



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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Aug](#) -> Re: Socorro: The Zamora 'Insignia'

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Socorro: The Zamora 'Insignia'

From: David Rudiak DRudiak@aol.com
Date: Fri, 20 Aug 1999 14:27:41 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 21 Aug 1999 12:07:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Socorro: The Zamora 'Insignia'

From: Andy Roberts <Brigantia@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 18 Aug 1999 13:44:00 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 18 Aug 1999 18:41:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Socorro: The Zamora 'Insignia'

>Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 21:53:14 -0300
>From: Donald Ledger <dledger@ns.sympatico.ca>
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Re: Socorro: The Zamora 'Insignia'

Don Ledger wrote:

>>What do you mean by identify Andy?. Do you mean when only 50
>>percent of the facts fit or 60 percent...or are you referring to
>>100 percent. We are nowhere near 100 percent yet so why blow it
>>off?

>I mean what I say, 'identify', ie work towards the state when
>the nature and origin of the Socorro object is known.

It doesn't, however, mean chasing after a lot of obvious red herrings like "hot air balloon."

>Unfortunately in this discussion all I've seen so far is a lot
>of self opinionated people stating what it can't possibly be
>because...well, because a lot of reasons I suspect.

Yes, a LOT of very good reasons, NONE of which I notice that you address, just like a true pelicanist.

We would very much like to hear how a hot air balloon can leave deep impressions in the ground. That's one heavy "hot air balloon."

Or why there was no evidence of a gondola. Do you really believe crews go INSIDE hot air balloons?

How's this? Zamora when he was CLOSE to the object (50 feet -- that's how close), said it was no larger than a small car. You obviously have no concept of how much volume a hot air balloon would have to displace to raise two men plus equipment into the air. Here's a simple calculation that shows that is would be IMPOSSIBLE for a "balloon" that size to lift that much weight.

>From the fundamental gas law

PV = nRT,

where P =Pressure, V =volume, T = Temperature, R = gas constant,
 n = number of moles of air.

Now let's look at the case of a hot air balloon of volume V . The volume doesn't change with temperature (balloon assumed to be nonextensible). Since the balloon is open to the air, the pressure P at equilibrium will equal external air pressure (no air flowing in or out of the balloon). So the product PV at equilibrium is constant regardless of air temperature inside the balloon.

This means that if the temperature is increased, some fraction of the moles of air, n , have to leak out to keep the product on the right side of the equation constant as well. So let's say external air temperature is 300 deg. Kelvin (27 deg Celsius or 81 deg Fahrenheit) and the internal air temperature is 25% greater than this, or 375 deg K. Then the number of moles inside the balloon has to decrease by 20% to keep the product on the right constant.

Thus the hot air balloon loses about 20% of its air mass and weight. This is where it gets its buoyancy. According to Archimede's principle, the loss of weight, or buoyancy, equals the weight of the fluid that is displaced (in this case, the air that flows out of the balloon as it is heated). So if the Socorro object was a balloon, the weight of the air displaced by heating of the air would have to equal the weight of the passengers plus the weight of the balloon equipment if the whole mess was to float.

Let's say the "balloonists" were real little guys, only 50 kg each or 110 pounds. That's 100 kg for the two of them. Let's say the balloon equipment (bag, heater, fuel, rigging, etc.) was only another 30 kg. This means for them to lift off, 130 kg of air had to be displaced from the main balloon.

So now the question becomes, how big does the balloon have to be such that if it loses 20% of it's air, this will equal 130 kg of mass? (These are very conservative mass figures, BTW, but I'm trying to give the absurd hot air balloon theory all the wiggle space it can get.)

The density of air at 300 deg Kelvin is about 1.3 kg/m³. Thus about 100 m³ of air equals 130 kg. Therefore, if the balloon started with 500 m³ of air at 300 deg Kelvin, heated the air to 375 deg, leaked out 20% of its original air mass, or the equivalent of 100 m³, it would now have just enough buoyancy to float the balloon plus the crew of two.

Well, how big is a car-size object? Instead of an oval like Zamora described, let's make it a box, 2 x 2 x 5 meters, or something like a VW van. That's 20 meter³ altogether.

But we need a balloon volume at least 500 meter³ in order for the hot air balloon to float. OOPS!!!! The stupid hot-air balloon hypothesis is only off by a factor of about 25. For a volume of 500 m³, a spherical balloon has to have a diameter of around 10 meters or over 30 feet. Now do you understand why hot air balloons are considerably larger than VW vans? Do you think Zamora could tell the difference from only 50 feet away?

Even if the "balloon" were filled with hydrogen, which would increase the lift by nearly a factor of 4, the object would still have been much too small to have lifted two men, even real little guys.

