



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](#) -> [May](#) -> **Re: MAGONIA ETH Bulletin 01**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: MAGONIA ETH Bulletin 01

From: " Jerry Cohen" <rjcohen@li.net>
Date: Sun, 17 May 1998 22:48:21 -0400
Fwd Date: Mon, 18 May 1998 10:11:25 -0400
Subject: Re: MAGONIA ETH Bulletin 01

>From: Mendoza <101653.2205@compuserve.com> [Peter Brookesmith]
>Date: Sat, 16 May 1998 17:43:46 -0400
>Fwd Date: Sun, 17 May 1998 11:29:27 -0400
>Subject: MAGONIA ETH Bulletin 01

JC: I, for one, am all for having intelligent discussions concerning high profile UFO cases of the past & present.

>from:
><http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk/ethbull/ethbull1.html>

>MAGONIA ETH Bulletin
>No. 1, March 1998

>Editor: JOHN HARNEY

>EDITORIAL

>....snip....We hope to examine and
>re-examine interesting reports in the hope of eventually reaching
>a consensus among intelligent ufologists as to whether or not the
>ETH should be taken seriously.

JC: I am happy to see anyone (group or otherwise) willing to dig into the "details" of specific cases in the UFO field. I certainly look forward to participating in these discussions.

>-----

>THE ETH AND ITS PROPONENTS

>ETH and PSH

>....snip....What ETH supporters do not
>realise, however, is that even if a few UFO reports turned out to
>be genuine sightings of extraterrestrial space craft, then the
>PSH would still be valid, as it would still be the preferred
>explanation for the overwhelming majority of reports.

JC: Yes, what they fail to realize is; What difference would it make? If even one UFO report were decided by this group to be a "genuine sighting" it would open a Pandora's box none of us can ever close. If one visit becomes an agreed fact (all those light years to get here) everyone of us would have to wonder: How many times before or since have we been visited? Who or how many different visitors have we had? Are we being observed? To what degree? Were Barney & Betty Hill and at least some "other "contactees" actually telling the truth? Are people actually

being abducted? Will we bring back samples of flora and fauna when we travel to other far-away exotic locales? Of course. (Moon and Mars rocks were only a start) With established "actual visiting space craft," the myriad possibilities become mind boggling. Would visiting "visitors" from afar fly all the way here and just leave; or would it make more sense, if they found us interesting enough, that they might set up a base(s) where they can observe us more easily? Are we too primitive for them? The list becomes endless. Also, to the person who actually saw the "agreed upon genuine space craft," this becomes a very personal issue. To that individual, if he is quizzical by nature, it is no longer just a theory or discussion by the brain; it becomes visceral as well.

....snip....

>Brain scanning

JC: This is all well and good as long as we don't use it as an excuse in cases we cannot solve by any other means to just claim the person/people were hallucinating. Suppose the person who the machine says is "prone to hallucinations" has a real experience? Then what? What percentage of the human race does this eliminate? How many of us will be able to testify in a court of law after being tested by this machine and its interpreters?

>Hard evidence

>PSH proponents do not concern themselves with hard evidence .
>What hard evidence? In 50 years of ufology none has yet come to
>hand. All we ever get are holes in the ground, bits of slag and
>fuzzy photographs. Some of the so-called scientific
>investigations of such evidence have been pathetically inadequate
>or incompetent, as has been devastatingly revealed by serious UFO
>researchers such as Maillot (3) and Simpson. (4)

JC: And who's fault is this? Mainstream science turned its back on the topic when it accepted both the pronouncements of the USAF (Project Blue Book) and the conclusions of the Condon Colorado Report as gospel, thus leaving any possible study to a basically grass roots movement. It never seriously studied the report for itself nor listened to other science groups who did.

>....snip....Others put their faith in radar-visual
>sightings which, if taken at face value, seem to indicate the
>operation of craft whose performance vastly exceeds that of any
>earthly machines. Experts on aviation and radar should be warned
>that such folk do not take kindly to complicated, boring and
>irritatingly rational explanations of such incidents.

JC: Here we have an interesting but unsubstantiated generalization. You see, at least a few of us on this list have been waiting for someone, anyone, to do just that and have it reviewed by other scientists of equal or superior merit. To this date there hasn't been much of this type debate forthcoming. We welcome any discussion the majority on this list find within the bounds of science and common sense.

>The ETH in Britain

>....snip....One very prolific British UFO writer who manages to upset
>many of these folk is Jenny Randles.snip.... They are
>particularly unhappy about a certain basic law of ufology which
>she has derived from her extensive readings and investigations.
>This law states: The more witnesses there are, the less likely
>it's really a UFO. (5)

JC: Absolutely! This makes great sense as noted in a recent court case where many people were originally on a Long Island, NY. USA train, a gunman came in, began firing upon the witnesses, and they later bring the gunman to court, convict him on the testimony of the witnesses and sentence him because everyone testified to same. He claimed it wasn't him. Horrible system, eh what? Probably had the wrong guy. Perhaps if we only had him on radar, he might have gotten off.

