



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](#) -> [Sep](#) -> **Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell

From: **Tim Matthews** <matthews@zetnet.co.uk>
Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 19:48:12 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 08:20:22 -0400
Subject: Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell

>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell
>Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 22:11:14 -0300

>>Date: Mon, 21 Sep 1998 00:45:20 -0500 (CDT)
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: Dennis <dstacy@texas.net>
>>Subject: Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell

>>>From: Stanton Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>>Subject: Re: -[For The Record]- P-1947: Death of Roswell
>>>Date: Fri, 18 Sep 1998 21:28:07 -0300

<snip>

>>>I just wanted to point out that the odds of a mid air collision
>>>between 2 saucers were pretty good since according to Ted
>>>Bloecher's report 40% of the 850+ sightings he recorded for the
>>>wave of 1947 involved more than one object seen at a time.

>>What the hell does "pretty good" mean? Most military operations
>>are conducted in tandem or formation. Does that make the odds of
>>a mid-air collision "pretty good"? No, it simply slightly
>>increases the already low odds of one aircraft malfunctioning
>>and colliding with another one. "Pretty good" is perfectly
>>meaningless. If the odds of a mid-air collision were really
>>"pretty good," then our own military probably wouldn't fly in
>>formation at all.

>>>Think of a pilot and a wingman. If they ran into a totally
>>>unexpected lightning bolt or a radar beam which we know was on
>>>because of an anticipated V-2 launch with data being required
>>>72,48,24,4 hours before launch, then the guidance or propulsion
>>>system of one or both might have been temporarily disrupted.

>>Hedging your bets, aren't you? If radar and lightning bolts were
>>so deadly to tandem-flying UFOs -- and remember the latter were
>>constructed of purportedly indestructible material -- why
>>weren't they falling out of the skies left and right during the
>>1947 wave? In other words, out of Ted Bloecher's 850 reports,
>>how many were of two or more UFOs crashing simultaneously to
>>earth? It wouldn't be one, would it? Does 850 divided by one
>>represent "pretty good" odds? Maybe Dave's splendid Roswell
>>paper backs you up on this logical fallacy, too? Or maybe Dave
>>begs to disagree? Who knows?

>>>I am personally convinced that were indeed 2 sets of bodies, one
>>>in the Plains, and one set a few miles from the Brazel debris
>>>field.

>>Which is partly the problem, but let me see if I've got this
>>straight: One UFO crashed on the Foster ranch in two parts, one
>>part of which had no bodies, the other part of which had all the
>>bodies. And a second UFO in one part crashed with bodies on the
>>Plains. Am I correct in assuming this means you don't accept
>>Kaufmann et al's account of yet another crash site, with bodies,
>>nearer to Roswell? I keep telling everyone I'm confused about
>>Roswell, but Splendid Dave just makes fun of me. I keep waiting
>>for him to straighten us out all on the competing claims about
>>Roswell, but he just accuses me of debunker double standards and
>>changing the subject, and then ignores my entreaty. Once again,
>>since you think Dave's paper is so splendid, I'd like to know
>>how splendid he thinks yours is. He could begin by telling us
>>his objective assessment of how many UFOs crashed, when and
>>where, and which ones involved body recoveries.

<snip>

>Anybody know whether mid-air collisions are more or less likely
>to involve planes flying more or less together. or simply flying
>into another plane at random? The point is that many sightings
>involve 2 or more UFOs. If none did, then the idea of a
>collision would seem far less likely.

And what about the revelation in the October edition of the UK
magazine 'Focus' that some sort of glider with attached balloon
was being tested at the time?

How many crash sites now? Eight?

Of course if it isn't aliens nobody takes any notice - an
indictment of Ufology if ever there was one.....

[[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](#).