public view),  
> are extremely suggestive. Should they prove to be true, they create,  
> at least in my opinion, a reasonable presumption that abductions are  
> genuine, or at least that something very weird is going on. That's all  
> I've been saying, and I can't for the life of me see why it's  
> problematic.*

I hope I've shown above two important points. The first is that verifying this alleged handwriting doesn't prove the existence of aliens or the reality of alleged abductions - it doesn't prove "that abductions are genuine." It would clearly erase the line between 'something' going on versus 'nothing' going on, it would all but erase the line between alleged abductions being a presently understood psychological condition and abductions being something that cannot presently be defined. And it would require some serious study.

I think all of that is fine, especially in light of the fact that the scientific community has really (today) no compelling reason to be interested in abductions. Having a compelling reason to be interested in abductions would be wonderful. (An exception to that of course is the MHP community which has very good reason to be interested.)

The second not entirely obvious point is that the verification method I very briefly described above is nothing magical or massively technical. Hopkins (or whomever) could have done it or had it done 10 years ago? What's taking him so long???

> *What I don't want in response -- and what I trust the moderator  
> wouldn't allow -- is more heat about how these things haven't been  
> proved. I know they haven't.*

In a nutshell [pun intended] you and I have been debating hot air, or exactly how hot the hot air is. You obviously sense the futility of that <grin>.

Well, why not let's start trying to establish some good data???

If we want people to be moved toward so-called alien abductions as possible or even likely then why not start doing the work to get that done? (Of what value is it to 'move' them merely by preaching to them?)

Why hasn't Hopkins (or whomever) had this symbology analyzed, why haven't 'they' had the physical markings analyzed, why haven't 'they' implemented electronic monitoring????

These are all things that 'we' can't do ourselves. I don't have access to the symbology or the people, I don't have access to the physical markings or the people...

Perhaps in your next message you will have discussed these questions with Hopkins and have some answers and suggestions?

--

Thanks, take care.  
John.

```
([[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]])  
[  
[ sjpowell@access.digex.net ]  
[  
([[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]])
```

Search for other documents to/from: [sjpowell](#) | [gsandow](#)

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)**

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.

To subscribe please send your first and last name to [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

---

[ [UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#) ]

**To find this message again in the future...**

Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: [webmaster@ufomind.com](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).