



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](#) -> [Kent's Statistics Invalid](#)

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Kent's Statistics Invalid

From: BOB SHELL <76750.2717@CompuServe.COM>
Date: 18 Jun 97 08:30:48 EDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 18 Jun 1997 10:31:01 -0400
Subject: Kent's Statistics Invalid

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth' - Part 1/6

I submitted the full text of Kent Jeffrey's article to a friend of mine who runs a top statistical analysis firm. Since his company does statistical analysis for Fortune 500 corporations, he is not interested in getting connected with the UFO field, and asked me for confidentiality. Here is his response to Kent's arguments about the statistics of UFO crashes.

Bob Shell

>Well, Bob---this is not the typical email I get across my desk everyday! But >interesting; very interesting. Actually, there ARE grounds for disputing the >"statistical" claim you sent me. I never really thought much about this until >THIS moment,----ok, here goes:

>First, the statistical anti-UFO argument ASSUMES (and this is very important) >that Roswell was an UNplanned crash; has that in itself ever been truly >documented in the first place? I doubt it. In other words, maybe it was MEANT to >land; the "crash" was made to look that way for political (?) reasons, military >strategy, etc....who knows? ...or perhaps it was a PLANNED crash for other >reasons---why must we feel that we must understand the "reasons" for everything? >There is NO KNOWN WAY to measure the intentions of any UFO pilots, just pure >speculation. If any of the above is true, it immediately blows any statistical >approach, since the entire statistical argument you forwarded to me is based on >the premise of an UNplanned crash.

>Second, the statistical laws are based on OUR experience, OUR normal curves, >OUR mathematical proofs all calculated within OUR limited knowledge of the >known universe. In dealing with supernatural speeds, etc., that we know little >or nothing about, how can we be SURE that the formulae apply at all in these >supernatural cases? That would be a very closed-minded view; i.e., OUR >known-universe "laws" are the only ones that can apply in any circumstance? >That can NOT be conclusively proven by our very own (limited) scientific laws!

>Tied to the above, while advancing technology creates higher reliability >(HA!!! ...tell it to my new Windows95 machine: \$4,000 worth of 4 gig HEADACHES; >still not right after two months!!! Thanks, Bill Gates...); the tasks being >asked of a ufo technology are beyond our comprehension. In other words, the >linear correlation of technology versus reliability may be "out of limits" of >the function (no pun intended!). Statistical functions only work correctly >WITHIN ranges of documented experience---ANY professional scientist (or good >grad student) working with math functions, and particularly statistical >analysis knows this. In a scientific or corporate research setting, you can get >in A LOT OF TROUBLE applying linear or non-linear functions to cases OUTSIDE of

>the realm of historical limits and making predictions or correlation forecasts
>from such functions. UFO's are CLEARLY outside the range of earthly/known
>universe historical limits. Considering the potential modes of travel, speeds
>and distances we are talking about; it is doubtful (but still INconclusive)
>that our "laws" of statistics be applied to such cases.

Search for other documents to/from: [76750.2717](#)

[[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](#).