



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

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Dec](#) -> Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass

From: **Jim Deardorff** <deardorj@ucs.orst.edu>
Date: Tue, 9 Dec 1997 13:34:47 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Wed, 10 Dec 1997 02:22:30 -0500
Subject: Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass

> Date: Mon, 08 Dec 1997 21:47:49 -0800
> From: Ted Viens <drtedv@freewwwweb.com>
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass
> Sightings

> > Date: Mon, 8 Dec 1997 05:16:43 -0800 (PST)
> > From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@ucs.orst.edu>
> > To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> > Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass Sightings

> > > Date: Sun, 07 Dec 1997 21:38:29 -0800
> > > From: Ted Viens <drtedv@freewwwweb.com>
> > > To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> > > Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: NUFORC Reports on the US Northwest Mass
> > > Sightings

> <massive snip, if you haven't followed closely, go to ufomind and read the archives...>

> In case Jim would choose to argue from an informed position, I leave my following lines...

> > > All the estimation and speculation in the world cannot substitute for the real facts and experience. A trip to <http://shuttle.nasa.gov> and following the links to the reentry profile page will answer these questions far better than I can.

> > But if you think the bulk of the observations were made while the objects were in an ionizing stage, long before they began to burn up, can you not supply us with a ball park estimate of what you think their altitude was and their speed relative to orbital velocity? [....]

Continued reading indicates the short answer is "no."

> > But if we both agree that a real object reentered and was viewed by few or some or many, and UFOs also were viewed by many at about the same time, then there isn't much left for us to debate on this incident.
> > You have to hand it to those UFO guys -- how easily they can stay several jumps ahead of scientific human minds.

> Jim, all of the erroneous conclusions you can draw from an unformed position on orbital decay will do little to support your claims. From the time an object kisses the orbit death of the first wisps of ionosphere to the point of impact is less than an hour and less than one quarter of a revolution. Even my first, off the top of my head, estimate of how much this would be

> was excessive by a factor of two. There is not a sharp
> demarcation from "ionization" to "burn up" phase of decay. Only
> a long, gradual transition. The ionization trail will begin
> first and continue until the kinetic energy of the debris can no
> longer literally punch electrons off from atmospheric molecules.
> After one or two tumbles, the booster will start to break up. It
> just can't fly sideways.

> Again, the breakup will not be a sudden single event, but
> continuing through the decay. As the booster is seared by the
> friction, light thin metals will boil off early in the decay
> while dense hard objects will burn deep into the atmosphere,
> perhaps even to the ground.

Hello Ted,

That much, from your latest post, sounds reasonable to me, though
I have no more expertise in this field than you do.

> What do we learn from the many reports coming from British
> Columbia and Washington State? Most widespread are the reports
> of the eerie contrail with the glittering fairy dust. A clear
> indication that the debris was high enough and fast enough to
> create an ionization trail throughout this area. As objects
> moved from the west to disappear in the east they glowed brighter
> and their flaming trails grew longer. Again, just as decaying
> debris would.

We seem to need some sort of categorization of these reports of
what is "most" and what is not. Below is my attempt at
summarizing how many different reports UFORC received showing 3
different aspects or combinations of the event, with redundancies
hopefully removed:

- 1) Lights (usually 8 or more) in formation, no trail mentioned:
86 + 1 report of 20 more + 1 report of "many" more observing it
- 2) Long trails (1 or 2 of them), and no lights in formation:
7
- 3) Both lights in formation and trail(s) behind:
5

The first category might have included observations where trails
were seen too, but if so, they were so insignificant in
comparison with the formation of lights that they did not warrant
inclusion.

An impartial or scientific investigator would not for a minute
neglect the primary category: 1).

> Most witnesses actually observed the objects for
> less than a minute after the first fiery flashes drew their
> attention to the sky. During this brief time, there would be
> little relative motion between the major pieces. They would
> certainly appear to be flying in formation.

That was easy to say! Why were the lights still white (8 of
them, with a trail behind them) when observed near Spokane (at
Nine Mile Falls)? In the report you quoted from earlier, which
came from west of Seattle, already all the pieces had appeared to
be disintegrating, with orange glows predominating, even in the
second mass that became visible.

