UFO UpDates Mailing List

UFO UpDate:Sarbacher, Roswell, nanotechnology - Was How many

From: **DRudiak@aol.com**
Date: Sat, 21 Jun 1997 12:29:11 -0400 (EDT)
Fwd Date: Sat, 21 Jun 1997 12:59:34 -0400
Subject: UFO UpDate:Sarbacher, Roswell, nanotechnology - Was How many

>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>To: "UFO Updates (E-mail)" <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: how many fingers?
>Date: Thu, 19 Jun 1997 20:18:14 -0400

> As for Sarbacher, didn't he say his involvement was minor, and
> confined to the early days of this alleged work? If he got drawn into
> the heart of it in the early '60s, as Corso seems to say, he never
> breathed a word of it.

According to Whitley Strieber, he phoned Sarbacher in 1986 shortly before he died. Sarbacher told him he wasn't peripherally involved, as he had told others earlier, but had actually handled and analyzed Roswell debris.

Allegedly he said that the structure of the "fabric" didn't become apparent until the 1960s when they finally developed suitable microscopics.

Historically, this would be the advent of the scanning electron microscope in the 1960s (I'm not sure Strieber would have even known about this instrument). He said they found out that the fabric had been "welded" or "machined" at the molecular level.

What I find interesting about this conversion is that Sarbacher was describing what we now call nanotechnology, which is currently in its infancy. Go to the NASA Web page and start browsing around. The promise of nanotechnology, according to scientists working on it, is the development of lightweight materials with superstrength, hardness, and heat resistance.

When you assemble materials on an atom by atom basis, you can eliminate the macroscopic flaws of ordinary materials that limit their strength. Computer quantum mechanical modeling predicts increases in strength on the order of 70 to 80 times over today's best materials. For example, a projected diamond/titanium composite would have unheard of strength and heat resistance. It would be harder than ordinary diamond, meaning you couldn't scratch or drill it with diamond tools.

Currently "nanoscientists" are modeling molecular assemblers, miniscule molecular machines powered by lasers, that can assemble materials in any way you want. This means that it will also be possible to make "active" materials, that is materials which respond to the environment in certain ways and with built-in intelligence. For example, a spaceship hull might be manufactured to repair itself if punctured by a micrometeorite, just like our skin heals itself.

This sounds very much like the stuff described by Roswell witnesses. The materials were lightweight, very strong and hard, being either unbreakable in the field or couldn't be cut with knives, weren't affected by ordinary flames, and in the case of the foil-like material, had active properties.

The "foil" could be wadded up and would then return to its original shape without wrinkling, or it could be hammered and the dent would just pop out again. This would be wonderful stuff to make an outer hull with.

I would like to make another point, which I earlier tried to make with Dennis Stacy, but got completely blown off. Kent Jeffrey was also arguing like Stacy in his recent debunking of Roswell. The argument they presented was that the materials recovered at Roswell lacked the variety one would expect from an advanced craft.

My point was that this is actually what one would expect from an advanced technology -- a minimum of materials. The current trend of our technology is to increase function and complexity through integration. Hand wired 1950s mainframe computers with individual transisters went to integrated circuits on circuit boards in the 1960s and finally to Pentium chips with 8 million transisters on a chip. Superficially a Pentium chip would like like a shiny black wafer, and only when you place it under a microscope do you realize that it is a very complex beast.

Recent advances in plastics have created conducting plastics, semiconducting plastics, light-emitting plastics, batteries made of plastic, etc. In the not-to-distant future (like 20-30 years) we will likely see flat screen TVs made entirely of plastic -- display, electronics, and all. Gone will be the picture tube and magnetic coils, the circuit board with hundreds of individual components. Gone too may be the controls. Intelligence could be built-in, and the whole thing could be voice activated and controlled. It would be one integrated unit.

The same sort of integration could be accomplished with the hull of a spacecraft, or the interior cabins. Sensors could be built-in, as would lighting and controls. New generations of daylight Stealth aircraft, e.g., are rumored to have luminescent hulls, whose lighting is controlled by built-in sensors, the purpose being to render the planes virtually invisible to the eye by adjusting the luminance of the plane to match background illumination. (It's an old WWII subhunting trick used by the Allies, that worked extremely well.)

I think it is also quite obvious, and has been for some time, that saucers don't use a conventional propulsion system, and probably use some form of intense electromagnetic propulsion along the lines of magnetohydrodynamics.

Again, such a propulsion system can be integrated right into the structure of the craft. So could the power storage, e.g. if the hull was superconducting or used high energy capacitive storage or had energy beamed to it remotely. A magnetohydrodynamic concept saucer currently under development at the Rensselaer Institute is very much like this description.

Thus, we aren't likely to find fuel pumps, hoses, reactors, and turbines lying around at a crash site.

Therefore I don't find Kent Jeffrey's or Dennis Stacy's argument compelling for dismissing Roswell. An advanced technology ship could be made of a minimum of distinctive looking materials. One might even expect it, given our own technolgical trends in integration. Also, even materials which might look the same to the eye, could conceal enormous complexity and differences in function, if examined more closely under a microscope. Remember, all we have our reports from the field from various people of shattered debris. They didn't cart a fully equipped laboratory around with them.

David Rudiak

Search for other documents to/from: drudiak | 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.