



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](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.7a

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.7a

From: "Jerry Cohen" <rjcohen@li.net>
Date: Thu, 6 Feb 1997 19:25:08 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 06 Feb 1997 23:20:59 -0500
Subject: Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.7a

Skeptics & Mr. Oberg,

If you've read nothing else please read numbers 7abc very carefully. I believe that the proof of extraterrestrial visitation lies in the material in these next two essays. Is there numerical data in them? No. Are the cases the real thing? You be the judge.

After my own sighting in '67, I know in my heart and soul that Cooper is most probably telling the truth.

P.S. I'm sure we'd all like to see James Oberg's responses to this series. The discussion ought to be quite interesting.

=====
Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.7a
continued from 6
(part 1 of 3)

A researcher's response to James Oberg's:
"IN SEARCH OF GORDON COOPER'S UFOs"
by Jerry Cohen
=====

How good is the evidence? . . . "Something is definitely happening and it's not hallucinations, hoaxes, misidentifications, etc."

If one thoroughly examines Dr. McDonald's research, etc. performed in his lifetime, one will undoubtedly find that the rigorous analysis I am about to present by McDonald, is generally characteristic of the majority of his life's work. If one examines Mr. Oberg's essay regarding Gordon Cooper, it is almost as if he were familiar with this case and had tried to imitate the presentation of Dr. McDonald. If one examines the two side by side, one can determine which scientist's case is more complete and compelling. I leave that up to the reader to accomplish on his/her own.

"Oberg/Cooper.7ab&c" will reasonably demonstrate that Mr. Oberg unjustly accused McDonald of generally not researching his cases and caring about the facts. I believe you will also find there certainly was nothing that anyone might remotely call "secretive" in regards to his analysis of the Kirtland AFB case or his address to the American Association For The Advancement Of Science (AAAS) UFO Symposium, Boston, Dec. 27, 1969. James McDonald spelled it all out for the entire world, if they had been listening.

= The accuracy of the following can be checked by consulting the sources provided, including your local libraries =

Footnotes appear at end of O/C rebuttal.7c

=====
SEBAGO / STOKES / KIRTLAND AFB
=====

In "Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.3," I used 4 cases as examples of UFO history. I used them because I believe they were the types of cases that Dr. Hynek himself thought were impressive because he chose similar ones to illustrate his concerns about Project Blue Book to Colonel Sleeper. Additionally, you will notice that the two newspaper cases provided, apparently closely relate both in timing and description, to another case used by Dr. James E. McDonald when he illustrated some of the defects in the Condon Study to the AAAS (American Association For The Advancement Of Science), immediately in the wake of the Condon Study's negative pronouncements. The latter was brought to my attention by Val Germann, Columbus Mississippi, who, having a great interest in McDonald's life, has documented McDonald's drive to make scientists aware of the UFO problem, complete with Germann's own introspective comments concerning same. I didn't know this case existed until just recently. 1

I've already posted the first of the four, "SKY THING" (occurred in 1960). No one so far, has come up with a reasonable explanation. We have already seen that we've had approximately thirty seven years to figure out what it was, with no success. 2

The two newspaper cases were: "Sebago" RADAR/visual (11/7/57) and "James Stokes," (11/6/57). As I mentioned in "Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.3" the Sebago / Stokes cases were the first two articles I ever cut out of a newspaper, for "curiosity's" sake. The date appearing on the articles is partially blocked by old, browned-out tape, but I can see it says "Wednesday, November xxx, 1957" 3

The "Sebago" article became personal to me because I later discovered that a neighbor of mine had been dating one of the Sebago's crew members when it occurred. (As unbelievable as it sounds) Brief synopsis: Crewmen on the Coast Guard cutter Sebago, off the coast of Louisiana, reported visually seeing an object resembling "a brilliant planet with a high rate of speed." It was tracked on the vessel's radar screen for almost a 1/2 hour and flitted on and off the screen several times during that time period.

