



# 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](#) -> [Jun](#) -> **Re: Roswell Historical: Facts or Fiction?**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Roswell Historical: Facts or Fiction?

From: [legion@werple.net.au](mailto:legion@werple.net.au)  
Date: Sun, 15 Jun 1997 12:58:59 +1000 (EST)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 15 Jun 1997 09:38:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Roswell Historical: Facts or Fiction?

Hi David:

>Date: Thu, 12 Jun 1997 11:44:32 -0400  
>To: [Updates@globalserve.net](mailto:Updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: David <[furry@nobelmed.com](mailto:furry@nobelmed.com)>  
>Subject: Roswell Historical: Facts or Fiction?

> Upon reading John's three-part "Roswell: Historical  
> Facts" post, I was first inclined to do a "reply" to  
> one or all three posts in order to discuss some of  
> the FACTS on a one by one basis.

I'm sorry that you didn't. Roswell looms large in UFOlogy, and so it should. If it's all true it's the most important event ever in human history, and 50th Anniversaries don't come around every day.

> However, after reading as much as I could possibly bear,

Sorry. This response will be much shorter. (Spontaneous cheering breaks out amongst the listmembers!)

[...]

> A lot of the elements of argument about Roswell go  
> into typical "He said, She said and They said"  
> scenarios.

If you remove the "He said, She said" components of the Roswell story, what's left?

[...]

> Now, with ALL of this being said, how about we  
> examine the irrefutable evidence of Roswell.

> FACT: In or around July 1 through 8, 1947  
> SOMETHING crashed near,

Brazel himself said he found the material three weeks before coming into town, around June 14. (There is some dispute about this, but even Major Marcel related the same timeframe in wire stories published on July 9, 1947.)

> or on Mac Brazel's ranch and was subsequently recovered  
> by men and officers of the 509th Air Bombardment group  
> located at Roswell U.S.A.A.F. Base.

It might have been recovered by just one man and one officer. Bessie Schrieber described gathering up three sacks of the material with her

father and we don't know how much (if anything) was left to be picked up later.

- > FACT: A story was written and released that
- > reportedly was under the authority of the
- > intelligence office

Major Marcel, the man who concluded that the scraps of foil and other bits and pieces constituted a "disc."

- > FACT: A story and press interview was conducted
- > under Col. Blanchard's authority that REFUTED

This took place in General Ramey's office at Ft. Worth.

- > the "Flying Saucer" story and that showed Maj.
- > Jesse Marcel posing with the remains of a
- > Weather Balloon which was supposedly recovered
- > at the controversial "crash site". SINCE that time,
- > the Air Force has changed the OFFICIAL story so
- > that the "remains" were obviously FAKED from
- > the beginning!

The story is actually quite consistent. Marcel recovered the debris, and it was flown into Ft. Worth. General Ramey's chief of staff, Colonel DuBose, stated repeatedly that the debris was never switched. This same debris was later examined by Warrant Officer Irving Newton who identified it as being part of a weather balloon and radar reflector.

The Air Force's story really hasn't changed since 1947. They said the debris was from a "weather balloon" and the Project Mogul train was comprised of mainly weather balloon components. A little white lie, perhaps, or a sin of omission, but if the debris was never switched and it was later confirmed to be a weather balloon, then Major Marcel simply made a mistake in his original assessment of the material.

- > FACT: People in and around Roswell, New
- > Mexico have stated that the Air Force is lying and
- > that there is a "cover-up" going on about what
- > really occurred at the crash site in 1947.

If you check out Kent Jeffrey's new article on his Roswell investigations at [www.roswell.org/](http://www.roswell.org/) you'll find that he interviewed 17 pilots and navigators who were stationed at Roswell Army Air Field in July of 1947. All of the bomber pilots had TOP SECRET clearances and were a tightly-knit group. They all told Kent that nothing unusual happened at RAAF on July 8, 1947, except for a little excitement caused by that news release.

There's also the affidavit signed by Jim McKnight whose family owned the land where the "main" crash allegedly occurred. According to McKnight, nothing special happened on their property in 1947. No giant road trains of military vehicles tearing up the sand and leaving deep impressions, no massive cordons of troops, no light planes flying overhead mapping the crash site from the air, etc. Nothing to attract his family's attention or reveal any major activity at all.

- > FACT: People in and around Roswell, New
- > Mexico have been maintaining the previous fact
- > for almost 50 years as of this writing.

