



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](#) -> [Sep](#) -> **Re: UFO sighting with John Velez**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: UFO sighting with John Velez

From: **Mark Cashman** <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 02:23:01 -0700
Fwd Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 08:30:37 -0400
Subject: Re: UFO sighting with John Velez

John's response to my last post, and some of the other items which have been exchanged on the subject seem to me to be signs that this is getting out of hand.

I certainly have no intent of providing offense to John, and, frankly, if it hadn't been for some of his flames directed at researchers engaged in historical pursuits, I had really intended to hang back and not comment specifically on his sighting.

Why?

First, because I am a researcher, rather than an investigator. That's personal preference and allocation of time, though I have done a small amount of investigation.

Second, because I was afraid that this is what would result when trying to deal with someone's sighting on the Internet, especially when it is clear that a fair amount of interpretation has already been assigned to this sighting by the witness. Flames and counterflames.

I'd like to return to the way in which, in my view, an investigation is carried out, because I think in the case of both John, and earlier, Jose, this led to a good deal of misunderstanding and unnecessary anger.

(I'd also like to point out that these procedures are even more rigorously followed when I see something odd. Interest in UFOs by a witness is a factor that I consider makes it much more difficult to be sure of uncontaminated data. To have a UFO investigator who sees something can be even more fraught with peril, and to BE both witness and unbiased investigator is almost impossible - thus, procedures, carefully followed, as a safeguard).

1) Assume that the sighting is of a normal object. This is typically a safe bet. 70-90% of all sightings are probably normal objects seen under abnormal conditions or otherwise misinterpreted.

2) Conjecture possible normal causes and establish conditions of proof and disproof for those hypotheses. Even unlikely hypotheses must be considered. I refer you to the case of Coral Lorenzen's cloud cigar, which turned out to be an unusual contrail.

3) Check everything possible and extract every bit of data. Give little or no weight to apparent size or distance unsupported by triangulation. Use any angular measurements possible to bolster or destroy a hypothesis. Call every resource to determine if an aircraft, balloon, or other mundane occurrence may be responsible for the sighting. If there are other witnesses, in other locations, no matter how close, use them to help derive

triangulation, with a healthy respect for sources of error.

4) Be aggressive with 1-3 above until the data literally forces you to support the case as an unknown. Even when the case is classed unknown, be cautious if little or no strangeness is present, or if the durations are very short or very long. Also be cautious when there are many similar sightings or many photos in one area over one period of time or produced by one witness.

5) If the sighting survives 1-4, then assess its quality. Does it contribute something important to the study of UFOs? This is very unlikely for NL or distant DD cases, except in the few cases where reliable triangulations can be used to document energy output (NL) or size (NL/DD) or where instrumentation (i.e. filters, magnetic field measurement equipment, radiation counters) show something unusual, or where the maneuvers and a known distance allow assessment of acceleration/speed. Large angular size NL cases which do not show anomalous trajectories, accelerations or luminous structure are also not particularly useful. What are needed are cases which show features of structure, luminosity, maneuvering, or physical effects. These are the most important cases and require the most intense focus. Unfortunately, they are also the least common, even among unknowns.

Now, it's true I suggested that the witnesses carry out some computations to evaluate the balloon hypothesis. Why was that? Was it just to offend them, or to cast aspersions on their perceptions or evaluation of same? No. It was simply because they are the only ones who can do this. Angular size, elevation, and azimuth from each of the witnesses have not been made available (unless I've missed that also). Without them, one cannot do the calculations. But, presumably, the witnesses may still be capable of estimating these if they have not yet done so.

John, what I'm after are carefully and aggressively filtered unknowns with details sufficient to supply some level of scientific information. But, as I mentioned a fair amount of time before, I can't go to the site to investigate the case. All I can do is make suggestions. And it seems to me we are still in phase 2-3, but I suspect you think we are at or past 5. Obviously, this will lead to conflict.

I don't think there's much more I can offer than this.

Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at
<http://www.geocities.com/~mcashman>
- Original digital art, writing, and UFO research -
Author of SF novels available at...
[http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The Temporal Doorway Storefront](http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The_Temporal_Doorway_Storefront)

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

[[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](#).