My neighbor related the following after she had moved here, when I had once mentioned that particular case to her: She told me she was dating one of the crew members and had seen him the evening he returned from this incident on leave. He was called back again the next day for a debriefing in Washington. The following day, after that debriefing, he appeared for an interview on the Dave Garroway show. She saw him again briefly that night and/or the next day. They lost touch after that.

(. . . if that person is reading this, please e-mail me. She would really like to say hello.)

At the time she originally told me this, I wasn't sure I believed her because the coincidence, to me, was mind-boggling and I thought she might have been teasing me about my interest in UFOs. However, she has NEVER changed her story all these years, been extremely serious about it and recently explained that this is why she, too, has been interested in UFOs all this time and fully understood my curiosity regarding same. By the way, she is married and has her own, grown children at this point in her life.

(If the skeptics don't believe this, that's O.K. You can totally discount it. This was "my" proof before I found "your" proof. There is a lot more to connect this story to reality than just her word for this. I'll explain this a little further on. Please read on, as I selected this group of cases for a reason.)

The second article, I am fairly certain, appeared in the paper the same day. James Stokes was an engineer from the Air

Force Missile Development Center at Holloman AFB, Alamogordo, New Mexico. The object claimed seen, appeared identical in both accounts. The proximity of the cases to each other, especially time-wise, and the "quality of the people seeing them," appeared well-above average.

The Kirtland AFB case which follows those two, ties all of it together and will be self explanatory. 4

I apologize for the condition of the bottom of the Stokes article. These articles were the first I ever cut out and did not ever expect to be doing what I'm doing today or that they (the articles) would turn out to be as significant as I firmly believe they are.

The following two articles were taken from:

Newsday (Long Island newspaper) on Wednesday, November 6th (or 7th), 1957.

I. CG Ship Sights Weird Object Off Louisiana

Washington (AP) -- A brilliant mystery object was reported sighted yesterday in southern skies by a Coast Guard cutter, even as Air Force specialists investigated a flurry of earlier, similar reports.

The Coast Guard cutter Sebago, cruising in the Gulf of Mexico about 200 miles south of Louisiana, radioed that an object resembling "a brilliant planet with a high rate of speed" was seen for about three seconds early yesterday. Coast Guard headquarters in New Orleans said the message did not report exactly who on board the cutter had seen the object.

The Sebago's message said the object was tracked on the vessel's radar screen for 27 minutes and that, during that period, the object flitted on and off the screen several times.

Sightings of strange objects have been reported from widely scattered sections of the United States since Sunday, most of them near secret military installations in the Southwest. The Air Force said that the radar network of the Air Defense Command is keeping watch -- so far with no results -- and that specially qualified investigators have been assigned to look into the reports.

For several years the Air Force has checked all reports of unidentified flying objects. Investigators work under the Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, Colo., and report to the Air Technical Intelligence Center. Judging from past findings, the chances are the Air Force will attribute the current sightings to natural phenomena or such ordinary man-made objects as aircraft.

II. Flying "Something" Still Unidentified

Lubbock, Tex. (AP) -- A missile engineer reported seeing a "brilliant colored egg-shaped object" which he said stalled autos in New Mexico yesterday.

The Air Force started an investigation yesterday into similar reports in this and other areas. Witnesses say a mystery object skipped about the countryside here and near scientific military bases in New Mexico over the week end. The reported sightings startled citizens, peace officers and servicemen but apparently left no concrete trace.

James Stokes, 45, an engineer from the Air Force Missile Development Center at Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N.M. told new director Terry Clark of station KALG, Alamogordo, that 10 autos were stopped on an isolated desert highway, U.S. 54, between White Sands Proving Grounds and Alamogordo yesterday. His description was similar to ones reporting a big ball of fire flitting about much of this West Texas area over the week end. A huge, oval object "nearly as bright as the sun" was reported seen at White Sands Proving Ground Sunday, hovering near bunkers used in the first A-bomb explosion. Witnesses said other strange lights were seen over other parts of Texas, near Chicago and in Virginia.