See above.

- > FIVE Facts. Five irrefutable facts.

I "think" I just refuted them, but I'm happy to discuss this further with you.

- > 1. WHY did something crash in the desert of New
- > Mexico in July of 1947?
- > SOME outside influence has to cause something to
- > crash!

According to Marcel, no gouges, no marks. No evidence that anything actually crashed.

- > A body that is in motion will remain in
- > motion until acted upon by some outside force.

And a balloon train will remain aloft until those balloons start to burst. Then it gently descends to the ground where it's torn apart and scattered by the winds.

- > 2. WHY did the "intelligence office" of RAAF base
- > authorize the release of a story about capturing a
- > flying saucer? Additionally, WHY release a story
- > that they had no concrete proof as being real?

THE most important question of all. For this it'll be helpful if we actually venture into the Roswell Forest. Occam's chainsaw at the ready? Right, start 'er up and let's start chopping...

Look over there, see that clearing? Let's head for it....

See all these tree stumps? Know what happened here about 51 years ago? Some forestry workers came in and chopped down a whole slew of trees. They were sent off to the pulp mills where they were turned into newsprint so that the Roswell Daily-Record could publish the July 8, 1947, issue with the headline:

RAAF Captures Flying Saucer  
On Ranch in Roswell Region

While this made for a dramatic headline, it was hopelessly inaccurate. Nobody "captured" anything. The "saucer" was just lying there in lots of little pieces, and it was not the first (or last) story about captured discs or saucers to be published that July. I've covered this in a subsequent message which, mea culpa, was also somewhat lengthy, but if you read through the newspapers of the time you'll note "saucers" and "discs" were generic terms to denote all manner of unknown aerial phenomena. Things didn't even have to look disc-like to be called "discs."

Newspapers, including those in Roswell, carried many "saucer" stories after the June 24th Arnold sightings. They also reported on the many "disc" retrievals that the Air Force was involved with. A large story appeared in the July 8 Roswell Morning Dispatch detailing the finding of two discs in Texas, and another one in Spokane, Washington. (A former scoutmaster admitted to hoaxing the Spokane disc, but the Houston Chronicle knew better: "...there are some mysterious facts contained in his (the scoutmaster's) first report that lend credence to the tale." But of course...)

This confusion highlights the fact that (can you guess what I'm going to say next?) "nobody knew what discs/saucers were." In another message I alluded to an August, 1947 Gallop Poll in which 90% of interviewees indicated they had heard of "Flying Saucers," but the overwhelming majority responded with entirely prosaic suggestions as to the origins of the saucers: secret weapons, mirages, etc. Flying saucers and discs were generic descriptions of "sky phantoms", or "whatzniks," or "whatzits." Nobody knew what they were so it was fun to call them different names and speculate where they might have come from. And in that atmosphere of excitement and speculation, if you found something you couldn't immediately recognise, calling it a "disc" might not have seemed far-fetched at all.

Announcing the "capture" of a "Flying Saucer" in 1947 made for a great headline, but it didn't even begin to address the question: "What exactly is a 'Flying Saucer' anyway?"

- > Based upon the fact that the 509th bombardment
- > group was the ONLY atomic air base in the world it
- > is highly doubtful that they were looking for "Press
- > Attention".

It's a good point. About the only thing I can suggest is that nobody within the Air Force thought there'd be such a reaction to the announcement.

- > It is well known that intelligence officers
- > have very little sense of humour,

Major Marcel did try to convince Newton that the rawin target he had in his hands contained "alien" writing. Some might have found that to be humorous.

- > Press officers and Intelligence officers NEVER need to
- > verify anything before they release information,

It's hard to accept in these post-Watergate times, but maybe it was all so simple back in '47: Marcel didn't know what the debris was, "maybe a disc?" Blanchard trusted his Intelligence Officer so he called "Higher Headquarters" about it. They told him, "Send it over." When Blanchard asked, "Can I tell the press?" they might have replied, "Okay, but keep the details to yourself." A press release was issued and...

Much the same happened with the Spokane disk discovery the day before. General Vandenberg told a Colonel Warren: "The line of approach is that we have nothing like that, we don't understand what it is, but we are leaving no stone unturned to be sure." If the Army Air Force was playing its cards close to its chest, Vandenberg should have told Warren to say, "No comment, keep the press out of it." But, you know, those were the good old days...

- > 3. WHY conduct a press interview and present
- > physical evidence of a mistake?

