



# 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: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>  
Date: Sat, 18 Jan 1997 12:49:45 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 19 Jan 1997 16:53:06 -0500  
Subject: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

>Date: Mon, 13 Jan 1997 22:31:49 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>  
>From: "Jerry Cohen" <rjcohen@li.net>  
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

>>I \_think\_ this was done up in a recent IUR article. They said it was an  
>>airplane, I don't recall who did the research, I don't think it was  
>>independently replicated, and I think there were photographs and stuff  
>>in the article.

>JC: I have to go through my IUR issues and find that. I don't remember  
>seeing it. If you say its there, we'll take a look.

I said I \_think\_ it was in IUR...

>>Higher!? Naaa. What I'm saying is that we start with a core dataset  
>>and then the gov't tells us which ones are theirs. (Pretend we live in  
>>a perfect world.) ....snip....

>JC: Now \_that's\_ a "haha." Only if your original numbers were on the  
>money. As I was trying to say, if you find that \_one\_ case that really  
>satisfies your scientific quest for truth regarding UFOs, you may find  
>yourself wanting to microscopically examine some of the dust on those rocks  
>we've been looking under, and reexamining others we just "tossed" aside.

Ideally, if we "tossed aside" some cases using objective criteria then  
looking back at them would not likely enrich what we knew from the ones we  
didn't toss aside. Or, I'll put it another way, if looking back at those  
tossed out cases \_does\_ enrich what we learned then we likely didn't do a  
good job of pre-screening to begin with. That's just a guess of course and  
has to remain merely that until the work gets done and we see what we see.

>>Sure, we can all throw away the data once they land and say "Hi!"

>JC: Gee, I wasn't thinking about a landing. Even if we had one, if I was  
>you, I wouldn't throw that data away. So we have a landing, nationally  
>televised from the White House lawn. It could still be a scam by the  
>television networks or a publicity gimmick by press-hungry politicians. :-)

Hahahaha!!!! (Geez, I thought \_I\_ was cautious...<grin>)

>>Except the question: "How do we presently study other species?" We  
>>snatch a few samples from the field, open 'em up and see how they tick.

>JC: Or tag them and track them? Hmmn, then \_if\_ we found that one case,  
>we might also have a philosophical problem (amongst others) here. :-)  
>Some, of what appear to you to be "way-out" claims, might take on new  
>meaning. This is purely philosophically speaking of course.

Of course I think most of the claims are "way out" because of the combination of two important factors: 1) There's no objective evidence to support them having actually occurred, and; 2) They haven't happened to me.

I'm completely open to the possibility that either or both of those factors could radically change even by tomorrow. Who knows?

Sure, we tag and track species sometimes. But eventually, we snatch one or two and open 'em up...<grin>

>>I personally think we should be trying to shoot down UFOs every chance we get so we can open 'em up and see how they tick.

>JC: With the technology being described in cases like the 1989/90 Belgium sightings (police version), you better hope you miss. :-)

Why!? You put a couple of Stingers up their exhaust pipes and they won't be so prone to zip-zapping around our atmosphere (<grin>), plus we'd get that chance to dissect one or two of them.

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