



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: Corso's book

From: joel henry <jhenry@wavefront.com>
Date: Fri, 20 Jun 1997 13:40:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 20 Jun 1997 17:52:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Corso's book

>Date: Wed, 18 Jun 1997 19:39:46 -0400
>From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Corso's book
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>Regarding...

>>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>>Subject: Corso's book
>>Date: Tue, 17 Jun 1997 17:34:25 -0400

>Greg wrote:

>>The key to Corso's UFO information is the title of the book -- "The
>>Day After Roswell." This refers to something initially quite limited,
>>and fascinating -- what happened to the crash debris. Corso says that
>>it initially got scattered scientific study, some of which led to the
>>development of the transistor.

>Greg,

>The development of the transistor was completed during 1947, by
>William Shockley, Walter Brattain and John Bardeen, working at Bell
>Telephone Laboratories.

This is true. But at that time this was the "neanderthal" fo transistors and not even a practical or useful product.

>Briefly setting this in some perspective:

>John V. Atanasoff, a professor at Iowa State College, and Clifford
>Berry, a graduate student, conceived an all-electronic computer that
>applied Boolean algebra to computer circuitry. In 1939, they designed
>a prototype and in 1973, a judge declared it to be the first automatic
>digital computer.

Invention of the idea of a functional computer based on simple already existing mathematics is not very phenomenal.

>The code-breaking Colossus computer was designed and built in 1941 at
>the University of Manchester, England and Colossus Mark II followed
>in 1944.

So? What does this prove?

>The first information-processing digital computer actually built was
>the Automatic Sequence Controlled Calculator, or Mark I computer.

>Completed in 1944, this electromechanical device was designed by
>American Howard H. Aiken, a Harvard engineer working with IBM.

>Around half the length of a football field and containing some 500
>miles of wiring, its purpose was to create ballistic charts for the
>U.S. Navy.

I'm so impressed.

>February of 1946 saw an unveiling of the Electronic Numerical
>Integrator and Computer (ENIAC), the result of a joint project between
>the U.S. government and the University of Pennsylvania. Consisting of
>17,468 vacuum tubes, some 70,000 resistors and 5 million soldered
>joints, it weighed approximately 30 tons and required 1000 square feet
>of floor space. Entirely electronic, it consumed up to 160 kilowatts
>of power, sufficient to dim the lights in part of Philadelphia.
>

Sounds real high-tech to me!

>
>Vacuum tubes were required for electromechanical circuit switching and
>the regulated conduction of electrical current - basically switching
>and amplification - but they consumed too much power, gave off too
>much heat, took up too much space, cost too much to produce, and they
>burned out.

>
>Shockley, Brattain and Bardeen's research addressed these problems and
>in searching for a suitable alternative they decided to try
>semiconductors, materials that were adequate, although not
>exceptional, conductors of electricity.

>
>Some time previously, while investigating the failure of radar diodes,
>they had noticed a "transistor effect" and suspected that small
>changes in current were taking place. They theorised that a suitable
>medium would produce active electronic effects and when they passed
>current through an N-type germanium crystal, they demonstrated the
>principle of amplifying an electrical current using a solid
>semiconducting material.

>
>Their concept was based on the fact that it is possible to selectively
>control the flow of electricity through silicon, designating some
>areas as current conductors and adjacent areas as insulators.

>
>The point-contact transistor amplifier became the building block for
>all modern electronics and the foundation for microchip and computer
>technology.
>

A simple solution to a simple problem, too bad they had to work with
stone axes and bearskins.

>
>>But then it languished, until the early '60s when Corso went to work
>>for a foreign technology unit of the army.

>
>[...]

>
>>If somebody's thinking is stimulated by a fragment of an alien TV
>>set, they still have to theorize and experiment to imitate the thing
>>-- and it's those theories and experiments that show up in published
>>data, not the inspiration for them.

>
>
>As for lasers and fibre (fiber) optics...

>
>Einstein is credited as the "Father" of the laser. In 1917, he
>theorised photons and stimulated emission and was awarded the Nobel
>prize for his work.
>

It's one thing to conceive of a thing, quite another to make a practical
working model.

>The first microwave laser was with us in 1954 and projected a beam of
>ammonia molecules through a system of focusing electrodes. The first
>optical laser appeared in 1960, it's design based on a rod of ruby
>crystal which produced pulses of red light.

>
>In 1961, a laser based on a mixture of helium and neon gases was
>constructed and produced continuous output of red light.

>
>Shortly after the announcement of the first successful optical laser,
>other laboratories around the world successfully lased different
>substrates and as manufacturing techniques improved, lasers rapidly
>made the transition from the laboratory to commercial applications.
>

Sounds a little late for a Roswell explanation.

>
>The principle behind fibre optics dates back to antiquity and has been
>used for centuries in prisms and illuminated fountains.

>
>In 1870, Englishman John Tyndall demonstrated to the Royal Society
>that light travelled along a curved stream of water and in 1880,
>Scotsman Alexander Graham Bell took the concept further in his
>photophone experiment, which transmitted voice signals on beams of
>light. Bell shelved the idea, as there was too much interference with
>the light beam and the signals couldn't travel any meaningful
>distance.

