



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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Jul](#) -> **Re: Sturrock Report**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Sturrock Report

From: "Jerome Clark" <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 07 Jul 98 10:07:24 PDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 07 Jul 1998 13:22:46 -0400
Subject: Re: Sturrock Report

>Date: Tue, 07 Jul 1998 13:33:05 +0100
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: John Rimmer <j_rimmer@library.croydon.gov.uk>
>Subject: Sturrock Report

>The P.L.A.Driftwood International Conspiracy in Exile is
>operating on a borrowed computer at the moment, so I am unable
>to quote extracts from previous postings. My apologies.

>I am puzzled and not a little irritated by the increasingly
>triumphalist attitudes of the ETH proponents to the muted and
>entirely reasonable conclusions of the Sturrock Panel. As far as
>I can see the only difference between their conclusions and the
>Condon Report is that, unlike Condon, Sturrock feels that
>science *would* be advanced by further study of the UFO
>phenomenon. So do I.

Ah, those PSHers. They just love to spin, don't they?

>Why Jerry, Bruce Maccabee and the others feel that this is any
>sort of endorsement of the ETH is baffling. They say they found
>NO EVIDENCE of any extraterrestrial involvement in the cases
>they found puzzling. You really cannot be much clearer than
>this. Perhaps the real achievement of Sturrock is to come up with
>a statement that both Jerry Clark, CSICOP and Magonia can agree
>with!

Spin, spin, spin. Of course the panel was not there to decide whether UFOs are ET or not. How John interprets what Bruce, I, and others have written as claiming the panel's conclusions as an "endorsement of the ETH" is baffling; but then I find much PSH rhetoric baffling. Has John been off-line these past days?

Hey, John, listen up:

The panel was to look at a limited number of cases to see whether further investigation of the UFO phenomenon is warranted. Participants whom I've heard interviewed since then have not ruled out the ETH as a possible explanation at the other end of the scientific investigation that they say ought to happen. The panel's concern was with what it had in front of it, which was not enough to establish the correctness of ANY hypothesis about UFOs, beyond the consideration that the phenomenon has physical dimensions, conventional explanations have so far failed for the most puzzling cases, and further investigation is certainly warranted. Of course, knowing that these sorts of concerns could lead to a renewed scientific look

at the ETH, New Scientist, New York Post, CSICOP, and other guardians of orthodoxy have waxed hysterical in the past few days. I am glad you are on our side on this one.

If you agree that further research on the physical aspects of the UFO phenomenon is a good idea, John, and can face up to the possibility that such research may lead to findings you won't like very much, then your quarrel isn't with me, Bruce, Greg, Mark, or anybody else who is more open-minded about the ETH than you are. Your quarrel is with CSICOP and the debunkers with whom Magonia has effected a de facto alliance in recent years. Direct your complaints to the guys like Klass and other UFOphobes whose books and wisdom you can't praise enough in Magonia.

In the meantime, don't try to make extravagant and unwarranted claims about the panel's mandate. The PSH and the debunkers have taken it in the chops in the past few days, and if you're man enough to take it, you have my respect. I hope to see an editorial in the next Magonia sticking it not to me for a change (I can't be a subject of much interest to your readers, I should think) but to the Sturrock panel's enemies, who seem ironically to have a clearer-eyed understanding of its significance than you do.

Jerry Clark

[[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](#).