

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



[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: IFOs

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 13:24:50 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 16:45:29 -0400
Subject: Re: IFOs

Hi,

There have been some curious responses to my posting in reply to the question asked about whether - in my 25 years experience - one alien spacecraft had conclusively been seen. I thought I answered it fully and properly. Evidently not. It seems that for some of you unless I can be bullied into saying - yes, sure, they are here I admit it, then it isn't good enough.

Well, sorry, I cannot honestly do that . I am afraid this attitude is, in my view, a large part of what is wrong with ufology. The plea - do we have to wait another 25 years for an answer - seems to be saying, go on, say they are here, I don't want to keep waiting to hear you say what I want you to say. I reckon we do have a good part of the answer. I understand what's going on far more than when I started. Its just that you don't seem to like what I say I have found. Problem is if you stand 25 years at a bus stop waiting for a train it won't show up.

As for Stanton's facts and figures. Some of them need to be interpreted. Yes, Condon found a third unsolved. But so would I if I selected the 60 best cases from the past year rather than studied the 6000 or whatever total sightings that have happened.

I cannot change the results of what I find to make people happy. As I replied (and sorry its going to sound repetitive but as some of you don't seem to grasp what I am saying its necessary) here is what I actually find. And so, by the way, do a lot of other ufologists beyond the US. Many researchers in the US seem unaware that there is a ufology beyond the East Coast or the West Coast. But there is and when you add it up its actually bigger and very different from whats in the US as well. Note I did not say better. That is not my argument.

In the UK in an average year we get say 300 sightings. Of these we can pretty conclusively explain around 180 (60%). I don't think there are too many disputes so far. Of the rest I contend, from my experience, that another 30 - 35% (it does vary - and thats maybe another 100 cases) are probably explainable. You cannot ever say for sure because the data to prove them is not there. But they are LITS or low definition incidents where it is best to err on the side of caution. For instance, witness A sees a blinking red light in the sky. You cannot find any aircraft supposed to be up there. Now, sure, of course, the blinking light could be a UFO disguised as a navigation beacon. But in my estimation it would be more sensibler to say that the blinking light was probably an aircraft and move on. Thats why I do and I wont apologise for doing it. Frankly, I don't regard it as good ufology or good science to do anything else.

Now, if said light, did a right angled turn, or flew over

streetlamps and they suddenly went off, or anything that is logically inconsistent with an aircraft I would not determine it was a probable aircraft and in my opinion it would not be good science or ufology to do so.

Yes, there are cases where we may judge something an IFO when in truth it probably is unexplained. But there are also cases that are presumed to be unsolved that turn out, years later, to be an IFO. I have encountered many and indeed the book Andy, Dave and I have written ('The UFOs that never were') is full of them.

I am not sure why these figures are creating such a stir, because to me they are what you find - nothing more, nothing less. If others find different results then there could be many reasons. These range from I am overly pessimistic and rate far too many cases as IFOs to you are far too optimistic and term as UFOs cases that really don't deserve it.

But what we are all agreed upon is that there are unsolved, currently unexplainable cases. I say 5%, someone else might say 10%. I really don't think we can justify much more as there are not more than 10% cases that are of any reasonable definition and to term a LITS as a UFO is normally I believe unduly risky.

So, those cases (in my view no more than 20 cases per year in the UK - but still enough to prove to my complete satisfaction that there is a real UFO mystery) need to be interpreted.

It is possible that every one of them is an alien spacecraft. Of course it is. But is that what you are saying? I doubt it. Any investigator who has been out there in the field year after year and is actually investigating cases knows that in many instances we are dealing with reports as follows.

Witness B sees a glow through trees. Going to investigate they find a fiery orange mass with a centre that looks like the embers of a fire. A faint whiff of ozone emerges and the object rises, perhaps with a humming noise, and the witness reports that their skin felt prickly as it climbed into clouds, causing them to apparently part slightly as it did so.

In my experience that is a fairly good, but not atypical unsolved case. Now, yes, of course it might be a spaceship. I cant prove it wasnt and you cannot prove it was. We are in the field of probabilities here. When you match hundreds of cases of this type you find patterns, consistencies, that stand out. We can make deductions from them. The UFO, for instance, is ionizing the atmosphere (cloud parting, ozone smell, tingling sensations, etc).The glow changes colour according to the state of the atmosphere and chemical changes resulting. There are genuine, physical properties that emerge and they imply a physically real, but quite possibly natural, origin.

So where do we stand? We can, of course, decide that here the ionization results from a propulsion system on a spacecraft. But in case after case like this one thats an inference that whilst not impossible is unsupported by real facts. On the other hand, we know from atmospheric physics and from the history of para science that reports like this have long occurred and they even tend to recur in certain places and at certain times. They obey rules. The consensus from this, in my view quite reasonably, is that the more likely answer for such reports is that we are dealing with some sort of unidentified atmospheric phenomenon - a UAP. It will expand our knowledge to understand it, but the presumption of alien intelligence behind such cases is neither necessary here nor evidenced by the facts. This does not mean it isnt so. It just means, as I look at things, that it is the option best taken only after others (such as UAP) are proven untenable. Thats how we work, by taking the simplest answer, showing it doesnt fit, finding the next possibility, eliminating that, and being dragged kicking and screaming (but willing to go there if necessary) to the most extreme view that an alien craft was witnessed.

