



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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> **Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

From: **Jim Deardorff** <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 13:25:23 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 18:18:37 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@GlobalServe.net>
>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>Date: Tue, 20 Jul 99 09:58:15 PDT

>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 comfortably prosaic causes.
>They haven't, but hey, who's going to let a little reality
>intrude on somebody's dreams?
>
>Jerry Clark

Hello Jerry,

I'd like to step in here to second your last two sentences above, and to say that it seems more than just "possible" that future science will make this judgment. It's a virtual certainty, judging from the number of firm unexplainable UFO reports.

As a corollary, it will very likely be similarly decided that the figure one often hears, that 90% or 95% of all UFO reports have prosaic explanations, was part of the dream. It has never been good science for a ufologist to claim an IFO solution to a UFO report on the basis that it **might possibly** have been Venus, a weather balloon, aircraft, etc., over and against the objections of witnesses who claim to know better. However, this tactic made the dream easier to maintain, and made it easier for the one-way "skeptics" to claim that if 95% of the cases can be explained away, then surely the other 5% can be also. I suspect the true percentage of IFOs lies somewhere between 50% and 75%.

Jim Deardorff

[[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](#).