>
>In 1926, another Scotsman, John Logie Baird, patented an early form
>of colour television which used glass rods to carry light. An idea
>ahead of its time, little progress was made until the 1950's when the
>first fibrescopes were developed.
>

Still too late for Roswell.

>Although scientists were aware that optical fibre could transmit
>light, the transmission interference seemed to be an insurmountable
>problem and it wasn't until 1970 that Corning Glass researchers, Drs
>Robert Maurer, Donald Keck, and Peter Schultz designed and produced
>the first optical fibre which met the specification for wide use in
>telecommunications.
>

What are you saying? They sent their fiberoptic cables 23 years back
in time?

>The discovery by the Corning group was soon recognised as a
>breakthrough and led the way for the commercialisation of optical
>fibre as a revolution in telecommunications.
>

>These are all of course verifiable facts.
>

I have no trouble accepting your facts, but what is the relevance?

>
>
>James.
>E-mail: pulsar@compuserve.com
>

If someone said all our current technology was invented by aliens and
found and then used by us, I would disagree. If someone said that
early crude human technologies were advanced quickly and suddenly
by stealing (through reverse engineering) alien technology, I would
say that could be so. Especially when you consider how blazingly fast
our technology has advanced in the past 50 years. Compare it to the
last 200.

If remains found at Roswell are true fibreoptics and real functional
transistors and/or computer chips, etc. then it's obvious that WE
did not invent them and they would have to be alien in nature. The
materials simply didn't exist in that form in our technology at that time.
Fiberoptic cables in 1947? That's pretty damning evidence of superior
technology. Mogul Shmogul. Give me a break. History lessons about early
prototypes and theories do not convince me that human technology was
fully functional to create the Roswell debris. And please don't pull
a Kent Jeffrey by pretending it's only a weather balloon by ignoring
the testimony of all the witnesses who don't fit your theory. I wish
people would spend more time thinking things out thoroughly before
trying to impose simplistic or inapplicable explanations to debunk
something.

I do not agree with the idea Sagan presented that basically said
extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. This is a "human"
attitude. Nature, computers and the universe do not care what we think is

or isn't. The same level of proof used to prove the existence of planets, black holes, or other scientific discoveries should apply to UFO's. No more, no less. Just a hundred years ago they would have laughed at most of the technology we have today- it would have been UFO's to them. Who cares how much it takes to convince a bunch of techno-neaderthals?

A lot of so-called self-proclaimed experts (i.e. authors), take a stand on the Roswell issue based on what slice of the data pie they think they can swallow. If they want to be that way so be it. I take offense when they make arrogant proclamations that their view is the truth, period, stop thinking and agree with them or you're a fool. (Listening Kent?) Mr. Jeffrey proved nothing, except he has chosen his belief system about Roswell (his slice of the data pie). I did not find his arguments convincing and found him violating Stan Friedman's adage: absence of evidence is not evidence of absence many many times. I don't agree with the assumption made many times that those men he interviewed would have to be aware of what was going on. The UFO issue has always been at the most top of top secret issues in the military and their paranoia would not allow them to tell a soul who didn't need to know, and even then skipping over some of those who should know. If secrecy back then was what Kent and his pilot friends think it was, the UFO enigma would have been solved long ago. I implore researchers out there to stop trying to find the simplest way to debunk Roswell/UFO's and stick to a thorough, scientific, unprejudiced approach. You have to incorporate all the evidence, not just the stuff that appeals to you or fits your explanation. And another thing, stop lambasting and/or dismissing witnesses because you do not like their personalities or the way they think/act. If their testimony does not seem to jibe once in a while, there are perfectly good human reasons other than lying. Those witnesses who are in question should be re-interviewed again, at length, in a positive and cooperative situation so they can get it out right. An investigators job is to sort out opinion, fact, contamination, and distorted memories if they exist and obtain the best information possible-not dismiss them because they aren't the perfect witnesses. I have had a couple of witnesses who were unsure of some of their facts, but through lengthy process of elimination, and discussion of details, the full data can be accurately obtained. If you care to bother. Some out there just don't have the time or patience. Why do they bother at all?

How trustworthy is your source? Moore/Shandera are highly suspect due to their past shenanigans with the military (Doty, etc.). Anyone willing to sleep with the devil is not to be trusted! And neither is thier info. Never use second hand testimony!!!! Get it from the source! You can't trust other researchers distortions/interpretations and bad memory. Well documented and backed up research info may be acceptable if it is checked first for accuracy. If so and so said such and such to someone else and it finally got back to me, I wouldn't give it much credence. Also, How can you trust all these high ranking officials in the military to tell the truth when they have already signed their lives away promising never to divulge their secrets? Those rare men with the courage to believe the public's right to know is higher than their filthy secrecy deserve to be respected. They have a higher moral standard. Military morality is an oxymoron. I am not just criticising Kent Jeffrey, here. There are many more doing the same things in different ways. In debunkery, everything unbelieved is considered rediculous, and eliminated outright on that basis. Nothing is rediculous to me, just proven, unproven, or waiting for enough facts to do one or the other.

Joel Henry

Minnesota MUFON Webmaster

Minnesota MUFON Web Page= <http://www.wavefront.com/~jhenry/index.html>

Search for other documents to/from: [jhenry](#) | [pulsar](#) | [gsandow](#)

[[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](#).