



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: The Next Step

From: **Jim Deardorff** <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Sat, 14 Feb 1998 11:50:23 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 14 Feb 1998 21:17:31 -0500
Subject: Re: The Next Step

>From: "Tom Burnett" <burnettc@gte.net>
>To: <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: The Next Step
>Date: Fri, 13 Feb 1998 08:10:16 -1000

>> To: updates@globalserve.net
>> Subject: UFO UpDate: The Next Step [was: Re: 'UFO Sphere/Orb'...]

Tom wrote:

>[...]

>This thread
>started when someone decided that judgements concerning the
>morality and ethics of a race of ETs could be made from an
>unidentifiable still photograph. I disagreed with that, and
>still do, [...]

In case it might be inferred that that "someone" was me, let me set the record straight. I said that much could be deduced about the ethics/morality of ETs responsible for overseeing the sightings of the past 50 years from examining the deniability factor they so often fed into those sightings. This should not have been distorted into "from an unidentifiable still photograph"! Distortions like this don't belong within the true scientific method, and shouldn't be tolerated on this list.

As Bruce Maccabee said in a post today:

"The conventional/straight world accepts the idea that there are no UFOs. Therefore each sigting must be explainable. Therefore there is an explanation for each sighting. When a sighting comes along one or more skeptics comes up with an explanation for the sighting. "It was Venus.... it was Mars.... it was an airplane... it was a balloon..." ... whatever, depending upon the sighting."

So let's keep Alex's sighting & photos in context of previous ones of a similar nature.

Bruce went on:

"However, rarely_if_ever_does a skeptic "test" the explanation' against the available sighting data. Instead, what usually happens is that the skeptic finds an explanation for one part of the sighting and then "publishes" (I can cite specific examples in my own experience if anyone is interested.) The general public/press/scientific community then asses the sighting has been explained and goes on its merry way."

Obviously, a capable ufologist doesn't operate that way, and continually ignore the bulk of the data that came before the particular sighting in question. Instead, he sees how it may tie in with the past data.

I went on to give examples of types of sightings where the UFO craft was disguised to appear, with a rough first glance, like some known object. Obviously the details of their appearance and/or behavior/maneuverability allowed the impressed witness to realize the object was quite remarkably different from the mundane object it may have cursorily resembled, and so it was a UFO sighting. But the negative skeptic ignores these differences and latches onto the similarities only. This saves him/her from believing what is unacceptable to his/her "belief system." This saves him/her from going beserk.

Quite often, such a belief system cannot imagine that what advanced technology and understanding thousands of years advanced to our own could do would indeed seem like magic to us, as even Sagan once realized. And quite often it can't admit that alien intelligence could be greatly advanced over our own.

I believe Alex's orb sighting is probably one more sighting of this nature. Agreed it may only be a coincidence that it resembled a lens flare, or as Bob Shell would emphasize, perhaps it is a lens flare and the real UFO eluded capture on film. (But Alex's other photos of it, though less distinct, suggest this isn't the case.)

We need to keep in mind the category of UFO sightings wherein the object passed itself off, under cursory examination (but not detailed or complete examination), as a mundane human or natural object, and not forget that this category of UFO exists when we come across others of the same nature. Don't treat Alex's evidence in isolation from the rest of the UFO phenomenon.

Jim Deardorff

Search for other documents to/from: [deardorj](#) | [burnette](#)

[[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](#).