



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)  
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)  
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)  
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore  
is [OPEN](#)

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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Greenwood's UFO Surve

From: [jan@cyberzone.net](mailto:jan@cyberzone.net) (Jan Aldrich)  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 15:37:39 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 01 Oct 1997 04:58:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Greenwood's UFO Surve

Since I have asked others to fill this out, here are my answers to the survey. If you don't agree or if you have better answers, don't bother arguing with me. Fill out your survey and send it to Greenwood.

Thank you.

Jan Aldrich

Jan Aldrich wrote:

>  
> Greetings List Members  
>  
> Barry Greenwood would like to do an survey of knowledgeable  
> UFO researchers.  
>  
> If you wish, you may post your answers to this list, or send  
> them to me, or answer anonymously by mailing your  
> questionnaire to:  
>  
> CAUS  
> P. O. Box 176  
> Stoneham, MA 02180  
>  
> You may simply answer yes or no, or include a few words or  
> long essay with your opinions. It will be of great interest  
> to see if there is a common consensus on the important UFO  
> cases.  
>  
> Please indicate what E-Mail list you are on:  
All  
>  
> Project 1947      Currently Encounters      UFO Updates  
> Other list (please indicate list)  
>  
> [Other lists, please feel free to cross-post.]  
>  
> Questions:  
>  
> I. Please list the ten most important UFO cases. Please  
> list cases by date and location. If you wish, you may also  
> tell why they are important.  
>

First, as I told Barry, I do not agree with this type of argument that we have a few cases that establish something. I do not see ufology as turning on any "critical evidence." I believe that the preponderance of evidence indicate something unusual is going on.

The biggest mistake Roy Craig made ever made was to advise Condon not to look at McDonald's Top 20 Evidential Cases. "If we shot these down, he will just bring us 20 more." Exactly,

it is called science.

What Craig turned down was the best conservation measures for the project's limited time and resources. Instead of having to look through huge amounts of raw to find possible interesting material, here was a first rate physical scientist who was handing the Condon committee on a silver platter the data the needed to deal with the problem.

Craig's quick-reaction investigation team idea was excellent, the early warning network was good, the field equipment kit was excellent. His execution of field investigations was poor. Why? They had no filter to decide which cases were worth a special trip and which should be ignored. Craig's rather lame argue that you might miss a good case is hogwash.

You set up certain criteria that a case has to meet before you conduct a field investigation. Sure you may miss some good ones. You must constantly re-adjust your criteria from experience factors. If you read Craig's book, you will see that this has not occurred to him in the last almost 30 years.

The 4602d Air Intelligence Service Squadron files are full of cases that were easy to explain. Just calculate the location of Venus, or check with the local weather station for balloon releases. When they did get an amazing case, instead of investigating, they wrote it off as overactive imagination or psychological.

Good cases are rare. Scientists and other who have to plow through a whelter of IFO could easily conclude there is nothing there. I personally worked on a particle physics experiment. Over 95% of the events were thrown out because they had no meaningful information or if they had particle events, they were not relevant to the study. No one came and said the experiment was flawed because most of the data was useless. It wasn't even mentioned.

This was an experiment under controled conditions. How much data can you expect to be relevant when the raw data comes from chance observations?!? But the obsession of the USAF, CIA, MOD, Battelle, and numerous scientists with the percent of unexplained from small nonrepresentative samples is completely ridiculous. I didn't do too well with statistic, but I can say this: that kind of reasoning is off the wall and has nothing at all to do with science.

That said, here are my ten important cases not in order of priority:

1. August 1947, Twin Fall, ID, Trees were swaying as the object passed over them. One of several of the same kind of cases in less than a five month period. Hynek's explanation of "atmospheric eddy" is laughable. The Battelle scientists evaluated it as unknown. Hynek in his re-evaluation of USAF cases disgarded his explanation. The FBI gave the main witness a good recommendation. Unknown to the investigators was that the witness was well-known in the Northwest. Two other newspapers outside of Idaho vouched for the main witness' integrity.

>

2. July 10, 1947 Newfoundland, the cloud-cleaver. This may have been a meteor as Hynek suggested, but it was one that should have been brought to the attention of the scientific community. There are photographs of this phenomenon.

>

3. The twin sightings of Oloron College and Gaillac, France represent a truly strange and rare phenomenon. The phenomenon continues to this day as The UFO Evidence, Volume II will hopefully demonstrate. Keyhoe had some original accounts of these twin sightings in his papers.