The V-shaped formation of "multiple large lights" was reported by
multiple witnesses from the vicinity of the western Washington
shore, and then again near Spokane. So if you are hypothesizing
that this formation occurred naturally and would not have changed
in all that distance to eastern Washington, I'd say Hogwash! The
inertia of the relative spinoff velocities of fragmentation that
you must postulate created the V formation would have persisted
to spread them out of any formation long before they reached the
vicinity of Spokane.

Some 40 of the reports mentioned the V formation of lights.
Since these outnumbered the 7 or so reports that were more
indicative of just a reentry event, it behooves you to indicate
how such a formation could have come about naturally. Unless you
wish to acknowledge that these 40 and more reports represent the
UFO events.

If you wish the V-formation to have come about naturally, we need a realistic account of the odds that the rocket booster, in fragmenting, would have first spit off a fragment to one side, then to the other, then the first side, then the other, etc., always with a *rearward* component of relative velocity, in fragments of comparable size (comparable brightness) and white in color rather than glowing orange, to create a V-formation of 8 objects, whose relative velocities thereupon ceased so as to allow the V shape to persist for many minutes. Any estimate of mine would result in vanishingly small odds for this. How would you get the odds up much closer to unity?

You need to explain the rearward component of relative velocity of the fragmenting pieces, because if the rocket booster were periodically tossing off equal sized fragments with precise timing while rotating, you'd just end up with a line of objects lying athwart the sky, not a V formation. And you'd need to explain how the odds could be high that the timing for each fragmenting piece would be just right, why the last piece or two to fragment wouldn't exhibit a reaction velocity, etc.

> In the quotes above
> that I have snipped, everywhere that you find anomolous behavior,
> I find a reasonable description of burning debris. This must
> represent some form of impasse in our dialogue. The specific
> details you keep asking for are relatively insignificant in the
> broad range of a decaying profile where these observations could
> be seen.

I see you have not come to grips with any of those reports I summarized that are *totally* inconsistent with the reentry of space junk. That's not using the scientific method, Ted. On the other hand, I include them as well as the likelihood that space junk reentry occurred then also.

And we have evidence, starting with Stan Gordon's observation back in 1985, that "unexplained UFO activity in some cases seems to occur at nearly the same time, and in the same general location where observers have reported the passage of a scientifically explainable UFO, such as a bright meteor or a satellite re-entry" (MUFON UFO J. Dec. 85). You have ignored this also; that's not being scientific -- ignoring the evidence.

We all know of the thousands of UFO reports where UFOs have paced automobiles and airplanes, and even persons on motorcycles. We know of the one incident in which a UFO once circled around a speeding U.S. missile fired off of California. So what's so hard to believe about a group of UFOs accompanying a rocket-booster re-entry? And at times perhaps changing their formation from a V-shape to two lines of lights, or changing the numbers of them that are made visible, and on occasion causing one of them to zip around the others (as reported) and on another occasion altering direction of the formation? This is but child's play to "them."

> I live a rather casual, low income lifestyle. Rather than
> vacuously say that the mythical somebody should personally
> interview these witnesses at the spot where they made their
> observations, I will make myself available. If anyone or any
> organization would care to pay my way to Seattle for a couple of
> weeks with some minimal per diem and minor compensation, I would
> gladly track down the witness and ask them to recreate this event
> for us. I am sure that I could set aside my own conclusions to
> ask the simple questions of where were they and what was the path
> of these objects as they passed. I could record their
> descriptions on tape to expose any bias that could slip into my
> questions. Perhaps I would be lucky enough to find those few
> witnesses whose events were totally unrelated to the decay of
> some Russian booster.

Check first with Peter Davenport, of course. But I doubt that he would supply anyone with witnesses' names who wished them to be withheld, especially if he suspected the investigator's mind was made up in advance and that he might verbally harrass any witnesses whose stories contradict the investigator's preconceived notions. However, quite a few persons were willing to give their names in that UFORC report and you could hunt them up; I know one of them whom I might be able to put you in contact with.

I notice that Kal Korff has come to your defense. Do you need that?

Jim Deardorff

Search for other documents to/from: [deardorj](#) | [drtedv](#)

[[Next 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](#).