Clark said the Air Force at Holloman gave him permission to use Stokes' story. He said Stokes told him occupants of cars saw a strange, unidentified object flying toward them from the northeast. He said his auto radio faded and died, then his engine stopped. He said, several other cars were also stalled. Looking up, he told Clark, "I saw a brilliant colored egg-shaped object making a shallow dive across the sky to the northeast. Then it turned and made a pass at the highway and crossed it not more than two miles ahead. Then it moved away toward White Sands Proving Grounds to the southwest. As it passed . . . I could feel a kind of heat wave, like radiation from a giant sun lamp. But there was no sound. It had no visible portholes and there was no vapor trail."

"When I got back to my car and checked the engine, I found it intact but the battery was steaming. But the engine started with no difficulty. I called officials at the Air Force Development Center and notified them of the sighting." He said the object moved very rapidly and its surface looked like 'glowing mother of pearl.' "

A spokesman at Reese Air Force Base here said yesterday a representative of the Air Defense Command had flown in from headquarters.

J.C. This next appeared at the bottom of the same article.

"New Orleans (UP) -- The U.S. Coast Guard cutter Sebago reported that it spotted a brilliant flying object in the sky this morning about 200 miles south of the mouth of the Mississippi River. The unidentified object was first sighted at 5:10 A.M., the Coast Guard said. Radar contact with the object was retained intermittently from 5:10 A.M. to 5:37 A.M. with the object visible to the naked eye for (old tape in the way) xxx beginning at 5:21 A.M. A radio report from the Sebago xxx xxx the Gulf of Mexico, said the object "resembled a brilliant xxxx" and was traveling at a high rate of speed."

J.C. This is why I am pretty sure it was in the paper on the same day. I may be a day off. It is important to notice it was stated that * Air Defense Command was involved. * That statement is an indication that our Air Force has known about and dealt with UFOs for a fairly long period of time. (Again, this was 1957)

Although you might think to yourself, "Perhaps some newspaper reporters made these up," as I mentioned, the next thoroughly researched case adds greatly to the credibility of the other two. When you read it, please note a similarity in object descriptions. Also, please note the date of the sightings and compare it with Sebago / Stokes above. As I mentioned, Kirtland was a Blue Book case included in the Condon Study which was additionally researched by Dr. James E. McDonald. 5

Below, is an excerpt taken from Dr. McDonald's address to the American Association For The Advancement Of Science (AAAS) UFO Symposium, Boston, Dec. 27, 1969. 6 In it, as Val Germann has aptly pointed out, McDonald takes Blue Book and the Condon Study to task for not following up on several cases which he felt should have obviously been examined further. McDonald was a meticulous scientist. If all of us were attentive to detail in life as Dr. McDonald was in the following analysis, the word incompetence would probably not exist in our dictionaries. Those that state otherwise concerning him, are most likely ignorant concerning his career and accomplishments.

McDonald chastises the Condon Study for not looking for witnesses in the "Kirtland AFB case;" two of whom he, himself, was easily able to find and who's testimony was vital to those proceedings. He further chides the NAS (National Academy of Science) for placing (in his own words) "its weighty stamp on this dismal report without even a semblance of rigorous checking of its contents." was one of the examples given. If one reads it carefully, I am certain you will find, as a number of researchers already have, great substance to his allegations.

It should be readily apparent to most, after reading it, that so

many people would have been placed in a "bad light" from McDonald's report, that his presentation HAD to be totally ignored when it was brought to their attention. (i.e. specifically, section 3, para. 2 & 3) But the facts still stand, if one reads them with an open, honest mind, you will realize that this case (and probably others he had analyzed) should have rightfully been classified as an "unknown" or more precisely, a UFO... most probably, a craft of some sort.

=====
End: Oberg/Cooper rebuttal.7a
Sebago / Stokes / Kirtland AFB
(part 1 of 3)
=====

Search for other documents to/from: [rjcohen](#)

[[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](#).