Or, how about a case where a group of people see several men attempt to rob them, couldn't agree on their exact descriptions because the events happened so fast and were so traumatic, thereby momentarily numbing their normally decent observational skills which were split amongst the various robbers. I'm sure it would make sense to conclude there probably was no actual robbery

attempt. Of course it doesn't matter that the robbers' car left tire impressions on the grass where it was parked or they left footprints when they ran back to escape, or that several of the victims have nightmares for months afterwards, reliving the entire incident.

>The Oz Factor

>The importance of the law derived by Jenny Randles cannot be overestimated. It could provide the key to the whole UFO mystery.

JC: Or, it might not. Generalizations sometimes fail when confronted with specifics.

>We are thus now closer to knowing what to look for when seeking >UFO reports that tend to lend support to the ETH. They must be >multiple witness reports, preferably backed by some form of >physical evidence. There should be no serious doubt that the >reported events actually took place. The only arguments should >concern the matter of the correct explanation, based on agreed >evidence and testimony.

JC: On this, I have to say I personally agree.

>-----

>TRINIDADE ISLAND

JC: Please forgive my interjection, I believe that island is Trindade.

>The Trinidade Island sighting of 16 January 1958 should provide a >good case for consideration by ETH proponents. Four reasonably >good photographs of a mysterious Saturn-shaped flying object >taken from the deck of the Brazilian Navy vessel Almirante >Saldanha and plenty of witnesses. Jerome Clark's verdict on it >is:

>Given the number of witnesses, the results of photoanalyses both >military and civilian, and the need for debunkers to reinvent the >incident to explain it, it seems most unlikely that the Trinidade >photographs were hoaxed. (6)

>Well, what are the agreed facts of this case? I was astonished to >discover, on re-examining the literature on this incident that >some of the most basic and presumably easily ascertainable facts >are very much in dispute. For example, how many witnesses were >there? Well, it depends on whether you are a believer or a >sceptic. And if you are a sceptic it depends whether you believe >the photographs were faked or that they are genuine and that they >portray an aircraft or some natural phenomenon.

JC: or possibly a reflection of the planet Saturn.

>Dr Menzel

>originally thought the photographs showed an aircraft flying >through cloud, but eventually claimed that they were faked.

JC: and his proof for this?

>Now we come to the really crazy bit. When we ask the obvious >question: How many witnesses were there? - what is the answer? >Again, it depends entirely on whether you are a believer or a >sceptic. According to Coral Lorenzen: Rio de Janeiro's Ultima >Hora on February 21 reported that at least a hundred individuals >had witnessed the sighting of the object ... (7) The US Naval >Attachi in Rio de Janeiro, evidently a dedicated sceptic, wrote >in his report to Project Blue Book:

>The Assistant Naval Attachi ... had an opportunity to visit >aboard [the Almirante Saldanha]. The commanding officer ... had >not seen the object and was noncommittal. The executive officer >also had not seen it but, arriving shortly thereafter, had formed >the opinion that those on deck had seen it.

JC: and why would he do this unless they had?

>The captain reported >that his secretary, a LCDR, had seen it but this officer when >personally questioned avoided discussing the matter. (8)

JC: Well, say we ignore the newspaper and focus on the US Naval

"Attachi," the Captain and his secretary. The Captain says he saw it. If his secretary didn't see it, all he had to say was "I didn't see it." Would you refuse to tell someone if you _didn't_ see it? Interesting, eh?

>Sceptics insist that there were no witnesses, despite assertions
>from believers that their testimonies were published in Brazilian
>newspapers.

JC: So, were they published or not? Is there any record for that date or didn't they keep microfilm accounts of the papers there back then? and again, what about the executive officers conclusion and the Captain's assertion concerning his secretary? Are we to assume the former was wrong and the Captain made this up? How can this be? Now think about this, why would the Captain say this? It seems rather obvious to me that people did see it. Whether they would admit it to the newspapers, that is another story, especially when we realize who the people were.

> If there really were many witnesses, then the
>photographs are hardly likely to be fakes. If there were no
>witnesses, it is difficult to see how people could be fooled by a
>photographer who purported to take pictures of something which
>nobody else noticed from the crowded deck of a ship.

>Conclusions

JC: I believe it is premature to draw a conclusion concerning the witnesses until you have answered the question I asked above? If they were published, we would appear to have found for the claimants; if they were not published we may or may not have found for the skeptics. At least some if not most of the possible witnesses aboard were scientists. Would you risk your career as a scientist participating in world-wide IGY experiments to say you saw this, even if you did? We know how scientists are: if you don't have something solid or the numbers and data to prove it, it doesn't exist. Who would know better than another scientist.

Hynek, J. Allen "The UFO Experience" Henry Regnery Company 1972, hardcover

Chapter 1
The Laughter of Science

p.9 =B6 2 "the most coherent and articulate UFO reports come from people who have not given much thought to the subject and generally who are surprised and shocked by their experience."

p.9 =B6 4 "some of the very best reports have come from scientifically trained people..... These reports are usually rarely published however, because the person usually requests anonymity."

Respectfully,
Jerry Cohen

Author: Oberg/Cooper rebuttals
Website: <http://www.li.net/~rjcohen/>
UFOMind: <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/people/c/cohen/>

[[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](#).