



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: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 16:54:20 -0300
Fwd Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 08:51:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1999 09:29:17 -0700
>From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 11:57:04 -0300

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1999 22:14:34 +0000
>>>From: dave bowden <dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>>>>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>>>Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 23:18:02 -0300

>>>>A. Some facts:

>>>>1. 20% of 3201 sightings investigated by Battelle Memorial
>>>>Institute as reported in Project Blue Book Special Report 14
>>>>could NOT be identified and were separate from the 10% for which
>>>>there was insufficient information.

>Fact: There was insufficient information to identify _not one
>report_ as an extraterrestrial spacecraft, yet we are led to
>believe by Stanton Friedman that PBBSR 14 statistically supports
>his notion that "some" UFOs are extraterrestrial spacecraft.

The category ET Spacecraft was not one that could be used. So Ed's statement makes no sense. I asked a simple question: what is meant by "confirmed alien contact". Does this mean a report from the Pope or the Queen or the UN? Confirmed how and by whom? The testimony of thousands of witnesses certainly carries weight in court as do radar measurements. Observations of objects landing and taking off and leaving physical traces and in about 1/5 of the cases involving strange beings cannot be ignored even if the Pope or Larry King or Ed Stewart wasn't there. The testimony of abductees cannot be ignored even if the Queen wasn't there. The % of UNKNOWNS was not 10% it was 20%. I gave the definition they used. But Ed who apparently doesn't care much for BBSR 14 conveniently neglects to mention that no sighting could be listed as an UNKOWN unless all 4 final report evaluators agreed. Any 2 could list it in one of the other categories which included aircraft, Balloon, astronomical, psychological aberration, miscellaneous and Insufficient

Information. BMI did a quality evaluation of every report. They found that the better the quality of the report the more likely to be an UNKNOWN and the less likely to be listed as insufficient information-- exactly what one would expect if the UNKNOWNS were indeed different from the knowns. They did a chi-square statistical comparison between the characteristics of the UNKNOWNS and of the KNOWNs; the probability that the UNKNOWNS are just missed knowns is less than 1%.

>Also, what Stanton Friedman, as well as others that like to
>mention BBSR 14 as supportive of their notions, neglects to
>always tell his audience is that the Battelle Memorial study
>only read the reports given it by the Air Force. Battelle never
>conducted any investigation --- they simply tried to interpret
>whatever pieces of papers (reports) they got from the Air Force.
>They never investigated the actual reports for the validity of
>the anecdotal information provided in them and therefore could
>never pass judgement as to the accuracy of the anecdotal
>documentation contained in the reports. As a consequence,
>reports containing anecdotal mis-observations, anecdotal
>mis-quotations/mis-identifications, conflicting anecdotal
>observations, etc. would of necessity be included in the so much
>quoted "10% unknown" category because they were not identifiable

It is 20% Ed not 10%. Perhaps you ought to buy and read a copy of the 250 page report from UFORI, Complete with the misleading press release and all tables, charts etc only \$25. including priority Postage. I will even throw in my 20 page "Case for The ET Origin of Flying Saucers" (only \$4. by itself) from UFORI, POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958. Or call Toll Free 877 457-0232. Visa or MC.

>to a specific category, i.e. balloons, etc. and did in fact
>contain unverified anecdotal evidence that the actual report
>could not be identified to a specific cause, i.e. balloons, etc.

>>>After reading your percentages I would be interested to know
>>>what your percentage is for confirmed alien contact.
>>>There is a serious semantic difficulty here. I have no idea
>>>what is meant here by "confirmed alien contact" or why it would
>>>be required.

Again simple question what does the phrase "confirmed alien contact" mean?

>Stanton Friedman all of a sudden seems to have difficulty in
>answering a simple question. I will provide Dave Bowden an
>answer backed-up by statistical evidence which is verifiable by
>anyone so wishing to do so. I compiled the comprehensive indexes
>to the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW from 1955-1994 and the combined
>MUFON UFO JOURNAL/SKYLOOK from 1967-1996. During that time there
>were 6,859 articles and entries in FSR/FSR Case Histories/FSR
>Special Issues and 9,231 articles and entries in the
>SKYLOOK/MUFON Journal/MUFON Proceedings --- all are cross
>indexed by author, subject category, volume and issue, providing
>the reader/researcher with over 48,000 entries.

