



# 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](#) -> [Jan](#) -> **Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

From: "Jerry Cohen" <rjcohen@li.net>  
Date: Tue, 7 Jan 1997 21:11:23 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 08 Jan 1997 01:58:52 -0500  
Subject: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

>Date: Sun, 05 Jan 1997 13:58:43 -0500  
>From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>  
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

>> From: "Jerry Cohen" <rjcohen@li.net>  
>> Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

>> JC: Sorry for this interjection again, but: A problem existing in  
>> ufology today is that skeptics, because they have not researched deep  
>> enough, often quote statistics that skew historical fact. Example, the  
>> following quote:

JC: Hi John, again regarding your statement:

>> >..... There are tens and tens of  
>> >thousands of UFO sightings reported over the last 50 or so years and  
>> >that is our raw uninvestigated data population. That is also the  
>> >most useless number in all of ufology. Of the uninvestigated total  
>> >we know that easily from 80% (being very generous) to 95% are IFOs  
>> >(and some, a small percentage) are hoaxes. We know statistically  
>> >that 80% to 95% will be retired as IFOs.....

>> REBUTTAL:

>> JC: In the past, most of the statistics used to retire UFOs as IFOs  
>> were provided by the Air Force.

>> We also have APRO and NICAP data from the same time period. We also  
>> have other data sources since then.

JC: Yes, that is correct. However, I don't think most of the skeptics were looking very closely at that material and taking it seriously for quite some time. I believe many skeptics are not tuned into it even today, but some are beginning to realize it is valid data to incorporate into their assessment.

>>If you prefer 70% to 95%, instead of my saying "80% to 95%," that's fine  
>>with me, I don't think the difference is significant with respect to the  
>>three points I was trying to make:

JC: John, 10% is 10%. To those people who have looked at a UFO fairly closely for 3 minutes or more back in the 1960's or '70's (or whenever), found what they saw to be virtually completely silent, yet still up in the air and performing maneuvers very un-airplane, un-helicopter, un-kite like, un-balloon like, (as one woman from New Hampshire told me personally; "when it left it took off like a humming bird"), the size of a plane or bigger, unlike anything they have seen before or since ... and to those of them who

made an attempt to go to the library, study every flying machine they could over the years and still not having found or seen anything like what they saw back then, and made a continual effort all that time to study the history of UFOs to explain what they saw to themselves and, finding for themselves that it looks as though something is most probably going on that is not simply misidentified astronomical items, media-hype, hoaxes, etc. .... it makes a big difference.

You have also said:

>Most of the folks who  
>have been doing for decades prefer 90% to 95% which would give us a nice  
>and easily to handle dataset.

JC: Those were the skeptics to whom I was referring in my opening paragraph.

>1) Most UFO sightings turn out to be readily explainable....

JC: It would make me feel a lot better if this said: "A large number of UFO sightings turn out to be readily explainable...."

>  
>2) The raw sighting count or the raw sighting report count is an utterly  
>useless and meaningless number.

JC: John, it can't be totally "useless and meaningless" or you would not have a base number from which to derive your core number.

>3) After extensive research and investigation, some (small)  
>percentage, with a high point around 15% to 30% <grin> to a low of  
>around 5%, of UFO sightings remain beyond current explanation. Some  
>older UFO sightings (Catalina film and at least one other) did yeild a  
>common Earthly explanation upon the use of modern technology, and its  
>likely a few more will follow in time.

JC: Hmmn. What did they say the Catalina sighting was? Who did the analysis? Who confirmed this analysis? Where is this material for us to see? Is this agreed upon by most UFO researchers, at least on this mail list? We should really save this for another discussion so we don't get off track here for a moment.

However, this remaining  
>core dataset should be the primary focus of ufology.

JC: Agreed.

>There's at least one good (or sensible to some <grin>) reason why the  
>really good UFO stuff didn't go to Bluebook. Bluebook was a PIO  
>quasi-investigative operation and if they had to explain a particular  
>sighting as being an advanced USAF R&D craft I rather think the folks at  
>the DoD would get upset...

