



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](#) -> [Mar](#) -> Re: Michael Wolf's Samples in Italy

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Michael Wolf's Samples in Italy

From: Brad Sparks <RB47Expert@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 27 Mar 1999 02:20:48 EST
Fwd Date: Sun, 28 Mar 1999 08:52:53 -0500
Subject: Re: Michael Wolf's Samples in Italy

>From: Francisco Lopez <d005734c@DC.SEFLIN.ORG>
>To: CURRENT-ENCOUNTERS@LISTSERV.AOL.COM
>Subject: Michael Wolf's Samples in Italy
>Date: Thu, 25 Mar 1999 14:24:36 -0500

>Via: Skywatch International Inc. <skywatch@ltlb.com>
>From: Bill Hamilton [mailto:skywatcher22@hotmail.com]

With all due respect, these Italian "analyses" do not make any sense at all. The percentages 99.9% and 0.01% DO NOT ADD UP so the alleged 0.01% of "ET isotope" or "unknown" is nonsensical and certainly does NOT confirm the "trustworthiness and credibility" of Wolf or "further increase the value of all his sayings" -- if he used the same erroneous 0.01% figure that is embarrassingly due to a failure of grade-school math. There is no mention at all of WHAT alleged laboratory analyses were carried out to supposedly identify the "isotopes" (wrong terminology, there are only isotopes of the same element, but nuclides of differing elements). What were the percentages of the different Si (silicon) isotopes Si 28, Si 29 and Si 30? Were they of normal naturally-occurring abundance?

If you're going to go into all this length of text with percentages then the alleged "most advanced laboratory devices" should be stated along with sensible details, otherwise spare us the irrelevant banter and backscratching.

I'm sorry to say but if anyone tested the sample on a mass spectrometer and tried to claim there was 0.01% (or 0.1%) "unknown" they'd be laughed out of scientific meetings as hopelessly misguided. You wouldn't even know there was any percentage "unknown" unless it in fact was registered on the spectrometer and therefore wouldn't be "unknown" any longer. There is no way to obtain such an exact quantitative value as 0.01% or 0.1% and still have it be "unknown." I suspect that whoever is behind these "analyses" simply don't know what they're talking about and are just masking ignorance with scientific-sounding gibberish.

I haven't seen the US lab analyses and don't know whether they are available on the Web.

Brad Sparks

[[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](#).