



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: French COMETA Report

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1999 11:28:09 +0100
Fwd Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 22:56:46 -0400
Subject: Re: French COMETA Report

>From: Gildas Bourdais <GBourdais@aol.com>
>Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 12:00:32 EDT
>Subject: Re: French COMETA Report
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>>Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 00:39:56 +0200
>>From: Perry Petrakis - SOS OVNI <sosovni@pacwan.fr>
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>Subject: French COMETA Report

<snip>

>>For instance, Lakenheath (1956), the RB-47 case
>>(1957) or Teheran (1976) are mentionned while there is not a
>>word on the Belgian sightings flap (1989-1991), a situation
>>which has led to much speculation in France and Belgium.

>This is an irrelevant critique. They have selected a few very
>good cases: fine! They may have avoided the Belgian wave because
>it is a very complex case. Even among ufologists, there is not
>100 % agreement on everything.

Hi,

There is a good test of the objectivity of the COMETA report noted above that perhaps those who have read it (as I have not) can comment upon.

In reviewing the 1956 Lakenheath/Bentwaters case as a good case what data did they use? The Condon report? The Jim McDonald assessment? Nick Pope's theories?

It is important because I too believed this case from older sources to be highly important. It is still an interesting case and I dont pretend it is solved, but I can tell you that the sources that report it to so far have got it fundamentally wrong.

How do I know? In 1996 I was asked to research, write and present a documentary on UFOs and the British government for BBC television. As part of my six months working at the BBC I was able to use their resources to do some things I never had the chance (or money) to do before. One included tracking down and interviewing the RAF crew involved in that 1956 intercept case. To my amazement I learned that many of the preconceptions about this case were wrong.

All the reports have the wrong kind of aircraft, the wrong number of crew, the wrong take-off and landing details (we retrieved log books) and most importantly significant

differences in nearly every aspect of the intercept story as reported by Condon.

Many have assumed he got this version pretty well right as he was working from USAF records. Although is there a Blue Book file on this case? But by going back to source as I did (and Condon and others clearly did not) (admittedly mostly because they did not have the opportunity to do so) they committed lasting errors in the understanding of this case.

So, the question is - as nobody at COMETA asked me for copies of the filmed interviews I made with the now elderly air crew - did they find them by some other way? Or did they base their report on the now somewhat dubious earlier sources?

The answer will help tell us if they genuinely did have high level contacts to establish a good assessment of the evidence or whether they are really doing what anybody else could do and comment upon pre-published information? If that is so then, okay, but it indicates the limitations of the project.

The key is their discussion of the actual intercept between RAF planes and the UFO in 1956. If the report says there was a visual encounter with radar lock on and the UFO flew from in front and to behind the jet very rapidly, then it is bad news for COMETA fans. That's the traditional (and incorrect) version in all prior reports. What the aircrew report first hand is that they saw nothing visually and that the radar contact was stationary. At no time did it fly around them. If COMETA has that version it has clearly done its homework and should be judged accordingly.

Can Perry or others comment on this, perhaps?

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[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](#).