



# 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](#) -> [2000](#) -> [Aug](#) -> Re: The Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Hatch

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: The Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Hatch

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>  
Date: Sat, 19 Aug 2000 18:21:33 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Aug 2000 11:22:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Hatch

>Date: Sat, 19 Aug 2000 22:53:23 +0100  
>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>  
>Subject: Re: The Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO'  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 17:11:22 -0500  
>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>  
>>Subject: Re: The Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO'  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Persons with the appropriate professional background to make  
>>them good witnesses figure disproportionately in the best  
>>sightings, just as one would expect.

<snip>

>Well no, Jerry, I'm afraid they don't. Allan Hendry has  
>demonstrated that pilots and law enforcement officers (typical  
>"reliable witness" types) are no better at distinguishing UFOs  
>from IFOs than other occupational groups that make no claim to  
>be "trained witnesses". The proportion of IFOs to all reports  
>made by pilots and air personnel was 75% (i.e. 75% of all  
>reports were subsequently identified) which was on the lower end  
>of the range, it was the same as the proportion for "skilled  
>trades", in which Hendry placed architects, musicians,  
>photographers, engineers, and quite possibly librarians. Worst  
>of all, with 94% of their reports turning out to be IFOs were  
>law enforcement officers.

>  
>Hendry suggests that the reason why the latter proved so  
>ineffective in distinguishing IFOs from UFOs was that their  
>training made the more conscious of small details during quiet  
>night patrols. This raises an important point: yes there are  
>"trained observers", but they are usually trained to observe  
>something quite specific. Pilots are trained to observe objects  
>with the flight characteristics of an aeroplane. they are not  
>for instance trained to observe meteors, which explains why  
>quite a few "near miss" UFO encounters with planes turned out to  
>be meteors may tens of miles away. policemen are trained to  
>notice anything out of the usual and report and act on it.

<snip>

Just some minor points:

1) On the higher 94% IFO rates for policemen, this may actually work in their favor. Its almost a movie cliché for an English policeman to be scribbling notes into his little notebook at

some crime scene, while the direct witnesses are more likely losing their heads. ( I suspect movie fans here would be disappointed if this failed to occur. )

If a good cop takes note of many details, great and small, this would inevitably lead to a higher rate of identification, since most well investigated UFO reports do turn out to be mundane.

I would offer this as an indication that the policeman was indeed a better witness, not just average or poorer. A good command of the details must necessarily imply a better witness!

2) As for airline pilots and crew, I cannot offer such a good argument, just my personal opinion based on pilots I have met, a rather no-nonsense lot, and what I have heard of them in general.

When it comes to in-flight sightings, I would take the testimony of any airline pilot over some passenger on the very same plane... perhaps at a two to one ratio. Throw in the copilot, others in the crew, and I would call that pretty darned good credibility.

( The "strangeness" rating is of course a separate issue, and would depend on the description. )

Even Joe Soap can provide some good testimony, if accompanied by George, Jill and Roger Soap .. and their descriptions tally.

I would nevertheless give greater weight to a pilot, or even a beat-cop, than some person taken at random.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).