



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 99 09:58:15 PDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 12:20:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 22:47:26 +0100

>>From: Roy Hale <roy.hale@virgin.net>
>>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 12:34:10 +0100

>>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>,
>>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>>Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1999 12:52:48 +0100

Hi, Jenny,

>I think the probability of other life in the universe is high.
>I think the probability it has visited our solar system at some
>time in the history of this neck of the space-time continuum
>maybe 50/50. I think the probability it has done so during the
>few millenia we have been here maybe 1 in 100.

On what do you base those odds, besides sheer guesswork?

>But that's not what you asked. In fact what you asked is a very

>different question. Have any UFO sightings anywhere ever been
>the result of an alien craft?

>Its possible. Of course it is. But look at the facts. The vast
>majority of cases (I mean 99% of them) absolutely do not offer
>any indication of that origin at all. They are, in fact, other
>things such as IFO and UAP. The disturbing prevalence of this
>data has to make you wary of assuming too much about the 1%
>because too often we have seen promising cases crumble even
>years down the track.

Curious. In a lecture you gave in Sydney in 1991, at a
conference we both attended, you said you considered the ETH a
likely explanation for the most puzzling UFO reports. I recall
your saying that your view of the UFO phenomenon was now much
like my own. I have enormous respect for you, Jenny, but it
seems to me, as one who's been reading your work for years, that
your views are all over the map and are consistent in only one
thing: their constant changeability. There certainly are worse
sins, of course, but I can't help wondering, given past
experience, how long you'll be holding to your current
neoskeptical course.

In your response you might inform list members exactly what a "UAP" is supposed to be.

I would also be interested in knowing which "promising cases" allegedly have crumbled. The classic UFO cases, in my reading, have stood up pretty well to years of sustained attack by would-be debunkers, including -- mostly recently -- your friend James Easton's failed attempt to identify Arnold's UFOs as pelicans. Now the neoskeptics are hinting darkly that Arnold's case has finally been explained (is this explanation #243 or #244? I'm afraid I've lost count at this point), but they can't tell us about it. And the relentlessly self-promoting Kal Korff promises an "expose" (his word) of the Hill case in the near future. Will someone wake me when it's over?

>As we do not have anything approaching scientific evidence -
>that is alien DNA, non earthly technology conclusively in our
>possession, photos of landed craft or aliens that are close to
>probative rather than a joke, etc. The sort of things any police
>officer would need to accept, for instance, to seek to prove
>that a crime has been committed, then the only proper answer to
>give to this question is not yes or no but maybe. The evidence,
>quite simply, is not nil but is certainly inconclusive.

In your opinion. In a statement he made to the UFO history conference in Chicago this past May, historian of astronomy Steven Dick said something to the effect that science has no one definition of, or universal agreement to, what constitutes "evidence." He cited the UFO controversy as one area where this issue is being played out.

In this context it may well be that scientists in the future, and maybe the not-so-distant future, will say that visitation by ET intelligence should have been evident as early as (say) the Nash-Fortenberry sighting of 1952. Or maybe the RB-47 case of 1957. Pick your solid, unexplained report. It is entirely possible that science will eventually decide that the "leap of faith" you mention was not taken by advocates of UFO reality but by those who maintained the stubborn belief, in the face of serious contrary evidence, that no matter what all UFO sightings would all resolve into comfortingly prosaic causes. They haven't, but hey, who's going to let a little reality intrude on somebody's dreams?

Jerry Clark

[[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](#).