



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: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 22:10:51 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 22:32:33 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 23:42:26 -0700
>From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>>From: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 16:54:20 -0300

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

>>>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.

>The categories employed were balloons, aircraft, astronomical,
>Light phenomenon, birds, clouds/dust/etc, insufficient
>information, psychological manifestations, unknown and other. Of
>greater importance was the main objective of the study:

>"to determine the probability that any of the UNKNOWNS
>represent observations of technological developments not known
>to this country."

>A secondary goal was to "ferret out any distinguishing
>characteristics inherent in the data" and to perform a
>"concentrated study of any trend or pattern found".

>The results were inconclusive. In other words, the probability
>that any of the UNKNOWNS represented observations of
>technological developments not known to this country was "highly
>improbable". Of course, BMI was not playing with a full deck.
>They were trying to evaluate Project Blue Book reports notorious
>for their incompleteness, lack of reliable measurements, and
>limited Air Force investigation of the original reports which
>meant that unreliable and unverified anecdotal testimony
>comprised a portion of the data which BMI was attempting to
>scientifically reduce and draw significant conclusions from. The
>portion of the data which is unreliable and unverified varies
>from a high percentage whether ET proponents are attacking the
>Air Force Blue Book Project, to a low percentage to when they
>are trying to present Blue Book Report #14 as supportive of
>their notions.

>BMI did not stop there. The problem they were asked to evaluate
>was too important simply to give up if they could not reach any
>conclusive statistical results. They took a second look at just
>the UNKNOWNS and separated them into UNKNOWNS, GOOD UNKNOWNS,
>and POSSIBLE KNOWNS. Only seven GOOD UNKNOWNS were found. Later,
>five more were added to that group. BMI attempted to build a
>flying saucer model from the reported data of these twelve
>cases. They could not do it! The anecdotal reports were so
>inconsistent with each other that BMI reached the conclusion:

Bruce Maccabee did an excellent piece about the 12 best cases
nonsense. He has written an extensive paper on one of them.

>"It is not possible, therefore, to derive a verified model
>of a 'flying saucer' from the data that have been gathered to
>date". In other words, reducing 4,000 reports as provided by the
>Air Force, only 12 had sufficiently detailed descriptions but no
>pattern or picture of what a flying saucer is could be
>developed."

>BMI did not stop there. They looked at the other groups of
>UNKNOWNS for observed characteristics if any were the same.

>"No such groups were found."

>Of course, BMI was attempting to apply statistical methods to
>Air Force data which has been shown to be notoriously
>incomplete, inaccurate, unreliable and most importantly the
>original data for the most part uninvestigated by the Air Force.
>The same data that when it suits the fancy of ET promoters, is
>purported to support their notion that some UFOs are
>extraterrestrial spacecraft.

>>The testimony of thousands of witnesses certainly carries
>>weight in court as do radar measurements.

>Court? Strange that a professed nuclear physicist has to make an
>appeal for legal standards and not scientific standards. The
>last time that science was decided in a courtroom setting was
>during the Spanish Inquisition. In a social context, we have had
>political standards applied to science in this century also. An
>example being Germany during the 30s-40s.

Evaluation of testimony and evidence relating to UFO
observations using the techniques of the legal system, in the
face of the government's refusal to release what it has, is an
appropriate technique. Being a physicist gives one insight as to
the questions to ask.. Being a noisy negativist is easy. One
starts with a conclusion (no sightings can represent
observations of alien visitations) and pushes and shoves the data
to make it fit. Sort of like a defense attorney without a
prosecutor to keep him honest.

>>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.

>It was ignored when the elite (you weren't invited to
>participate) of ufology made their pitch last year to an
>"independent" panel of members of the scientific community at
>Rockefeller's place. Or when the Coalition presented the best
>evidence. Strange that no CE-III cases of note were included.
>Much less abductions.

Certainly is strange .. reminds me of the Robertson panel.

>>testimony of abductees cannot be ignored even if the Queen
>>wasn't there.

>See above.

>>It is 20% Ed not 10%.