My argument is that in most cases a UAP works. So I currently accept that this is what we are dealing with much of the time. Sure, its a judgement call, but not one I made up for fun or one that has anything to do with the loopy tales people invent to try to justify to themselves why I say this. Its not because the government pay me to say so. Its not because I am terrified of accepting alien contact. I wish the government would pay me to

study UFOs (I could use the money as writing books that don't proclaim the aliens have landed is no way to get rich quick, I promise you). I would be as excited, delighted and vindicated as anyone if the aliens were coming here because it would be such a huge event and much of my life has been spent contemplating the possibility. So nothing would be of more fascination to me. The truth is that I make my judgement call on the balance of the evidence and that call is that most unsolved cases are UAP. Sorry if that offends you or it isn't what you want to hear. You are totally free to believe otherwise (and I am in no way saying I am right and you cannot be). You are equally free to try to persuade me through evidence - and I'll listen (as I always have). But I cannot deny what my present experience tells me.

Now, as I also said, there remain cases (and I reckon 1% but it could be up to 2%) (so maybe 4 or 5 per annum in the UK) that defy any reasonable attempt to force fit an IFO or UAP solution. So I don't do that. I regard them as unsolved and in those cases regard the possibility that another intelligence is behind them as both reasonable and a theory worth exploring. I cannot say that there is certainty here - as asked. That's because even good cases do crumble and because there may always be factors we haven't thought of yet or phenomena and science that we have not caught up with. 1999 is not the summit of the learning curve and to reject a case as not possibly being some unrecognised phenomenon because we don't yet know of a phenomenon that behaves this way is as wrong as the argument often used by ETers. They say, sceptics foolishly deny alien presence on the grounds that we cannot do it yet. But one day we might. So UFOs could be more advanced craft flown by people who can do it. Absolutely. No dispute from me on that. But equally, the things we regard of as craft could be non alien phenomena emerging from an understanding of science we don't yet have. So we have to let that caveat work both ways.

On balance, I don't think these last unsolved cases will be natural phenomena as the hints of intelligence are quite strong. But I can't prove it. I do think there is a reasonable chance they might be contact with another intelligence. But I cannot prove that either and hard evidence is undeniably in short supply. Sufficiently so to take seriously workable alternative possibilities, such as Persinger's, and recognise that we cannot say with assurance as I am being asked to do here that aliens have landed in spacecraft.

In my view, there may well be an 'alien' contact afoot in a few cases. But most of ufology is not it. Even with the few puzzle cases where it is a realistic option the usual ET interpretation is but one evaluation. Alien contact may be happening on a mind to mind, consciousness basis. So there could be alien imagery without alien artefacts. Maybe in space you cross the light years via virtual reality mentality. I see the argument here as grounded in proper evidence. We have theories but no proof that alien star travel in craft can happen. We have evidence (enough in my view to accept) that mind to mind contact that bypasses the normal rules of time and space does exist. Hence, why assume (as most of ufology does) that an advanced civilisation would build a photon rocket (or whatever) and come here? Why assume (as most of science does) that ET would phone home using a radio set. It's a useless piece of technology with which to contact another star system. You ring home and tell mum to put the tea on and when she gets the message 50 years later you are all dead. I don't find it at all improbable that other, better methods may be discovered soon (in the galactic time scale) and that aliens would laugh at our idea that they talk to each other using radio waves as we might smile at the islanders of Hawaii trying to get hold of San Francisco using two tin cans and a (very) long piece of string. Of course, if they are 100 years more advanced in understanding the how and why of consciousness alien contact that way could be happening all the time. If so who on earth would know about it? Professor Big Bucks tuning his 1000 foot radio dish skyward? Nope. But sensitive, artistic, apparently psychically attuned witnesses who might catch and decode the attempts to say 'hello earth'. Oddly these just happen to be the very people who are the ones having alien contact experiences. That coincidence is enough to make me sit up and take notice. But not many others in ufology it seems, to whom this idea is garbage because it dispenses with their apparent desire to have real spaceships coming here. And of course they may be. Again no argument there. But equally, as I have just shown, they may not. Which is what I said in my

posting yesterday.

Moreover, even if another intelligence is visiting us in craft (a prospect I am less convinced by than that alien contact is going on I might add) then we should not conclude that it comes from zeta reticuli just because it says so. There are good arguments you can make for various other origins. To cite three - from inter-dimensional reality inter-penetrating briefly through our own. Or as the true primary denizens of earth, not usually perceived by most of us because (as a lower life form) our senses are not generally equipped to detect them (but some, quite sensitive souls sometimes can). We are like ants trying to perceive humans. Or maybe visitors from our own future (the argument several abductees have told me that visitors have shared with them) - on the premise that if time travel ever becomes possible in the future history of earth our descendants could come here, study us and may deliberately play to the gallery to disguise their activities. In fact some of the evidence is better interpreted as a result of time travellers as it is in terms of ET spacecraft.

Jerry Clark tells me this is changing my mind and that my views are 'all over the map'. Perhaps. But I don't think it improper to consider viable options. ET spacecraft is clearly one - and a not unreasonable one - for a few cases, but not the only one.

Hope this helps to clarify things. By the way - has that train arrived yet?

Best wishes,

[[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](#).