>  
>I suspect that if the DoD would be forthcoming with declassification  
>and disclosure we could whittle our core dataset down to around 5%.

JC: Well, the Bollender Memo apparently did confirm part of what you are saying. But as for your last sentence, this is your opinion to which you are certainly entitled. However, it is not shared by this researcher. I believe it is quite possible the percentage could be a lot higher than this. Why do I think this? Again, in your most honest opinion, upon close inspection does the following case from 1965, quoted by Dr. Hynek from Blue Book files, sound like it was "an advanced USAF R&D craft?" Look at the speed and hoverability.

>>[Extract from a  
>>classified document of reported sighting of 5 May, 1965, contents  
>>unclassified, classification refers to name, and location and  
>>mission of vessel.] " . . . leading signal man reported what he  
>>believed to be an aircraft. . . . When viewed through binoculars,  
>>three objects were sighted in close proximity to each other; one  
>>object was first magnitude, the other two were second magnitude.  
>>Objects were traveling at extremely high speeds, moving toward  
>>ship at undetermined altitude. At . . . . four moving targets  
>>were detected on the . . . . air search radar at ranges up to  
>>twenty two miles and held up to six minutes. When over the ship  
>>the objects spread to circular formation directly overhead and  
>>remained there for approximately three minutes. This maneuver was  
>>observed both visually and by radar. The bright object which  
>>hovered off the starboard quarter made the larger presentation on  
>>the radar scope. The objects made several course changes during  
>>the sighting, confirmed visually and by radar, and were \*tracked  
>>at speeds in excess of 3000 (three thousand) knots. \* (J.C.

>>Asterisks are mine.) Challenges were made by IFF but not  
>>answered. \* After the three minute hovering maneuver, \* the objects  
>>moved in a southeasterly direction at an extremely high rate of  
>>speed. Above evolution observed by CO, all bridge personnel and  
>>numerous hands topside."

JC: Add to this the three cases I cited in Oberg/Cooper.7abc from the  
late 1950's. Or the "NATO and police-verified" Belgium sightings of  
1989/90. \*  
Same question. Do these cases sound like "advanced USAF R&D craft?"

>But I think the difference between 30% or 15% or 5% is largely irrelevant.

JC: Irrelevant to who(m)? I guess you are entitled to your opinion. But,  
let's see. Say we call the number of raw cases \_15,000 per/yr\_ (Difference  
between your 10,000 and Jan's 20,000).  
Core database number of unknowns would be: 30% = 4500 15% = 2250 and  
5% = 750 cases respectively.

Instead of cases, if one of these was going to be your salary for this  
statistical analysis, which one would you choose? :-)

Please remember that if you were to discover \_1\_ of these cases to be  
proven to your satisfaction to be the "real thing," you might just might  
have to start rethinking other cases you eliminated by "grand reduction,"  
perhaps military cases first, since they have radar-visuals and they have  
radar which is geared to the specific task. \*\* If "they" actually got  
here, where are they staying? You might have to ask; "Did they just stop in  
for a drive around the block, or with the effort and cost it probably took  
to get here, did they have a purpose?" How do we presently study other  
species? Are they studying us? How might they do this? etc.

\*\* We wouldn't want to cloud the issue with possible doubt  
as was claimed in a "radar-visual" Michigan case where  
a well-known skeptic was convinced that the person with  
weather radar must obviously have made a mistake since  
the operator's radar wasn't geared specifically for that  
purpose. (Even though the operator was well-skilled and  
swore that what was on his scope were extremely solid  
returns and he was able to show interested parties the  
difference between ground reflections, temperature  
inversions, etc.)

Unfortunately, the only trouble is, we may never be privy to those specific  
military cases because they'll never release them. But, a large number of  
indicators are literally screaming at us that they are there; from the CAA  
tower operators Professor McDonald brought in to testify in the 11/4/57  
Kirtland AFB case (Oberg/Cooper 7b & c) to the 1979-81 FOIA releases of  
memos from nine different government agencies that discussed amongst other  
things, UFO visits to SAC bases in 1975, in which the coordinated efforts  
of 15 A.F. bases to apprehend the intruders failed.