>It may have been a hot air balloon, it may not.

How about not?

>But look at it another way.

>* We know balloons exist

We know lots of things exist. E.g., Zamora said it was the size of a car and he initially thought it was a car. Does that mean we should consider a Chevy as a hypothesis? Chevy's exist.

>* We have some evidence to suggest that they may well have been >flown in that area of America at that time

"Some evidence to suggest," or clear-cut evidence? Even if true, what difference would it make if none of the other pertinent details fit? Why consider the Chevy hypothesis even if there were lots of Chevys in New Mexico at that time? Perhaps because Chevys don't fly? Well, neither do hot air balloons that size.

>* There is some suggestion that a platform-like structure may >have been used on balloons at this time

A "suggestion" or actual evidence? As usual, all we have is a lot of pelicanist handwaving.

>* We know that the insignia looked similar to an insignia used on a balloon

Do we?

>* Zamora radioed in that the object, 'looks like a balloon.'

Which was nothing more than a comparison to a familiar object when asked on the radio what it looked like. It doesn't mean it was a balloon or Zamora thought it was a balloon. Zamora initially thought it was an overturned car when looking at it from a distance. Does that mean we should waste a lot of time considering the Chevy hypothesis?

>* He noted the figures 'looked normal in shape'

(like human balloon pilots?)

But small like children. Footprints found afterwards were also small, quite independent of his perception. So if these were human balloon pilots, they were midget balloon pilots. Not a lot of those around.

>* He noted the 'object was smooth, no doors or windows' (like a >balloon?)

Strange "hot air balloon" that lacks seams and rigging. Where was the gondola, or do you really believe people ride inside hot air balloons? How do you imagine they got inside or steered if there were no doors or windows?

>* The object's ease of silent movement and lifting slowly is >largely consistent with a >balloon.

How about Zamora's description of how the "object was travelling very fast" after it lifted off and quickly disappeared over the mountains? Is that "largely consistent with a balloon?"

>and so on.....

And so on? We're still waiting for you to get to the beef -- at least one strong piece of evidence that anybody in his right mind should even entertain the ridiculous "hot air balloon" hypothesis.

>Now those points, to my sceptical mind,

To your highly illogical, scientifically untrained mind. But I forget -- you're a pelicanist.

>makes me think there is
>a very real possibility a hot-air balloon may have been
>involved. True, it doesn't explain some of Zamora's statement -

"Some" or most? To everybody except the pelicanists, it is blatantly obvious that the vast majority of details don't fit.

>but much of what he said fits a hot air balloon.

Essentially nothing of what he said fits a hot air balloon.

>So why this theory hasn't been taken seriously by many on
>this list astounds and worries me.

It would be truly worrisome if many on this list took this nonsense seriously. The fact that this apparently "astounds" you, is only evidence that you are as clueless as the original pelicanist himself, James Easton.

>>From: GT McCoy <gtmccoy@harborside.com>

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject:
>>Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 18:32:54 -0700

GT Mcoy opined:

>>I think that Zamora was not a fool and at least
>>knew what a hot air balloon was.

>Well, he did say it 'looks like a balloon' GT! But in any case
>no witness describes their experience perfectly and they are
>_all_ subject to the vagaries of misperception.

Funny how the "vagaries of misperception" never apply to the
details pelicanists choose to focus on, to the exclusion of all
the others that obviously don't fit.

>Zamora may have
>been a policeman but I'm afraid the UFO subject is littered with
>examples of policemen (alone and in groups) misperceiving
>everything from planes to stars as 'UFOs', chasing said
>misperceptions for miles and so on. So please don't try to tell
>me we should take a literal view of the whole sighting!

Zamora saw the whole thing up close. There were familiar objects
to scale size by, such as bushes and two humanoid figures right
next to the object. Impressions left in the ground were another
means by which the size of the object could be estimated quite
independently of Zamora's account. So, among other things, the
object was much too small to have been a hot air balloon and
clearly much too heavy.

>With any UFO case it's perfectly reasonable (before you all
>start yipping) -nay, essential - to fit any relevant parts of
>the sighting to phenomena we already know exist. Which in this
>case is why the balloon theory is perfectly feasible.

No, it's not "perfectly feasible." It's scientifically
impossible. People aren't rejecting it because they are
"opinionated." They are rejecting it because it is obviously
absurd. There are all sorts of major details that are lethal to
the hot air balloon hypothesis. Why should anybody with brains
consider the trivial details that might match when many more
important details clearly do not.

How can a hot air balloon the size of a car lift two men?

>Oh, alright, I'm a pelicanist and proud!

Uhhh, Andy, this is not something to be proud of. But
pelicanist seem to be clueless about a lot of things.

David Rudiak

[[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](#).