

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



Navigation

[UFOs](#)
[Paranormal](#)
[People](#)
[Places](#)
[Area 51](#)
[Random](#)
[Top 100](#)
[Catalog](#)
[What's New](#)

Search...

...for this word in:

Page Titles
Page Contents
Book Title/Author
[Help](#)

New Catalog Items (Random Selection)

[The Unofficial Guide to Las Vegas](#) (used trpb) Bob Sehlinger - \$3.00
[Mere Creation: Science, Faith and Intelligent Design](#) (new trpb) /d/dembski/ - \$24.95
[Freemasonry and other Secret Societies](#) - Assortment
[A Newcomer's Guide to Hawaii](#) (new trpb) David Paxman & Chad Keliiliki (illustrator) - \$9.95
[Myths and Legends of Hawaii](#) (new pb) William D. Westervelt & A. Grove Day (foreword) - \$5.95
[Haleakala: A Guide to the Mountain](#) (new trpb) Cameron B. Kepler & Angela Kay Kepler - \$9.95

[Other New Items](#) | [Main Catalog Page](#) | [Subjects](#)

2000+ new & used titles, including hundreds you won't find at Amazon!

Log-In Here

For Advanced Features

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

[Our Focus](#)

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>
Date: Thu, 19 Dec 1996 09:37:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 20 Dec 1996 09:54:28 -0500
Subject: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

> From: Peregrine Mendoza <101653.2205@CompuServe.COM>
> Subject: Re: MJ-12 and Area 51

> The Duke of Mendoza presents his compliments and his best wishes for
> the holiday season and for the New Year to all on the List.

Ditto.

> > 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.

> Yes indeed. Why don't they just hand us over a few parchments? After
> all, they must know Budd & Betty & everyone's blown their cover by
> now, don't they? However...

They are covering up how atrocious their penmanship really is.

> Lacking the priceless MSS, John Powell suggests comparing 'original'
> and 'fresh' samples of alleged alien writing from each claimant (a
> vertical test) and then comparing these writings claimant v. claimant
> (an horizontal test).

Exactly.

> > 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.

> So far so good, but you haven't any controls in this experiment. I'd
> suggest that an even more workable dataset would have a third axis,
> using the same abduction claimants and a control group of
> non-claimants (selection criteria to be agreed). AFTER the claimants
> have produced their "fresh" allegedly-alien scripts, you ask the
> claimants and the control group to write down their

> **impressions** of a couple of lines of writing in (a) the Greek
> alphabet (b) Arabic script (c) Hebrew alphabet (d) Chinese pictograms.
> It will be obvious to anyone who knows these scripts whether or not
> the writer is giving an impression or really knows them. You either
> wipe the latter from your dataset, or choose control group members who
> don't know these scripts. (As with Roman letters, handwritten Greek
> and Hebrew are significantly different in places from their printed
> forms; for all I know that's true of Arabic and Chinese too.) The
> point would be to try to get some measure of how far people's
> impressions differ from a known real thing. What they write doesn't
> have to make sense - we just want to know how accurately they recall
> details of unknown scripts that they have seen only casually.
> When they have completed their impressions, you show them a couple of
> lines of the real thing, for a couple of minutes or so, then ask them
> to reproduce them from memory. That gives you a measure of how
> accurate (compared to the generality, too) the claimants' memories for
> such things may be.

If I understand correctly you're trying to make two specific distinctions:

- 1) How good are they at remembering 'foreign' symbology.
- 2) To what degree (if any) has their alien symbology been affected by known foreign symbology.

So, procedurally, we have this:

- 1) Sketch the alleged alien symbology.
- 2) Sketch what you think is foreign symbology.
 - a) If this foreign symbology closely resembles their alien symbology then we do likley have a problem.
 - b) If it doesn't then fine.
- 3) Observe known foreign symbology.
- 4) Re-sketch that foreign symbology.
 - a) If the re-sketch closely matches the observed foreign symbology then perhaps we have a good observer.
 - b) If it doesn't then perhaps we have a poor observer.

> *The way to lay out the analyses is pretty obvious, I should think.*
> *What say? Good wheeze?*

I like it but it does create some interesting analysis problems.

What do we say about a claimant whose tested observation powers are poor yet who's 1st and 2nd alien samples closely match each other and the original reference samples? (I think realistically we have to ignore that oddity unless we can prove they cheated.)

Additionally, what do we say about a claimant who knows foreign alphabet, both foreign alphabet tests are fine, the alien-foreign comparison doesn't match well, and whose alien sample closely matches the original reference sample? I think this is the 'best' path through the tests.

I do think that separating out the claimants who's alien sample closely matches known foreign samples and then making separate comparisons with original reference samples would be interesting.

--

Thanks, take care.
John.

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

Search for other documents to/from: [sjpowell](#) | [101653.2205](#)

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

UFO UpDates - Toronto - 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

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

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