

Path:
news.otenet.gr!news.grnet.gr!irazu.switch.ch!switch.ch!in.100pr
oofnews.com!in.100proofnews.com!news-out.visi.com!petbe.visi.co
m!feed.news.qwest.net!news.uswest.net.POSTED!not-for-mail
Reply-To: "Prince Albert Inacan" <albert@nothere.not>
From: "Prince Albert Inacan" <albert@nothere.not>
Newsgroups:
24hoursupport.helpdesk,alt.alien.research,alt.alien.visitors,al
t.folklore.ghost-stories,alt.folklore.urban,alt.movies.monster,
alt.paranet.abduct,alt.paranet.ufo,alt.privacy.spyware,alt.tv.s
entai,rec.arts.horror.movies,rec.games.frp.dnd
References: <nIT7b.19545\$cJ5.2644@www.newsranger.com>
Subject: Re: What We Know About UFOs, and Whether It Matters
Lines: 489
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
Message-ID: <%eZ7b.13\$SZ.4881@news.uswest.net>
Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 05:45:35 -0600
NNTP-Posting-Host: 67.1.139.8
X-Trace: news.uswest.net 1063280699 67.1.139.8 (Thu, 11 Sep
2003 06:44:59 CDT)
NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 06:44:59 CDT
Xref: news.otenet.gr 24hoursupport.helpdesk:650940
alt.alien.research:143593 alt.alien.visitors:188503
alt.folklore.ghost-stories:178044 alt.folklore.urban:245856
alt.movies.monster:71411 alt.paranet.abduct:12783
alt.paranet.ufo:80774 alt.tv.sentai:25120
rec.arts.horror.movies:3178 rec.games.frp.dnd:674203

"Sir Arthur C. B. E. Wholeflaffers A.S.A."
<nospam@newsranger.com> wrote in
message news:nIT7b.19545\$cJ5.2644@www.newsranger.com...
> What We Know About UFOs, and Whether It Matters by Richard
Dolan
>
> "It takes two to speak the truth—one to speak, and another to
hear." -Henry
> David Thoreau
>
> Truth in society is really a three-stage process. You learn
it, you tell
it, you
> act on it. None of those steps are easy, and there are no
guarantees that
one
> stage will lead to the next. One may know that something is
true-for
instance,

> the reality of UFOs-but so what? At the societal level,
knowledge often
fails to
> translate into action. Frequently, it can't even get an
official
acknowledgment.
>
> Pick a topic. Narcotics trafficking? Many detailed studies
have linked
narco
> traffickers to the global intelligence community. The JFK
assassination?
Eighty
> percent of Americans, supported by a mountain of
well-researched evidence,
> believe there was a conspiracy to kill the President. The
environment?
Most
> scientists now agree that our civilization, within a mere
century, has
caused a
> rate of species extinction that rivals some of the most
vicious in our
Earth's
> history. And, oh yes, we appear to be heating ourselves into
the
stratosphere,
> too.
>
> The result from such societal knowledge? Nothing much. Banks
and spooks
continue
> to launder drug money, official quarters explain away the
public's
so-called
> "need" to believe in an assassination conspiracy, and people
continue to
turn
> the natural world into a toxic suburban development.
Knowledge doesn't
always
> equal power.
>
> Such is the case regarding UFOs. There is an overabundance of
data
indicating
> that real objects with extraordinary capabilities have been
the cause of
serious
> concern by the "national security state" for over 50 years.
Many people,
perhaps

> a majority, believe the phenomenon is real and unexplained by
conventional
> means. Yet officially, UFOs don't exist. They continue to be
ignored
publicly by
> the world of science.
>
> The discrepancy between reality and official acknowledgment
is great, even
when
> compared with other areas of subterranean history. The
phenomenon is
real: why
> is no one in official (or public) quarters inquiring about
it?
>
> Asking The Wrong Questions
>
> After all, even if one argues that the good UFO cases are the
result of
> classified technology--which is the basic media response--we
still have
some
> important questions. Consider the triangles that are so often
reported in
North
> America and Europe. These objects are commonly described as
immense and
low
> flying, capable of motionlessness, instant acceleration in
any direction,
and
> no-radius turns. And they do all this silently. No one is
arguing
seriously
> that these things are hoaxes or misidentification of natural
phenomenon--both
> absurd in the face of an enormous body of witness testimony.
So, just what
does
> that?
>
> The object seen in Illinois on January 5, 2000 is a good
example. At least
four
> police officers and three civilians in several nearby towns
described with
near
> uniformity a classic triangular UFO--enormous, silent, two
stories high,
and at

