



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: Sheffield and Flying Triangles

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Sheffield and Flying Triangles

From: **Tim Matthews** <matthews@zetnet.co.uk>
Date: Sat, 11 Jul 1998 07:09:32 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 16:37:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield and Flying Triangles

>From: Max Burns <AlienHypel@aol.com>
>Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 09:13:54 EDT
>To: Updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Sheffield and Flying Triangles

>I think the focus seems to have been shifted by some onto the
>Tornado jet aspect of this incident..Let us not forget that
>there are five very clear witnesses to the flying triangle. which
>was there and was sighted by a number of people who are not my
>friends, and only know me because of my investigation into this
>incident.

>I feel that these questions need an answer.

>A) Why would they be test flown, low, over heavily built up
>areas of the U.K? Such an aircraft would be designated 'Top
>Secret' and normally flown from establishments such as Boscombe
>Down.

In the UK it would be designated 'Most Secret' which it most certainly is/has been.

There have been many sightings in and around RAF Boscombe Down. These have featured in a number of military aviation magazines. RNAS Yeovilton is also a focal point. The US Navy has a track record of black programmes stretching back over 50 years and it has been responsible for many of the 'unknowns' within the UFO literature.

>B) If they are Stealth aircraft, why would they fly around at
>night, illuminated like "Christmas Trees" or alternatively, why
>would they fly close to airports, without any navigation or
>strobe lights?

You argue later that they are illuminated like Christmas trees - so which are they - lit or unlit?!

Who says that these are specifically 'stealth' aircraft? I doubt that Max knows much about stealth.

I have investigated over 100 'triangle' cases and on many occasions these have had standard lighting patterns. Check out Tony Gonsalves report on the Hudson Valley flap.....

>C) If they were undertaking a normal night flying test program,
>why would they undertake such irresponsible behavior as to
>silently hover near an isolated witness or car full of
>witnesses, far from any airfield?

What do you mean "normal night flying test programme"? In many areas there are no restrictions up to app. 2,000ft. Many triangles are NOT silent and in any case we know that some of them are large LTA platforms. The use of advanced propellers enables good maneuverability and near-silent operation. In the UK at least, it is not far from one airfield to another....

On the question of noise, this could be simply explained by prevailing weather conditions and/or wind direction.

>D) It has been said that a triangle is an excellent design for >flight and this could explain their design, but what could >explain the FT's 'broad side first' movement, seen by numerous >witnesses?

'Broad side first' seen on a couple of occasions and almost certainly further evidence of the inability of witnesses to get their reports straight. I saw a report of this in Fowler's document - and remain unimpressed. Having said that, if you did some effective research you would know that the 1950s 'Silver Bug' project allowed for similar motion in flight....edge-on operation etc.

>E) If they are under Air Traffic Control in the U.K, why have >they been observed frequently flying over Nuclear Power >Stations, a restricted 'no flying' area?

This argument has already been fought and won. There is NO evidence to suggest that these things have been flying near such facilities (at least in the UK - Indian Point was an interesting business and is dealt with in my book). A couple of convenient inventions have added to the myth....In fact, despite the fact that Sizewell is supposedly a focus for these illegal visitations going back several years nobody has one photograph or second of video footage to substantiate these claims. In another case the North Lancs 'group' filmed some lights in a triangular pattern (no evidence of an actual craft of course) and showed this in public in 1995. The footage was filmed 3 miles from a Nuclear power station and was said to have 'flown towards Heysham Nuclear Power Station'. This is not true and there is no evidence to substantiate the claim. In any case, the group knew about this sighting in advance because I was there at the meeting when they discussed filming it!

>F) Could the UK afford to develop such a Stealth aircraft as the >'Flying Triangle', when the British Aircraft industry currently >has to co-operate with several other countries to develop the >'Eurofighter'. Without this >co-operation the UK couldn't afford to proceed alone.

Given that the funding would be related to a classified defence project then the obvious answer is yes. British Aerospace, in conjunction with Lockheed-Martin, cooperated in the construction of the Special Projects Site at Warton, situated on the Southern tip of the airfield and well away from the other goings-on...

Eurofighter is all about jobs. I'd have some F-22's if I was making the choice.

Check out your UKUSA history....

'Jane's' reports at least =A3100 million spent on facilities to 1996. This is most likely a joint UK-USA project. How much do you think a couple of prototypes would cost?

Why is hovering seen to be such a big deal?

