



# 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

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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth' - Part 2/6

From: David <[furry@nobelmed.com](mailto:furry@nobelmed.com)>  
Date: Mon, 16 Jun 1997 17:48:09 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 17 Jun 1997 00:07:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth' - Part 2/6

>SNIP

>UFO Crashes

>Even before the advent of recent negative developments in the  
>Roswell case, I have always felt that a UFO would never crash.  
>However, because of the impressive witness testimony about which  
>I was told, I suspended judgment and allowed for the possibility  
>that Roswell might be an exception -- some kind of  
>one-in-a-quintillion fluke. That was, in retrospect, a mistake.

>The problem with the concept of a UFO crashing is that as  
>technology advances, so does reliability. Be it with cars,  
>airplanes, televisions, or wristwatches, the reliability of  
>today's technology far exceeds that of the technology of just a  
>few decades ago. For example, because of the high reliability of  
>their engines, long-range, twin-engine commercial jetliners are  
>now authorized to fly nonstop across the North Atlantic. A few  
>decades ago, that would have been unthinkable. (The positive  
>correlation between advancing technology and reliability applies  
>to "proven" technology, not experimental state-of-the art machines  
>still in the developmental phase, such as experimental aircraft  
>or space vehicles.)

>With today's industry-average engine-failure rate of less than  
>one failure per 100,000 flight hours, the chances of both engines  
>of a two-engine jetliner failing during a given hour of flight  
>are less than one out of 10 billion. Figuring 50,000  
>aircraft-ocean crossings per year, and factoring in such  
>variables as average time over the water and average distance  
>from land, the odds are less than fifty-fifty of a double-engine  
>failure and consequent ditching in the North Atlantic of even one  
>such aircraft over the next 10,000 years.

>This incredible degree of reliability is found with a technology  
>that would be primitive compared with a UFO. Even with today's  
>relatively "primitive" technology, our commercial aircraft have  
>very efficient collision avoidance systems, as well as excellent  
>radar systems for avoiding thunderstorms and their associated  
>hail and lightning (phenomena, incidentally, that are surely not  
>unique to this planet).

>If we assume that UFOs are extraterrestrial spacecraft and that  
>some of the many reported UFO sightings are genuine UFOs, we are  
>dealing with machines apparently capable of high-speed  
>right-angle turns, incredible accelerations and speeds, and  
>wingless flight -- not to mention of traveling light-years  
>through the void of empty space in, presumably, a relatively  
>short period of time. Such capability would require a technology  
>totally beyond our present understanding of physics -- a

>technology the sophistication of which we cannot even begin to  
>imagine.

>Because of the positive correlation between technology and  
>reliability, such incredibly advanced technology would most  
>certainly mean a correspondingly high degree of reliability.  
>Common sense dictates that the chances of such machines crashing,  
>breaking down, or colliding would be all but zero. It certainly  
>would be many orders of magnitude less than the already  
>infinitesimally small chance of one of today's twin-engine  
>jetliners having a double-engine failure.

>SNIP

Kent,

I'm reading your posting with great interest.  
However, with THIS particular LINE of thinking,  
I have only one PHRASE to say.

Can you say "Unsinkable Titanic!"

Dave (Furry) Furlotte

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