Sincerely,  
Jerry Cohen

E-mail: rjcohen@li.net

#### BELGIUM CASE:

\* Belgium case shown below as it appeared in the July/Aug 1990 issue  
of CUFOS (Center for UFO Studies) IUR (International UFO Reporter). The  
case was retracted on "Unsolved Mysteries" narrated by Robert Stack.  
Recorded data taken by Belgian Air Force plane radar was included in the  
retraction along with videotaped statements from military & police  
personnel. I find it extremely difficult to believe that the Belgian Air  
Force and national police would put their reputations on the line to say  
something of this sort if there wasn't something substantial to it.  
Something had to really shake them up enough for them to say it as a  
combined group. The descriptions given by the police in the video were  
amazing to say the least.

These people are trained observers to handle emergencies & wartime events.  
It seems to make sense to me to trust a \_large group\_ of trained observers  
before I will believe any individual skeptic who \_thinks\_ he has proven  
otherwise.

>----start here----

"On the night of March 30th, one of the callers reporting a UFO was a Captain of the national police at Pinson, and [Belgian Air Force] Headquarters decided to make a serious effort to verify the reports. In addition to the visual sightings, two RADAR installations also saw the UFO. One RADAR is at Glons, southeast of Brussels, which is part of the NATO defense group, and one at Semmerzake, west of the Capitol, which controls the military and civilian traffic of the entire Belgian territory. The range of the two RADARs is 300 kilometers, which is more than enough to cover the area where the reports took place. . . . Headquarters determined to do some very precise studies during the next 55 minutes to eliminate the possibility of prosaic explanations for the RADAR images. Excellent atmospheric conditions prevailed, and there was no possibility of false echoes due to temperature inversions.

". . . at 0005 hours the order was given to the F-16s to take off and to find the intruder. The lead pilot concentrated on his RADAR screen, which at night is his best organ of vision. The F-16 is equipped with very sophisticated equipment, including chase RADAR, which is not fixed directly ahead of the airplane, but makes a wide search in an arc of 90 degrees left and right of the nose. . . .

"Suddenly the two fighters spotted the intruder on their RADAR screens, appearing like a little bee dancing on the scope. Using their joy sticks like a video game, the pilots ordered the onboard computers to pursue the target. As soon as lock-on was achieved, the target appeared on the screen as a diamond shape, telling the pilots that from that moment on, the F-16s would remain tracking the object automatically . . . .

"[Before the RADAR had locked on for six seconds] the object had speeded up from an initial velocity of 280 kph to 1,800 kph, while descending from 3,000 meters to 1,700 meters . . . in one second! This fantastic acceleration corresponds to 40 Gs. It would cause immediate death to a human on board. The limit of what a pilot can take is about 8 Gs. The trajectory of the object was extremely disconcerting. It arrived at 1,700 meters altitude, then it dove rapidly toward the ground at an altitude under 200 meters, and in doing so escaped from the RADARs of the fighters and the ground units at Glons and Semmerzake. This maneuver took place over the suburbs of Brussels, which are so full of man-made lights that the pilots lost sight of the object beneath them . . .

"Everything indicates that this object was intelligently directed to escape from the pursuing planes. During the next hour the scenario repeated twice. . .

"This fantastic game of hide and seek was observed from the ground by a great number of witnesses, among them 20 national policemen who saw both the object and the F-16s. The encounter lasted 75 minutes, but nobody heard the supersonic boom which should have been present when the object flew through the sonic barrier. No physical damage was reported. Given the low altitude and speed of the object, many windows should have been broken."

This case has all the hallmarks of the classic USAF jet-scambling cases of the 1950s and 1960s, with one notable exception: the Belgian Air Force is not covering up anything.

For a full translation of the Paris-Match article, write to:  
Robert J. Durant, 106 Hessian Hill Drive, Pennington, NJ 08534.

>-----end here-----

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

---

[ [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](#).