



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



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

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Roswellian 'Unearthly' Silicon Scoffed At By

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 17:30:43 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 22:03:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Roswellian 'Unearthly' Silicon Scoffed At By

>From: Dennis <dstacy@texas.net>
>Date: Sun, 27 Jul 1997 21:08:59 -0500 (CDT)
>Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 01:37:02 -0400
>Subject: Re: Roswellian 'Unearthly' Silicon Scoffed At By

>>Date: Sun, 27 Jul 1997 09:05:20 -0400
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: Steven Kaeser <steve@konsulting.com>
>>Subject: Re: Roswellian 'Unearthly' Silicon Scoffed At By Scientists

>>Those who attended the July 4th presentation made by Paul Davids, Derrel
>>Sims, and Russ VernonClark are aware that many questions were left
>>unanswered.

>Dear Steven:

>Actually, each and every question was left unanswered.
>As you know if you were there, there was no press
>conference -- as advertized. Sims and party departed
>through the back door of the Pearson Auditorium, hopped
>into a waiting car, and sped away. Reportedly, Russell
>VernonClark was flown out of the Roswell the same day.

>Most of the media present to whom I talked considered
>this -- how do we put it politely? -- "curious" behavior
>for what had been widely billed as a 9:00 a.m. "press
>conference" at which "Scientific Proof...that an
>Extraterrestrial Craft was Recovered near Roswell, NM"
>would be presented.

>>From statements that have been made since the event, it is
>>clear that VernonClark was only making an appearance because
>>he was under an agreement to do so.

>Well, that's some sort of behavior to be sure, but is
>it necessarily scientific behavior?

I wouldn't characterize their behavior as "scientific", to be sure. But even scientists can find themselves in legal agreements that they wish they could avoid. Paul David's decision to "hype" this event as a "News Conference" was one that I wouldn't have made if I had been in his shoes, but he must have had his reasons. He'll have to defend himself in regard to this action, but I'm not sure I would blame the scientist they brought into the debate. However, I'll admit that sneaking out the back door is not a good way to build trust. . . . <g>

>>In private correspondence, he has indicated hope
>>that a journal article on the "debris" should be completed within a year.
>>At that time he, and the other un-named scientists, will be more prepared
>>to defend their theories.

>In most minds that would indicate that the so-called

>"press conference" probably should have been put off
>until at least then as well. Ordinarily, you
>double-check and confirm your findings before going
>public with them.

Yes. Any press conference should have waited until the final paper had been written and all of the scientists were willing to come forward and be counted. Again, I think VernonClark had the confirmation of this findings that he needed to make his statement. However, that confirmation came from scientists and labs that didn't want to go public until the final paper was completed.

>Here we seem to have gotten the press conference --
>that wasn't a press conference -- before the
>proverbial horse, if not the straw cart itself. Is
>it just me, or is this not normally the way good
>science is done?

I guess I'll have to ask if you really expected to get good "science" at Encounter '97. No, I don't think this is the way good science is done, but then again I wasn't expecting that much. When we have vendors on the street selling plastic eggs with alien faces drawn on them with a magic marker, one realizes that we must truly be on an alien world. . . . <g>

On the other hand, I found the presentation provocative and will wait for the actual paper to be released to make a value judgement. It certainly hasn't been handled in a way that I would choose, but I'm not going to throw out the baby because the bath water is too dirty.

> Can you imagine what would have
>happened had NASA held a press conference, say, a
>year _before_ Pathfinder landed in working order?
>They'd be up to their armpits in Hoag Land. Of
>course as far as Hoag Land is concerned, NASA would
>be in over its eyebrows no matter what it did, short
>of appointing His Hairness CEO. I suspect that the
>Roswell fragment press conference -- that wasn't a
>press conference -- took place where and when it did
>precisely because of terrestrial isotopic ratios
>having something to do with the number of cameras
>and microphones present in a given room at the same
>time.

Interesting that you should bring up the Pathfinder . . . <g> There seems to be quite a debate in some other groups questioning whether or not the rover is really on Mars. But that's another issue.

There's really no way to resolve this question until the paper is written or VernonClark agrees to come forward and provide the names of others that have confirmed his results. We can debate the manner in which it was handled, but it won't change the test results, and this public debate is the reason that most scientists would rather keep their mouths shut than announce preliminary findings.

But those findings, should they be confirmed, will generate a major discussion in many areas on this matter. Even without confirmation of where the "debris" came from, I would think the volumn of the discussion will likely be higher than we recently saw with the "Mars Rock".

If they aren't confirmed, we'll see the issue die down and the credibility of those responsible will be impacted appropriately.

>Mind, Steven, none of the above is directed at you
>personally. I just hopped on your post with an early
>press release. Direct any potentially discomfiting
>questions to my agent...aka the Duke of Mendoza, and
>_his_ agent, Aleister Crowley, and _his_ agent before
>him.

Please be assured that my comments are directed only at the issues, and not at the personalities involved. If there are any questions that come to mind, I will forward them to the appropriate office.

Steve

PS- What's your stance on the Phoenix Lights issue. The Maryland National Guard would seem to be supportive of the most recent article on the subject in the MUFON Journal, but several news reporters weren't convinced that flares were the cause.

Search for other documents to/from: [steve](#) | [dstacy](#)

[[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](#).