The release had been issued before the debris had been identified.

- > And with the ever-changing "official" line of what really crashed,

The initial release stated that a "disc" had come into the hands of the RAAF through the co-operation of a local rancher. As already noted, there was nothing "disc-like" about the material at all. It was only a guess on Major Marcel's part that the debris might have come from a "disc."

- > why conduct this interview with FAKED evidence?

According to DuBose, the evidence wasn't "faked" at all. The "disc" debris was brought to Ft. Worth where it was identified as being parts of a weather balloon and radar reflector.

- > The Air Force really enjoys showing the world when
- > they screw up, therefore, call everyone in and bring
- > the widest possible attention to their mistake. I think
- > NOT!

They had no choice. The release had been issued and the media wanted to know more. Too late to say "Oops! Go away..."

- > If the evidence shown was FAKE, then WHERE is the REAL
- > evidence and why not show us that NOW?

There's no evidence that any of the material was "faked." DuBose maintained the material was not switched. Newton identified it as being balloon debris. There was just the one type of unidentified evidence that was later identified as being the you-know-what.

Perhaps someone can enlighten me as to the source, but in "The Roswell Incident," Major Marcel is quoted as saying that he had been photographed with some of the actual debris. If you examine the debris pictures taken in General Ramey's office, they all show the same material, regardless of whether it's being held by Marcel, DuBose, or Irving Newton.

- > 4. WHY did all those people decide to risk ridicule
- > and potential government and air force intervention
- > in their lives by saying that the whole thing was a
- > cover-up and that the Air Force was lying?

Not "all" those people did. It's just a given that when you're trying to provide evidence for the proposition that a spaceship crashed in Roswell in 1947, you're not going to clutter up precious pages with stories from people who say that nothing happened. (Not for any dishonest reasons, I should add. It's simply a matter of managing one's limited resources.)

- > For fame and monetary gain? All those people are
- > now well known by everyone in the world and they
- > are all living as multi-millionaires from their stories!

Is money the only reason people tell stories? Why would Glenn Dennis, for instance, say he wanted to marry his beloved Nurse "X" only to later state she was a nun with no interest in men? Why would Gerald Anderson lie about the length of a phone call with Kevin Randle and then fabricate a phone bill to "prove" his story was true? Where's the "money" in doing something ridiculous like that? Yet he did it. Why?

> Anyone out there familiar with the term NFL?

National Football League?

> As in NOT F---ing LIKELY!

Oh. ;-)

Sadly, as noted above, it does happen, and it happens often enough to make the matter of gauging eyewitness reliability an ongoing issue.

> 5. WHY have those people and their family  
> members kept this story alive for almost 50 years?

The ones who claim that nothing happened, or the ones who claim something did happen? Either way, I suspect the answer is they were asked about it by reporters and researchers.

> Because they've got nothing to better to do with  
> their time and they love being hounded to death by  
> UFO researchers, questioned endlessly and  
> having people call them liars whenever they tell  
> their story.

Some people enjoy a nice chat, especially in their latter years, and you'll find that very few Roswell "witnesses" are ever called liars.

> I firmly understand the need to get as many  
> DETAILS confirmed as much as the next person,  
> however, let's NOT lose sight of the forest.

In a forest the trees are the "details." Remove all the details and your forest becomes an empty field.

Same with Roswell. We need those details. Who, why, where, and given the short timeframe in which the events occurred, when. Things become problematic when you string all the current "details" together: lots of enormous gaps. This leads to the necessity of "filling in" those gaps. Depending on how this is done, the landscape can be altered entirely.

> It's time to let the "Official" arms of the incident at  
> Roswell try to answer the HARD questions and convince us  
> of the reasons WHY these questions are there.

The "official" arms believe they've already answered the hard questions: Unknown debris, later identified as being from a weather balloon. Ever the party-poopers, the Air Force reinforced this answer in 1994 by telling us that the weather balloon was a component of the TOP SECRET Project Mogul.

Clearly this answer isn't to everybody's satisfaction, and there's no harm done if we keep on looking. I intend to.

> (Just my two cents again, from a voice in the  
> wilderness....)

We need to be discussing these things and I'm grateful you went to the trouble to post your thoughts.

Thanks David.

Best,  
John

--

```
*-----*
|.....|
|... legion@werple.net.au ...|
|.....|
*-----*
```

Search for other documents to/from: [legion](#) | [furry](#)

---

[ [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](#).