4. The Leveland series. Maybe this is a something that shows up once every ten years as a rare natural phenomenon or maybe it was something even more unique. Menzel, Keyhoe, Hynek and USAF were not helpful here at all. Except for Hynek each talked about their particular belief system before they even investigated the phenomenon. Hynek's request to the Air Science Division Review again, did not did not recognize that anything unusual was happening. He talked of "mass suggestion" a cause of ignition stops. Loren Gross has shown that there

was an increase in sightings starting before Levelland, but Hynek talked about the flood of sightings after (and caused by) Levelland. There were many more sightings (unknown to the USAF and the UFO organizations) in the newspapers and especially more car-stalling accounts that exist only in the old newspapers files. The USAF should have tried to gather double the troublesome 500 cases. They might have got a hint of what was going on.

>

4. Gulf of Mexico, December 1952. The Air Force throw everything in as answers to this case except the kitchen sink. This is indeed an unusual case. A Canadian radar expert after reading Keyhoe's version, wrote to the Air Force to ask if such a fantastic event had indeed occurred. Keyhoe's melodramatic version had made him doubtful.

>

5. Leominster, Massachusetts, 8 March 1967, EME, close approach, physiological effects.

>

6. Socorro, New Mexico, April 1964. Hynek was only allowed to check this one case. There were a series of similar cases within a short time and not too distant from Socorro...

>

7. Nemingha, NSW, Australia, March 22, 1976, EME, trace, light engulfment.

>

8. Atlanta, Missouri, 4 March 1969 EME and other effects.

>

9. Minneapolis, MN. Oct 10-11, 1951, General Mills scientists.

>

10. Shag Harbor. Whatever this was, it is a good mystery.

>

> II. Considering what has been done in the last 50 years,  
> and the situation today, what should be the next step for  
> ufology?

Unfortunately, scientific ufology about reached its peak in late 1960s and early 1970s as far as scientific investigations. There was a recovery in the mid-1980s. There were also some good guidelines laid down. That effort collapsed, also.

It seems now ufology is constantly attracted to the highest strangeness and most sensationalized cases.

Some UFO advocates now sound like lawyers. They use of rhetorical tricks, obfuscation, and appeals to emotions. Fine for a court of law. Cicero may have been able to use his skills in the law courts to get guilty murders off, however these skills have no use in scientific inquiry.

Courts are not a place to search for truth. Courts are arena of controlled conflict where by social contract everyone agrees to abide by the results right or wrong.

Once a ufologist starts saying, "you can't disprove this." Red flags should go up. That should be the end of the argument. It is the person making the claim that has to prove the contentions. James, Ed, and especially myself have been sucked into this silly game of trying to prove a negative.

The argument that the skeptics behave in the same way has no weight here. (BTW Many skeptics behave honorably and are even sympathetically.) I don't care about skeptics. I am trying to reform ufology not skepticism. Ufologists should have a very critical and skeptical attitude toward evidence. Otherwise, we get the emotional near feeding frenzy we find on the web when someone reports NLs. Ufologists should not need skeptics or others to "keep them honest."

I think that CE II cases are the key to obtain good solid evidence. However, realistically, investigations of such cases are not easy. Considering where we are today, CE II cases are probably the best entree to more scientific information and improved understanding. Dr. James McDonald thought that radar cases were the most important evidence. Unfortunately, the only radar catatlogs I know of are The UFO Evidence and the Condon report. Most radar cases are woefully inadequate, missing

a lot of important information.

Ufology is a philosophy of science problem. The Condon committee, in its early meeting recognized this. Their debates on this are very interesting. This question has never been adequately addressed.

How do you study things that seem to be involve chance observation of a transient nature. Hard, but not impossible. Scientists who say they can't are like generals who can't mount operations in the face of the enemy.

To paraphrase Churchill concerning the Mulberries: "Don't tell me all the reasons it can't be done, just go and do it."

> III. Government involvement in the UFO problem.

>  
> 1. Is there a government cover up or foul up?

>  
> Cover-up

>  
> Foul up

I agree with James McDonald there is a foul-up and to a certain extent a cover up of a foul up. Saying that, McDonald had a list of 100 "obfuscation cases" which indicated cover up. However, the cover up idea has grown. First, if we only got the Project Blue Book files that would prove the existance of high level knowledge about UFOs. Then, the CIA were the ones. However, sections in the OSI of the CIA handed the UFO problem back and forth to one another and they didn't want to do anything with it.

