



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

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [May](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Rendlesham Unravalled -NOT

From: James Easton <pulsar@compuserve.com>
Date: Sat, 2 May 1998 20:43:41 -0400
Fwd Date: Sat, 02 May 1998 21:17:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Rendlesham Unravalled -NOT

Regarding...

>From: georgina@easynet.co.uk [Georgina Bruni]
>Date: Thu, 30 Apr 1998 13:13:26 +0100
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Rendlesham Unravalled -NOT

Georgina wrote:

>Ufologists waited in anticipation....

I doubt it!

>when armchair researcher, James Easton...

LOL!

As they say, life's a bitch.

On the 25th April, discussing with Peter Brookesmith some queries re the Orford Ness lighthouse and Shipwash lightship, I wrote to Peter:

"I think it's come to the point where I need to go down there and sort this out for myself.

[...]

I intend to make the pilgrimage next weekend".

So, following a couple of days and nights spent touring this most pleasant area with my son, taking the opportunity to visit key sites in the story and acquire some relevant local knowledge, I'm writing from a hotel room in Woodbridge, on the 'Boyz Go To Bentwaters '98 Tour'.

Let me know if you want the t-shirt!

>...announced through the Internet that he was about to disclose new
>information that would seriously question the Rendlesham Forest UFO
>witness statements.

>When his paper, titled "Rendlesham Unravalled" was posted to all and
>sundry, it turned out to be "not quite" what some had expected.

I'll bet.

Still, it did 'disclose new information that would seriously

question the Rendlesham Forest UFO witness statements'.

>Whilst Easton has done a good job in bringing his findings to the
>public forum...

His armchair is suitably amused.

>Using one of the original "Rendlesham" researchers as back up,
>namely, Jenny Randles, to verify his case, certainly helped to
>promote it, but it hasn't amused Ms Randles.

The only private quote I had 'used' with Jenny's permission was a
brief extract from her summary that:

"Now Rendlesham is at best half the case it was and may turn out
to have been little of substance after all. Its likelihood of
being a real alien contact was never high and is now almost zero.
If it proves even less than that then any honest UFOlogist should
seriously think about the subject they consider so all important.
Might it not be that its importance is not as they assume? And
you can quote me on that".

Any further references come from Jenny's books and are sourced.

>She quotes:

>"My principle concern, whilst I applaud equally James Easton's
>attempts to solve this case, is that I feel he has been
>misrepresenting me.

See above.

I think you'll find that Jenny's main concern is that there are
still some issues she doesn't believe have been resolved. As
Jenny knows, we hardly disagree on most aspects of the case,
however, it's up to Jenny if she wishes to express all of Jenny
Randles' views.

>Ian Ridpath informs via e-mail....

>'James Easton has now found contemporary documents that the airmen
>and Charles Halt knew the flashing light they were chasing was the
>lighthouse all along....they admit they eventually did manage to
>identify the light.'

>Has anyone confirmed this with the witnesses?

See 'Rendlesham Unravalled' for further insight.

>Says Jenny Randles. "Right from the beginning, Burroughs and
>Penniston had always insisted that their statements were not the full
>story and were watered down.

This is hugely debatable, however...

>James Easton's paper does pose serious questions that have yet to be
>answered by the principal witnesses.

Yes... they remain unanswered.

>There's also the facts about the witness statements which I explained
>to him, but that do not appear in his paper.

>So why didn't he mention this in his paper ?

It's not clear where you are quoting Jenny or adding to her
remarks.

Again, I have neither the obligation or the time to cover Jenny's
lengthy musings, not all of which would necessarily be accepted
as 'facts'. Jenny is quite capable of speaking for herself.

As noted, I had incorporated her summary conclusions, which were
in response to being sent a draft of 'Rendlesham Unravalled'.

>When I alerted Colonel (Ret) Charles Halt to the fact that Easton had
>been provided with these statements, he was most alarmed and replied.

You(?) 'alerted' him?

>"How did he get them, I'm the only one who has those statements."

And the reason that Halt, celebrated critic of the 'cover up',
seems to object to this information being made public is...?

>So who leaked these statements out?

'Leaked', as in someone disclosed evidence that wasn't supposed
to be revealed?

Isn't the question why, during the past 18 years, they weren't
publicly volunteered as evidence.

>The originals did indeed contain a hand written note on one of the
>statements, namely Cabansag's...

This is incorrect. Four of the five statements in fact contain
Halt's brief, hand written notes.

>...in which Halt writes: that he doesn't think that he (Cabansag) is
>telling the full story.

>Why has Easton failed to mention this vital piece of information ?

Why would Halt's opinion, as opposed to the detailed, documented
account from Cabansag himself, be comparatively vital?

I have in private correspondence with several people mentioned
these notes and the problem they posed.

Coincidentally, I did so in that same letter to Peter Brookesmith
and referring to Chris Arnold's published recollections, which
come up again in a moment, stated:

"As you will see from the published testimony, he claims
Burroughs was prone to overreacting, which is exactly what Halt
has noted on the copy of Burroughs' statement. I excluded Halt's
hand-written notes from any photocopies or scans of that
statement I made available. I would have to consider them too
personal for publication".

Well, maybe it's regrettably now necessary to clarify that Halt
seems to have forgotten exactly what he wrote about Burroughs and
Penniston, not entirely complimentary in both cases.

Halt's opinions or character assessments were either of no
relative importance in view of other developments or were
considered too personal to publish in public without his express
permission. He is more than welcome to confirm what his notes
contain, although infinitely more appreciated would of course be
his response to the many questions raised by the original witness
affidavits he holds.

Incidentally, thank you for helping to further corroborate that
these documents originated from Halt.

>Another witness that Easton produces is Chris Arnold who claims he
>was the one who made the report to the Suffolk Constabulary. That
>may well be genuine.

It looks that way and was the only reference I made to Chris
Arnold. It helps tie-up the correct dating of both incidents,
which are wrong in Halt's memo to the MoD.

>Halt confirmed that Arnold was at the Woodbridge base that night, but
>insists he was NOT involved in the incident.

I hadn't claimed he was, so why bring it up?

>Why didn't Easton mention the Arnold letters in his paper?

I don't understand, unless you haven't read 'Rendlesham Unravalled' and are oblivious that other than the above noted and undisputed point, Chris Arnold isn't in fact produced as a 'witness' at all.

>No offense to Ridpath, but as a researcher myself, I don't pay too
>much attention to TV shows on this subject . Give me the facts
>please!

Assuming you had read 'Rendlesham Unravalled', which seems to be debatable, you had significant new facts and in apparently speaking to Col. Halt, an appropriate opportunity.

What did you do with them?

We of course look forward to an appropriate update and corrections appearing in a forthcoming 'Hot Gossip'.

James.
E-mail: pulsar@compuserve.com

[[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](#).