



# 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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: UFOs not worthy of study?

From: **bruce maccabee** <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sat, 4 Jul 1998 12:40:41 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 04 Jul 1998 16:08:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFOs not worthy of study?

>From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
>Date: Thu, 2 Jul 1998 19:50:48 EDT  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: UFOs not worthy of study?

>I think some of the more eloquent, detail orientated  
>people on this list should write a response to this  
>editorial from the N.Y. Post. Bruce Mac. and  
>Stanton Friedman immediately come to mind  
>among others.

>Editorial email - [letters@nypost.com](mailto:letters@nypost.com)

>>From N.Y. Post Online Editorial

><http://www.nypostonline.com/070198/editorial/2874.htm>>

>THE TRUTH ISN'T OUT THERE.

-----  
>"Panel Urges Study of UFO Reports," ran the front-page headline  
>in Monday's Washington Post. According to that Post, an  
>independent scientific review directed by a Stanford physicist  
>said that UFO sightings need serious study. The implication: The  
>UFO industry has now received the intellectual backing of  
>serious scientists. >

>But the sad fact is that The Washington Post has been taken for  
>a good long ride by one of the more superficially respectable  
>organizations on the lunatic fringe - an association for the  
>sort of credulous academic who overdosed on science fiction as a  
>teen-ager, is a sucker for ESP and Eastern mysticism and is  
>drawn to the kind of crank who claims that Martians built the  
>pyramids.

THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE HAS BEEN SENT However, probably won't see  
th light of day outside this List.

.....

Editor,  
New York Post  
[www.nypostonline.com/070198/editorial/2874.htm](http://www.nypostonline.com/070198/editorial/2874.htm)

Dear Editor,

The Editor of the New York Post has criticized the Washington Post for being "taken for a good long ride" by the Society for Scientific Exploration. The Washington Post publicized the report of a panel of independent scientists who evaluated UFO sighting evidence and concluded that because, some sightings were unexplainable, they deserve further serious study.

The tone of the editorial indicates that the editor knows next to nothing about the present understanding of UFO sighting reports, next to nothing about the history of the subject and next to nothing about the intense debate continually being carried on within the community of scientifically oriented UFO investigators.

The editor asks, why would "actual science professors put their name to a report like this?" The implied answer is that these professional scientists are "given to wild fantasies." The editor presents this idea with certainty, even citing previous examples of scientists with wild ideas (e.g. Isaac Newton, Michael Faraday) without stating that he/she had actually talked to any of the UFO panel scientists to assess their level of "wildness".

According to the editor, the SSE panel says the reason UFO sightings have never been taken seriously is fear of ridicule or because of a government conspiracy. The editor calls this a "big lie." It is clear from this that the editor really does not understand what has been going on. The fear of ridicule is real. I was on a call-in talk show in the Washington, D.C. area and heard Dr. Jay Melosh, one of the panel scientists and a UFO skeptic, tell the talk show host that for a young scientist to become publicly interested in studying UFO sightings could be professional suicide. The implication is that such studies should only be carried out by tenured professors or scientists with well established backgrounds in conventional science. As for the government conspiracy aspect, it is clear from the historical record, available to anyone including the editor for review (e.g., the UFO files of Air Force Intelligence released within the last 12 years, the UFO files of the FBI released 20 years ago and now on line at [www.fbi.gov](http://www.fbi.gov) and the UFO files of the CIA released some 20 years ago) that the US intelligence agencies and the Air Force in particular took these sightings, especially the ones by Air Force personnel, very seriously. Furthermore, according to the FBI "X" file (yes, it includes sighting reports entitled "Security Matter - X"; look it up in the web documents!) in 1952 Air Force intelligence told the FBI that 3% of the sightings could not be explained and that the objects reported in these sightings "may possibly be ships from another planet such as Mars." (FBI document dated July 29, 1952). On the same day that AF Intelligence told this to the FBI, in a press conference the AF General in charge of Intelligence, John Samford, told the American public that all the sightings were natural phenomena. This sort of contradiction between what the Air Force would say privately and what it would say publicly has led to the present state of confusion over just what information the Air Force uncovered year ago. It is no wonder that the citizens of this country suspect that they have not been told the whole story.

The editor correctly points out that UFO sightings have been "exhaustively investigated by genuinely openminded people over and over again." The editor then states that "there is no - repeat, no - convincing evidence of space aliens visiting the earth in suspiciously Hollywoodesque flying saucers." I suppose the crux of the matter here is not "Hollywoodesque" but rather what one accepts as "convincing evidence." Under ordinary non-UFO conditions multiple witness, daytime reports of phenomena seen clearly and for considerable time durations (many seconds to minutes) and perhaps supported by film, video or radar would be at least mildly convincing to the intelligent person. There are such UFO sightings (several of which were evaluated by the panel and left unexplained) for which there seems to be no possibility of misidentification, delusion or hoax. At the very least these sightings point toward something new, something unexplained. Some of these sightings also involve descriptions of objects which seem to be constructed craft of some sort. (Note: Hollywood, starting in the 1950's, has followed the UFO/saucer sightings with the creation of "Hollywoodesque" saucers, not the other way around.) It is certainly true that the field of UFO research is littered with

the hopes, dreams and faulty theories of many people who "want to believe," but the hard core of the UFO evidence does not lie within this litter. If the editor would take time to look beyond the Hollywood glitter and the tabloid press, the editor would find that the UFO subject is grounded in much more solid information.

The value of information is in what you do as a result of it. One has the option to ignore it or to pursue it. UFO information is of this sort. Clearly the editor intends to ignore it, which is fine. However, the editor should apply his/her own criterion of "sweet reason", leave out "true religion" and not criticize scientists who do wish to pursue this information in a rigorous manner.

Yours truly,  
Dr. Bruce Maccabee

---

[ [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](#).