> low altitude, perhaps as low as 500 feet. The witnesses were credible;
there
> was even a Poloroid snapshot.
>
> Unable to dismiss the event, the media, predictably, blew it. Here was a golden
> opportunity to ask important questions, such as what kind of science can make
> those triangles do what they do. Instead, the media expended its energy
> disproving that aliens were behind it. "Probably military," is all the public
> learned, and that was that. Is it at least possible that there are staggering
> energy implications? Yes, I think so. No one bothered to ask.
>
> But, of course, we know how the media works. Just as in the world of science,
> gone are the days of independent investigation. Journalists are no better
> qualified than scientists to speak intelligently about the UFO topic, largely
> because there is no institutional authority granting them the permission
(i.e.,
> paying them) to investigate. It's tough to be a lone gunman.
>
> There have been a few sophisticated analyses of the event, such as the one
done
> by the National Institute for Discovery Science (NIDS). Its carefully worded
> conclusion referred to NASA scientist Paul Hill's monumental work on UFOs
and
> stated that the craft's movements "can best be explained by the application of
> localized, directed acceleration fields, which serve to both propel the craft
> and modify the airstream surrounding it in order to eliminate aerodynamic

> friction. Such acceleration fields are just a manifestation of space-time metric

> engineering." In case you're wondering, NIDS did not imply that this was a

> current, classified (i.e., terrestrial) project.

>

> Within mainstream culture, however, the most accredited theory for the triangles

> seems to be the so called stealth blimp. Along these lines, one writer stated

> blithely that "even big-time UFO buffs have to admit that it's possible the

> [Illinois] mystery craft was a top-secret, man-made experiment." Others have

> suggested the object might be powered by microwave energy from a satellite. This

> would, in theory, allow for such apparent impossibilities as instant

> acceleration. Such technology would demand absolutely leading-edge technology.

> Although no one knows for sure that there even is such a thing as a stealth

> blimp, let us acknowledge that it's possible.

>

> What no one seems to be asking, however, is whether it was also possible

20

> years ago, when similar objects were described many times over New York's

> Hudson Valley. The stealth blimp explanation becomes more problematic the

> further back in time we go. We can push this line of questioning back 30,

40,

> and 50 years. The triangles were less common back then, but people reported

> disk-shaped objects doing the same things. Did our military secretly possess

> this type of technology back in, say, 1950?

>

> An objective review of the available evidence leads us to a resounding

"no."

> There is no evidence, not in the historical record, nor in any analysis of past

> or present technologies, to suggest a breakthrough in "flying saucer"

technology

> back in the 1950s or earlier.

>

> Skeptics continue to argue there is no proof that UFOs are of alien

origin. This

> is a correct answer to the wrong question. What we do have is excellent

evidence

> that the UFO phenomenon did not originate with our military.

Let's deal

with

> that.

>

> What We Know

>

> For more than 50 years, unknown objects have violated the airspace of

sensitive

> American installations. The capabilities of these objects have astonished

our

> best pilots and intelligence officers. Regarding one UFO incident, a

classified

> CIA memo from 1949 stated: "Information is desired if this was some new or

> experimental aircraft or for any explanation whatsoever." In 1951, the Air

Force

> reported an object that was "flat on top and bottom and appearing from

front

> view to have round edges and slightly beveled . . . described as traveling

at

> tremendous speed." A scientist who saw one in 1952 said it had "some

propulsion

> system not in the physics books." An F-94 pilot, who encountered one in

1952,

> said, "the power and acceleration were beyond the capability of any known

> aircraft."

>

> To a reasonable extent, we know how the American military responded to all this.

> There is no shortage of documents that describe the seriousness of UFOs.

A 1949

> FBI memo, for instance, stated: "Army intelligence has recently said that the

> matter of 'Unidentified Aircraft' or 'Unidentified Aerial Phenomena,' otherwise

> known as 'Flying Discs,' 'Flying Saucers,' and 'Balls of Fire,' is considered

> top secret by intelligence officers of both the Army and the Air Forces.""

>

> Gee, no kidding.

>

> UFOs mattered to our military brass and intelligence officials. Americans who

> studied them typically believed them to be technological. As early as the 1940s,

> the situation became further complicated by American investigations that

> indicated this technology was probably neither domestic nor Soviet. Read that

> last sentence again, slowly. Even after the classified Robertson Panel debunked

> UFOs in 1953 (largely, as I have argued elsewhere, to defuse this topic for the

> incoming Eisenhower administration), UFOs remained important and shrouded in

> secrecy.