>Well, actually, the unknowns can be just about anything
>dependent on what someone wishes to emphasize. The statistics
>contained in the charts and tables used the end of 1952 as the
>cutoff date. It included 3201 total cases. 1953 and 1954 cases
>show an UNKNOWN rate of 9% (4834 cases by the end of 1954),
>while the 1955 cases to May 5, 1955 show an UNKNOWN rate of only

>3%. (131 total 1955 cases)

Of course Ed is fully aware that BBSR 14 tables did indeed not deal with any of the 1953-55 cases. He is beginning to sound more and more like one of those Air Force Disinformation Specialists. USAF Sec. Donald A. Quarles in the October 25, 1955 Press Release "Air Force Releases Study on Unidentified Flying Object" (the report wasn't distributed, the names of the investigators and of BMI were not mentioned.) stated " On the basis of this study we believe that no objects such as those popularly described as flying saucers have overflowed the United States. I feel certain that even the UNKNOWN three % could have been explained as conventional phenomena or illusions if more complete observational data had been available". His 3% was the 3% of the 131 1955 cases. It had absolutely nothing to do with "this study" for which 20% of 3201 cases were UNKNOWNS completely independent of the 10% listed as insufficient information. In short he lied, or is disinformed a better word?

The USAF techniques were worse, not better than BMIs.

The rules were try to explain everything no matter how unlikely the explanation was. There were many other tricks used to try to fool the public.. almost as bad as explaining reports of alien bodies connected with Roswell as Crash Test Dummies not dropped until 6 years later, or trying to get rid of 1947 reports of a red haired officer using Colonel Kittinger who wasn't at the Roswell Hospital until 1959.

>But I know that Stanton Friedman knew that all along. He is a >nuclear physicist after all and should understand the nature of >statistics. <GRIN>

>>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.

>Why would anyone do that? For half your price, \$12, they can >get an analyses from FUFOR that says essentially the same thing. >BBR #14 is the greatest thing supporting ET (if you read it the >right way) and ignore that the raw data reduced in the report is >notoriously incomplete, inaccurate, unreliable and most >importantly for the most part uninvestigated by the Air Force >and presented to BMI "as is". In all fairness, it can be argued >that it is the best of the Blue Book data because Blue Book went >downhill from the moment it was created.

>>including priority Postage.I will even throw in my 20 page"Case >>for The ET Origin of Flying Saucers" (only \$4.by itself)

>Stanton Friedman, the business man that argues for legal >standards in the interpretation of data, but professes to be a >nuclear physicist. Will the real Stanton Friedman please stand >up?

The real Stanton Friedman is interested in finding the truth. Legal standards are far more appropriate for dealing with testimony than are lab experiments totally under the control of the experimenter. When I have a piece of wreckage I know an appropriate place to have it tested.

>>>_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?

>Ask one of the many English majors on this mailing list. I fully >realize you have a tendency to gag when the word 'confirmation' >is uttered, mainly because no matter what the definition you are >unable to support your contention.

Still can't define "Confirmed alien contact" can you, Ed?

>>>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.

>Personally, I think the "etc.etc." case is the most promising.
><GRIN>I knew all along that Stanton Friedman would come through
>with a definite case that left no doubt ET made a pit stop on
>the third rock from the Sun.

>>Try those in Jim
>>McDonald's congressional testimony though none have papal
>>imprimatureur.

>
>Dr. McDonald was enough of a scientist to separate his belief
>that some UFOs were extraterrestrial spacecraft, from the
>knowledge that there was no compelling scientific evidence to
>support his notion to his colleagues. That is why he fought so
>strongly for added study and investigation. It was necessary if
>ufology ever was going to get there from where it was in his
>lifetime. There is not one single case which he publically
>hawked as an ET spacecraft case and you know it. You dishonor
>the memory of Dr. James McDonald by implying otherwise. But then
>again, Dr. James McDonald was a real scientist. He didn't simply
>talk the talk. He also walked the walk. In spite of his beliefs,
>he was a scientist above all.

>>>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_!

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

>Also higher than the percentage of professed nuclear physicists
>shorter than 7' tall that rely on social appeals to the court
>system or polls instead of scientific standards. See above.

Court techniques are appropriate for evaluating testimony. Why
is that so difficult to understand?

>>>>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.

Nothing like snipping the preceding remark about Sagan

>>>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.

>It is not required that you "belong" to anything. It is
>documented evidence that shows a compelling archival record of
>the real Stanton Friedman.

Another neat snip about my traipsing around the world.

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

>Your baggage is your responsibility, no one elses.

So is yours Ed and it sure is over the weight limit.

Stan Friedman.

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](#).