



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](#) -> [Oct](#) -> ET Hypothesis: Government Concern? [was: Solved]

UFO UpDates Mailing List

ET Hypothesis: Government Concern? [was: Solved]

From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 21:13:27 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 31 Oct 1997 05:57:46 -0500
Subject: ET Hypothesis: Government Concern? [was: Solved]

Regarding...

>Date: Sun, 26 Oct 1997 04:44:37 +0100 (MET)
>From: Henny van der Pluijm <hvdp@worldonline.nl>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Solved abduction cases?
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

Henny wrote:

>>The reality is, if I may paraphrase, that, with rare exceptions,
>>there is no indication the ET hypothesis is taken seriously by the
>>vast majority of government officials, either within the USA or
>>elsewhere.

>James,

>You missed the point. The reality of this discussion is that we were
>pointing out that the ET hypothesis was taken seriously outside the
>United States to demonstrate ET is not just popular in the USA.

Henny,

You wrote to John Velez:

"Not only is the ET hypothesis taken seriously outside the USA, government officials of several countries, such as Chile, Belgium, Mexico and Russia, have openly stated that their air space has been violated by craft that do not originate on this earth".

A claim to which John expounded:

"Now this is one piece of reality that you'll never see debated!"

It's a reality which is debatable, I suggested to John.

The ET hypotheses is of course taken seriously by many people in most countries, but that wasn't the only claim being made. The point being addressed was whether it is a recognised concern at government level.

In context, it's not, and the government officials who do sometimes express that concern, often do so based on evidence which in fact has a proven, or probable, explanation.

[On Chris Gibson's reported sighting]

>The aircraft you refer to is the Aurora spy plane which falls in the
>category of human made craft.

The aircraft reported by Chris remains unidentified. "Aurora" remains absolute speculation and from knowledgable discussions I've witnessed within the military aviation community, is long accepted as a likely myth.

>One of the clues that this plane was flying were the results of
>measurements by the US Geological Survey. The USGS is the outfit that
>monitors earthquakes and they tracked Aurora when it went through the
>sound barrier. Does that sound like a plane that makes no sound?

Around June 1981, seismological sensors operated by the USGS first recorded anomalous sonic booms. It was estimated that these originated from an object travelling at Mach 3 or 4 and all of the tracks pointed north and east over LA, heading towards southern Nevada.

So far as I know, this also remains unexplained, but there's no evidence linking these events with "Aurora".

You might find the following article informative:

Plane Mystery Gains Speed, Hits 5,500 Miles an Hour
By John Mintz
Washington Post Staff Writer

[...]

Jane's said it believes the spy plane has been flying tests since about 1985 and has been operational since 1989.

Air Force officials have denied such reports for years, with more pointedness than the "I-have-nothing-for-you-on-that" nondenial denials used in reply to queries about other classified subjects. "The Air Force has no such program, period," said Capt. Monica Aloisio, an Air Force spokeswoman. Yesterday she also denied a suggestion in Jane's that the Air Force would lie to cover up the secret plane. "Air Force public affairs doesn't knowingly participate in any disinformation programs," she said.

But Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio), a member of the Armed Services Committee who led congressional opposition to retiring the SR-71, said this week that the Pentagon's trickiness in denying secret programs over the years gives people pause. So with each flurry of reports like the one in Jane's, he calls the CIA and senior Defense Department officials "to make sure I wasn't being hung out to dry."

"They answer me from all quarters there is no such program," Glenn said. "Everybody in CIA swears up and down there's no such program. I think they're telling me the truth."

He said he used to wonder about those denials, because the Air Force's 1990 retirement of the SR-71 did not make sense. Air Force officials said satellites are more cost-effective for reconnaissance, but Glenn said planes such as the SR-71 are far superior. Spy planes, he said, are more maneuverable and can get to a target more quickly than satellites. Further, an adversary can often calculate when a satellite is making its once-every-few-hours sweeps and hide secrets on the ground. "The only way doing away with the '71 made sense," Glenn said in an interview this week, "was if you had a (spy plane) follow-on," which the Air Force has always denied.