Government agencies have not been forthcoming with information and have constantly been very non-cooperative and in many cases have lied about their records on the subject. I have been on the inside and have sympathy for the pressures of the military requirements. However, if you have time and money to occupy people full time in looking for Roswell records, you have the time and money too follow the FOIA requirements or great rid of the whole thing and put everything out there.

>  
> Other (please specify)

>  
> 2. To what extent is/are the government(s) involved:

> A. United States (everyone may answer this  
> question):

> Major involvement

> Minor involvement

There is always a national security implication to things in the skies. At other times there may have been a major involvement.

> Not Interested

> B. If you are not a US resident, indicate country  
> and government involvement:

> Major involvement

> Minor involvement

> Not interested

> IV. Abduction phenomenon.

> 1. Is the abduction phenomenon part of the UFO problem?

> Yes

> No

> Cannot determine at this time

I am unsure on this. I think investigations of these things are important and may lead to interesting findings. However, I do not think this should at this time be the center of ufological attention.

> 2. Is the study of the abductions important to  
> understanding the ufo problem?

Unfortunately, the investigators of the abduction phenomena are generally part of the problem and not part of the solution. Dr. Bullard is the most credible and he is not a case investigator per se. A lot of investigators who are more circumspect are probably doing better work. I am appalled by comments like, "you can throw a rock and you will hit an abductee," "do 'they' ask about me?"

> Yes

>

> No

>

> Do not know

Research is important. Again, the UFORC's approach is probably the best if you feel something is happening here.

>

> V. Paranormal phenomena

>

> 1. Is the UFO phenomenon related to paranormal phenomena  
> such as psi, ghost, fortean phenomena, etc.?

>

> Yes

>

> No

NO! I am surprised that scientist like Vallee proceeded down this road. This debate had already taken place in the 19th century. Huxley pretty well laid out the ground rules. There were phenomena and divine [or paranormal, if you wish] manifestations. Science is concerned with phenomena, the divine [read also paranormal] may be very interesting, but it is outside what is being looked at. (A gross oversimplification of Huxley's cogent and elegant arguments.) Phenomena are in the physical world, and we can try to understand and measure them. The others are outside the realm of understanding or study by the methods of science. (Now, maybe psi is a mental phenomenon, and if so, it could be studied. But if Uri Geller can't bend certain spoons. but can bend others, then something is wrong here.)

>

> Cannot determine at this time

>

> 2. Should the study of the paranormal be part of UFO  
> studies?

>

> Yes

>

> No

No, it is a big distraction to the study of the problem.

>

> Do not know

>

> IV. The probably answer(s) to the UFO phenomenon is/are [you  
> may choose more than one--if so, please indicate order of  
> importance by "1st, 2nd, etc"]:

>

> Extraterrestrial

I am unhappy that the word "UFOs" now equals ET space ships.... It should mean unidentified flying objects....just that.

> Parallel universe

>

> Time travelers

>

> Little understood natural phenomenon/phenomena

2d. Almost certainly there is something to this. When I first saw ball-lightning, the scientific consensus was that it did not exist. It would be useful to look at UFO reports for "once in a decade/50 year/century phenomena." It is stupid not to look. (But to a certain extent with all the foolishness associated with the phenomenon it is understandable.)

>

> Secret man-made phenomenon

>

> Misidentification of man-made and natural phenomena

3d I am not thinking about raw data here which contains the majority of IFOs, but after filtering IFOs out, these will

still exist.

> **Psycho-sociological phenomenon/phenomena**  
> This area, for sure, is important! I am appalled by American ufology's obsessions with abductions and crashed saucers. I am equally appalled with the European's obsession with the psycho-sociological explanation. Americans don't give this area enough weight. European have ridden this like a hobby horse. It is time to dismount from the theories and beliefs and collect and compile better data.

> **Occult phenomenon/phenomena**  
> This a post-modern world....every idea and opinion is equal to any other idea and opinion.... No, we need to make a break here and try to define the limits of ufology. These things are outside.

> **Other (please specify)**

> **Cannot determine at this time**

1st. This is the same way I felt in 1959. I have seen nothing that has changed by mind.

> As you can see, this is not a survey that can be done in five minutes. Please take your time.

> Thank you, the results will be posted to the lists and in JUST CAUSE.

--  
Jan Aldrich  
Project 1947  
<http://www.iufog.org/project1947/>

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

---

[ [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](#).