>G) It is claimed that the 'Flying Triangle' is a product of the >British Aerospace Establishment at Warton, Lancs. If this is the >case, why was Simon Lewis of the North Lancashire UFO >Investigation Group, invited to address a meeting of British >Aerospace engineers at Warton to explain what the 'Flying >Triangle' thing is all about. They had heard of the huge FT >craft and exclaimed "Its not ours!" However this does not >preclude the possibility that a smaller 'Stealth' triangular >craft may be undertaking flying trials over the UK

The big lie from Max. I have claimed that SOME of the smaller FTs have been built there.

Why is this? Because BAe ADMITTED in public that they were working on advanced stealth and UAV projects. The work is mentioned in articles by Jane's Defence Weekly and Jane's Military Aircraft in the last three years. Not to mention the many sightings in and around the base including those made by ex-RAF personnel. I saw it too. Check out my book.

What about the frequent visits to my Lancashire UFO Society meetings by BAe personnel, as witnessed by several Northern Ufologists?

As to Simon Lewis, he like Max and other so-called 'researchers' knows very little. Have they ever heard of 'need-to-know', compartmentation, security and classification? They have failed to understand that all too many Ufologists are useful idiots whose convenient fascination for the 'alien' clouds the issue totally. Luckily, nobody in the North West believes that these are anything other than terrestrial craft.

The public seems to understand this better than the average Ufologist.....

Lewis hardly had access to the restricted areas at Warton!

In any case, I have spoken, as have military aviation researchers, to people involved in the stealth programme in the UK. They all say the same thing. That there is an aircraft in the air already.

>H) If the FT was due to exercise in Belgium air space during the >period 1989/90, why did the Belgium Air Force have no knowledge >of the FT flight plan? Why was it necessary for the Belgium Air >Force to 'scramble' a group of F16's to intercept the 'Flying >Triangles'?

Same thing. Best to try it out in Belgium. The FT actually flew from the UK and as I have pointed out time and time again, there was no relationship between the object seen at low level and the so-called 'UFO' performing 'amazing maneuvers' and playing catch with the two Belgian AF interceptors. Their radar systems were faulty and they locked onto each other. Check out van Utrecht's research with which I (75%) concur...

The pilots never actually saw the UFO did they?

The whole thing was badly handled by the Belgian AF and they were leaned on by the US - hence all those intel' docs indicating US interest. What better way to conduct a psychological warfare operation than use one of their LTA vehicles?

Note that the MOD via Nick Pope conducted its' own small campaign of misinformation by allowing him to pontificate about 'alien spacecraft'. In fact, Pope emerged onto the scene in 1993 - at the same time that we experienced the new wave of triangle sightings - in order to deny UK government involvement in the joint UK-USA programme and to direct attention away from the reality of terrestrial technologies.....

>I) We have had reports of FT's dating back to the mid-50's, why >hasn't the technology been revealed by now? The American >authorities wasted no time in disclosing the use of Stealth >aircraft in the recent Gulf War.

Many of the delta-wing projects were derived from German technology and I suspect a little embarrassment re; use of ex-nazi scientists via 'Paperclip'.

I do Jack Northrop an injustice; German-American technology!

Often, these things (postwar Horten wings) were not developed through to the operational stage. In addition, there is interservice rivalry to consider as well as the fact that once something is classified it can remain so for years.

Take for example the CIC documents released in 1994 (a wait of some 47 years), which you should read, which tell us that the Horten wings and other German advanced designs were being developed in the US and reported as 'flying saucers'. Check out the similarity between the Horten parabola and Ken Arnold's drawings of his June 24th 1947 saucer sighting.....

And then there is the USAF Intelligence document 100-203-79 which states that Horten flying wings (tested in the US from 1947) 'most closely resemble' the 'flying saucers' reported by both civilian and military personnel.

>J) If the FT is British (or American) what is it doing flying >around Japan, Guatemala, Belgium, Spain, Canada, Brazil etc.?

The US has bases and interest around the world does it not? Remember that at least 9 out of 10 sightings are misidentifications in any case. Three lights in a tri pattern is not a triangular 'UFO'.

Spot the coincidence - flashpoint North Korea - triangles sighted over Korea and Japan and other places.

>K) Are we being confronted with both a huge extra-terrestrial >craft and a smaller military Stealth development

Afraid not, Max. The larger triangles are actually not as advanced and relate to lighter-than-air technologies - designed from 1965 by the way.....

>With regard to the Sheffield incident

Which we know was not really an incident at all...

>As to whether this triangle was ET or Terrestrial in nature I >can only call it on how I see it, whether it ET or Terrestrial >or the jury is still out..

No, Max. The Ufologists are still denying the reality of the situation and the intelligence services are pissing themselves laughing - especially at you.

[[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](#).