Glenn said he was also intrigued by the suggestion in the Jane's article that the supposed new plane is so secret that Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney has designated it a "waived program," meaning only the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the House and Senate military committees would have been told of its existence. If true, Glenn is being kept in the dark by his own committee chairman, Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.).

Glenn said he called Nunn's staff this week and was told Nunn has not misled him on the subject. Glenn said that under the Senate's "rules of engagement," a direct question to a colleague must be answered straight.

There are other indications suggesting there is no new spy plane.

In the 1991 Persian Gulf War, for instance, field commanders were distressed at what they believed was inadequate photo reconnaissance by U.S. satellites and the some subsonic spy aircraft. The Pentagon considered reactivating the SR-71, but rejected it, government officials said.

"If they'd had this (new spy plane) operational," said William E. Burrows, author of a 1987 book entitled "Deep Black: Space Espionage & National Security" about space-based military projects, "they would have used it" in the Gulf.

Ernest Blazar, who is writing a book on the SR-71, said industry sources told him the Pentagon planned a second-generation Blackbird that died in 1990 when the SR-71 was withdrawn from service.

John Pike, director of a space policy project for the Federation of American Scientists, a nonprofit research group that favors disarmament and opposes government secrecy, contends as do other nongovernment experts that secret airplanes may exist but may have multiple missions operating as, say, spy planes and spacelaunch vehicles.

Speculation about a possible successor to the SR-71 heated up in 1984, when an entry in the defense budget mentioned a \$2 billion, two-year "Aurora" project. Pentagon officials said it was not a spy plane, but journalists became suspicious when, a year later, "the Aurora line item vanished as mysteriously as it had first appeared," said a report by the Federation of American Scientists. Jane's still uses that name for the supposed project, but Blazar said if a new spy plane exists, it would be code-named "Senior Citizen."

[...]

"The number of reports (of mystery aircraft) and their consistency suggest that there may be some basis for these sightings other than hallucinogenic drugs," the report said. But it warned: "There is no exit from this wilderness of mirrors."

[End]

Incidentally, Paul McGinnis, a researcher from the US, later confirmed on the skunk-works mailing list:

"SENIOR CITIZEN was one of the first "black" programs I located in the Fiscal Year 1993 budget, among a group of highly classified Air Force tactical programs, whose individual cost was classified, but as a group cost more than 800 million dollars for FY 1993. (Other programs included the aircraft program code-named OMEGA (PE 0207591F), COPPER COAST (PE 0207424F), the HAVE FLAG missile (PE 0208042F), and "special tactical unit detachments" (PE 0207248F), the funding for the flying of covertly obtained Russian aircraft.)

A number of people, myself included, had assumed that the code-name SENIOR CITIZEN referred to a high speed spy plane, sometimes called "Aurora". Hot on the trail of this aircraft, in August 1994, I located an obscure DoD budget document the size of 2 telephone books ("FYDP Program Structure") that clearly indicated that, surprise!, SENIOR CITIZEN was a transport aircraft".

>>The Belgium reference is a good example of the questionable data >>which some government officials base their beliefs on.

>>... the F-16 radar data from the Belgium flap was officially >>explained by the Belgian Air force as ground clutter and no pilot >>ever witnessed an actual object.

>Hogwash again. I should simply say do some elementary research on >this one, James. The people who were involved in this investigation >would either have been insulted or would have rolled over the floor >over this explanation. Ground clutter! The official explanation was >'unknown craft'.

You appear to be unaware of any developments which succeeded the

initial conclusions.

