



# 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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: 'UFO Sphere/Orb' over Brooklyn, NY

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>  
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 1998 22:59:45 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 14 Feb 1998 09:58:11 -0500  
Subject: Re: 'UFO Sphere/Orb' over Brooklyn, NY

From: "Tom Burnett" <burnettc@gte.net>  
To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@globalserve.net>  
Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: 'UFO Sphere/Orb' over Brooklyn, NY  
Date: Tue, 10 Feb 1998 05:33:08 -1000

<snip>

>Thank you for your comments. I agree with them to a point, but  
>my position is not exactly the way you present it. First, I  
>neither dispute Alex's sighting report nor his photograph. What  
>I dispute is a tendency, on the part of people who claim to be  
i>investigators, to infer data which cannot be supported by the  
>evidence. In this case an eyewitness report and a photograph are  
t>he evidence. Unfortunately, neither the report nor the  
>photograph are clear and undisputable evidence anything, and  
>certainly not of the moral and ethical propensities of  
>extraterrestrials.

I would certainly agree that one cannot infer moral and ethical propensities of ET's from the sighting and photo alone. (If one had a priori knowledge about ET morals and ethics then one might be able to use determinet whether or not the sighting and photo were in some way consistent or inconsistent with the ethics and morals. But since we have no such a priori knowledge the sighting can do no more than establish that some UNKNOWN PHENOMENON - possibly ET - was or was not present at th time of the sighting.)

>This is not an investigation since no one disputes Alex's  
>sighting report.

Well.....,

I suppose that if everyone accepted the report entirely "as written" then the only argument would be over the interpretation. But an "investigation" to determine details of the reports could be needed to make the correct interpretation.

>This is an exercise in futility.

On a larger scale perhaps.... since the rest of the world probably won't notice this any more than it notices numerous other more spectacular sightings. Futile because we already have THOUSANDS of sightings..... do we need another?

On the other hand, if the "investigation" establish that the UNKNOWN REALLY DID OCCUR (the sighting is inexplicable), then we can perhaps use the information in this sighting to help clarify whatever th nature of teh phenomenon is (OK, for you true believers, the information might provide some insight into what

"they" are doing here. On the other hand it might provide no such information. But you can't tell which without the "investigation." or analysis.)

> The object has gone on its  
> merry way and no matter how much everyone argues about what it  
> may or may not have been, there is no possible way to know. Even  
> if a similar object appears as you read this, you cannot know  
> whether it is the same object as before or whether it has the  
> same purpose. When people start rationalizing evidence instead  
> of dispassionately looking at the evidence at hand, the  
> investigation becomes an imagination contest.

Yes.

Theories are needed to understand data... but theories which "excuse" data are not very useful. The data (sighting, photo) are real. They mean something. When one tries to compare the data to a preferred theory, one is usually or at least often, confronted with inconsistencies. Some of these may be excusable (bad data points, etc.)... but when excuses go off the deep end... it is time to stop theorizing and go back for another look at the data or... admit defeat! (The data can't be understood.)

> Let's  
> develop a focus for all of this. We can start a foundation, get  
> some sponsors, and offer a million dollars to any non-government  
> entity who can demonstrate clear and unambiguous proof of first  
> contact. Then turn the investigators loose on the applicants.  
> That would give UFOlogy a shot in the arm and generate some good  
> press for the cause. And, it would also open up every claim to  
> public scrutiny. I think I can find the sponsors. And no, I am  
> not joking.

Not joking, eh? Something like this has been tried in the past. In the 1970's the National Enquirer offered a megabuck, if I recall correctly, for indisputable proof. They also offered \$50K per year... or some such sum... for the best sighting of the year as determined by an independent panel. There have been other offers (seems to me a British liquor company..also had an offer years ago). This is not the same as a foundation, but the incentive was there. And the Enquirer got lots of entries into the contest... but no big winner (did have annual winners, but none of these was considered conclusive).

Of course a well funded foundation could provide another shot in the arm. The conditions aren't the same as they were 20 years ago BCE4 (Before Close Encounters of the 4th Kind). I suspect there would now be more entries with potentially better data (multiple witness, video recorded, etc.).

And of course, it is my duty as former chairman of the Fund for UFO Research to say that if you are aware of major sources of funding... contact me directly..

Search for other documents to/from: [brumac](#) | [burnettc](#)

---

[ [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](#).