>These 16,090 articles and reports are representative of the best
>ufological research and reporting of the UFO phenomenon over the
>past five decades. The percentage for confirmed alien contact is

Again what in the world is meant by "Confirmed alien contact", by telephone, fax, Email?

A rubber stamp from Ed Stewart?

>_zero_. Stanton Friedman calls it "a serious semantic
>difficulty".

It is because it is undefined. SETI cultists talk about contact from many light years away; is that what is meant? Or a handshake or what?

>When asked to produce a single case Friedman, as
>well as others holding similar viewpoints, refuse to do so
>stating that the evidence that some UFOs are extraterrestrial
>spacecraft is in the aggregate, not in any single case.

Try RB 47, Hills, Salt Lake City.. etc etc. Try those in Jim McDonald's congressional testimony though none have papal

imprimateur.

>Yet, the 16,090 MUFON and FSR articles that have reported on
>ufological cases, offered here as evidence in the aggregate,
>fail to substantiate Friedman's contention and belief that "some
>UFOs" are extraterrestrial spacecraft. Instead, they are
>introduced here as compelling evidence that the percentage of
>"confirmed alien contact" in the published UFO literature as of
>today is _zero_!

You still haven't defined CAC.

><snip>

>>This is frankly silly. The BBSR 14 definition of 'unknown' "was
>>assigned to those reports of sightings wherein the description
>>of the object and its maneuvers could not be fitted to the
>>pattern of any known object or phenomenon". There was no
>>category for ET spacecraft.

>Since there was no investigation by Battelle for the accuracy
>and veracity of the reports, the anecdotal information had to be
>taken literally. That would include any misquotes,
>mis-reporting, mis-identifications, and conflicting anecdotes.
>Difficult of the job as it was, the Battelle staff were still
>able to categorise all the reports but a mere 10%.

Again it was 20% Ed. That is much higher than the % of isotopes
that are fissionable or people who are 7' tall.

><snip>

>>As I noted in TOP SECRET/MAJIC and in a number of papers, Carl
>>Sagan has said many foolish and unscientific things about flying
>>saucers.

>As I have documented in the past on this very same mailing list,
>Friedman's _Top Secret/Majic_ is riddled with errors, historical
>innacuracies, misrepresentation of people's quotes and
>positions, faulty logic, and unsupported substantiations in the
>presentation of his beliefs. The above is a matter of record.
>Check the archival record of this mailing list for past
>discussions on MJ-12 for specific examples.

Now I understand CAC.. approved by Ed Stewart. Sorry I don't
belong to that church.

>>>>Could you please tell us if you personally believe at anytime
>>>>in the last 25yrs or perhaps beyond that there has been at
>>>>least one visit to this planet by any form of Extraterrestrial
>>>>craft?

>>>That is a very good question and since there are so many
>>>'ufologists' out there maybe one kind soul could answer that
>>>(what I perceive to be) simple question.

>>I answered it in my posting. I believe the evidence is
>>overwhelming that Planet Earth is being visited by
>>intelligently controlled ET spacecraft:Some so-called UFOs are
>>alien vehicles. I should think that is very straight forward
>>and unambiguous.

>Unfortunately, it is not supported by anything ever published in
>the FSR and MUFON literature which I have indexed and made those
>indexes available. I am also in the process of indexing the
>NICAP, APRO, and CIS literature to be available in the next
>century. Overwhelming evidence for extraterrestrial spacecraft
>has yet to show up, contrary to Stanton Friedman's contention
>and positional statements on his world-wide tours.

Sounds like the green monster is coming into play. Sorry Ed, I
don't need anybody to carry my luggage.

Stan Friedman

[[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](#).