I've checked my elementary research and although it's almost three years old now, it still notes that on the skunk-works list, the learned Jean-Pierre Pharabod, who does know a thing or two about the Belgian incidents, advised me:

[Defence Department report, Belgium: "On some occasions they described the phenomena as a triangle-shaped platform up to 200 feet wide with 3 downward beaming projectors, hovering at +/-100m above the ground and making only a very light humming noise...On two occasions the BAF scrambled 2 F-16's during the evening hours...On the second occasion, pilots could identify a laser-beam projector on the ground...A total of 9 interception attempts have been made. On 6 occasions the pilots could establish a lock-on with their air interception radar. Lock-on distances varied between 5 and 8 NM. On all occasions targets varied speed and altitude very quickly and break-locks occurred after 10 to 60 seconds. Speeds varied between 150 and 1010 kts. At 3 occasions both F16's registered simultaneous lock-ons with the same parameters].

"The above are excerpts from an old "SUMMARY REPORT ON OBSERVATIONS 30-31 MARCH 1990", written by Col. (now General) De Brouwer. Further studies have been made, and the conclusions are different. The first "two occasions" were before the night 30-31 March 1990, and the "laser-beam projector on ground" was used by a night-club (this was well known, and was what De Brouwer meant in his summary). During the night 30-31 March, the pilot of the second F-16 video recorded his radar echoes. It appears now (Gilmard & Lt. Col. Salmon's study) that the first lock-ons, with speed and altitude varying very quickly, could be "ground clutter", while the one which lasted for 60 seconds, with nearly constant altitude and speed, was the first F-16. Now the Belgian military say "though this is not excluded, there is no proof that we got echoes from a real object with unusual abilities".

And later added:

"Now the Air Force has an explanation: ground clutter. I know of only 4 radars involved (2 on ground, 2 airborne), not 5. There were not hundreds of eye witnesses (this night), only a few gendarmes. Now it is said that what they saw could be stars through unusual atmospheric refraction phenomena.

Only one thing remains unexplained. The F-16's took off at 0h 05 local time (= GMT + 2). At 0 h 28, the Semmerzake radar detected an object 2500 ft over the western part of the Brussels agglomeration, moving towards Liege (roughly speaking, towards east) at 450 knots. At 0 h 29, the Glons radar detected it also. From 0 h 29 to 0 h 33, both radars followed the craft, which was going in straight line towards Liege, increasing its speed and its altitude. The Semmerzake radar spotted it again 6000 ft over Liege at 0 h 35, speed 650 knots. The last point was some 12 miles east of Liege, altitude 12000 ft, at 0 h 36. (This craft was not one of the two F-16's, which were flying in complicated loops, followed by the radars on ground).

The Semmerzake radar is an array type radar. It is used for military air safety. Semmerzake is about 30 miles west of Brussels. Glons CRC is a part of NADGE (NATO Air Defense Ground Environment). There are about 80 NADGE CRC in Europe (including Turkey). Its missions are: 1. detect and follow every flight in the Belgian air space, 2. identify friend or foe, 3. if foe, intercept and/or destroy according to the alert status. The Glons radar is a multipurpose impulsion type radar. Glons is about 6 miles north of Liege. The distance Brussels-Liege is about 60 miles. There is another radar at Bertem, for civilian traffic. The craft passed 5 miles south of Bertem at 0 h 30. The Bertem radar did not see anything (maybe because it looked only for transponders ?). As far as I know, the craft has not yet been identified. Maybe illegal flight of a private jet?"

>You are partially right that the F16 pilots chasing the UFO did not
>witness the object, but then we are talking about visual contact.
>There was radar contact, however, and the position and manoeuvres
>recorded on radar tape matched the observations of multiple witnesses
>on the ground.

See above.

>The facts are that a few individuals have a reluctance to do even the
>most basic research, which is very apparent from the fact that they
>are not even aware of the most popular debunkers 'explanation' of
>this case.

Perhaps you will now reconsider your comments and understand the
points I highlighted.

The "Belgian flap" remains an interesting series of events, but
maybe doesn't have the substance we thought it had.

James.
E-mail: pulsar@compuserve.com

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

[[Next 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](#).