>

> Nasty events continued to happen, such as the violation of air space at Maxwell

> AFB in 1954, when, according to an "Emergency Report" from that base, a

> "saucer-like" object hovered stationary at 2,000 feet. Comparable events

> happened during the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

>

> None of this tells us what UFOs are, although I suspect most people can do the
> math. The matter was, after all, top secret, and sweeping conclusions on such a
> topic don't easily make it to public view, despite the Freedom of Information
> Act.
>
> But we know that the extraterrestrial hypothesis was discussed (and believed) by
> many within the classified world. Beyond that, we can make a pretty good guess
> that the extraterrestrial hypothesis was believed and acted upon from the 1940s
> onward. At the very least, I would argue that the actions taken by the U.S.
> national security apparatus fit better with this thesis than any other.
>
> One might also recall the 1960 public statement of former CIA Director Roscoe
> Hillenkoetter: "Behind the scenes, high-ranking Air Force officers are soberly
> concerned about UFOs. But through official secrecy and ridicule, many citizens
> are led to believe the unknown flying objects are nonsense."
>
> Strong words from a former DCI. Yet, after 40 years, the academic community has
> yet to comment on it. Not a single scholarly book or monograph on Hillenkoetter
> has ever mentioned it.
>
> What We've Done
>
> Okay, so you and I can know all of these things about the phenomenon of UFOs.
> Assuming that we should even act on this knowledge, the question becomes,

how

> can we act effectively? How can we, in other words, educate the public, foster

> open discussion, obtain official acknowledgment, receive verified factual

> information about the situation, and get a sense of what would then be the best

> thing to do?

>

> There is scarcely any credible institutional structure within which to study

> this problem and, what's more, bring the results to the wider public. The

> universities would be the obvious choice, but have been a circle of ignorance

> for over 50 years. Professors, who know nothing of the topic, will not sanction

> dissertation study by graduate students, who then become the next generation of

> ignorant professionals. Part of this stems from the paranoia of academic life;

> part of it is simply an issue of funding. Until money flows for the public study

> of this topic, you can rule out universities as a viable engine for change.

>

> As an aside, you might want to reflect on an apparent disparity. First consider

> that the wellspring for so much university research in this country is our

> military (either directly with federal money or through corporations and

> foundations associated with the defense industry). Then think about the

> importance of the UFO phenomenon to national security. If this issue were

so

> important, one might conceivably ask, then why isn't it being funded?

>

> The answer is that it is not being publicly funded. We know UFOs are a

> classified subject. It is reasonable to assume that funding
for research
into
> UFOs would also be a classified matter.
>
> Essentially, mainstream culture offers little in the way of
enabling
people to
> organize and study this problem. Beyond the mainstream lies
the fringe,
although
> not all fringes are created equal. Let's look at the larger
UFO
organizations,
> such as MUFON, CUFOS, and the rest. This is something I will
describe at
greater
> length in the second volume of "UFOs and the National
Security State."
For now,
> I will express my feeling that these
organizations--successors, in a way to
NICAP
> and APRO--have not matched either of the older organizations
in moving
this
> topic forward and presenting it clearly to the public. In
practice, they
act
> more as vacuum cleaners: a great deal of data goes in, but
very little
trickles
> out, except in journals that no one reads. The journals of
CUFOS and MUFON
are
> not even in most libraries; none in my state of New York. Nor
have these
larger
> organizations engaged in any extended efforts to end UFO
secrecy.
>
> It is fair to look upon the two above-named groups (and a few
related
> organizations) as encompassing most of what we might call
professional
ufology,
> academic ufology, or simply the Old Guard. Perceptive readers
will know
who the
> main players are. Over the years, they have stopped at the
first rung of
Truth's

> Ladder; that is, knowing the facts, but not seeking to persuade or effect
> change. They are academic in their approach to the problem, with prose to match,
> unable or unwilling to draw inferences from their data, conducting specialized
> research, and publishing monographs for the small community of UFO researchers.
> Conclusions about the nature of UFOs?
>
> You'll be hard-pressed to find them. Ideas on the cover-up of information?
> Ditto. Even when the research is excellent, such as in the aforementioned work
> by NIDS, the conclusions are hardly evident, except to the most dedicated and
> patient of readers. It's taken professional ufology a long time to get nowhere.
> Still looking to effect change, we now move to the fringe of the fringe.
Dr.
> Steven Greer, for instance. I am fascinated by how the Old Guard of ufology
> uniformly has savaged him. It would be blindness itself not to see faults with
> Greer and his approach. Anyone who wants to save the world is going to irritate
> people, and by all accounts Greer has an ego to match, as well as a history of
> alienating the people close to him. But consider the press conference Greer
> organized in the spring of 2001: this was a major event given before a packed
> house at the National Press Club. The speakers Greer brought in to discuss UFO
> secrecy were impressive and credible, and the event was more proactive than

> anything undertaken by Greer's detractors.
>
> Media coverage, however, was abysmal. Nearly a year later,
nothing really
has
> come from the event. I am even told there is no trace of it
in the Press
Club
> archives, though I have not confirmed this for myself. Thus,
despite his
real
> and alleged faults, Greer's biggest problem is the national
security state
> itself. It will always be true that, when it comes to winning
and losing,
money
> and resources matter more than personalities.
>
> There are other venues for getting the truth out. UFO
Magazine does as
good a
> job as anyone at trying to raise awareness of this issue and
to educate
the
> public, but the sum total of such efforts cannot match the
magnitude of
what we
> are dealing with. What we have is an utterly fragmented
movement, where
"the
> center cannot hold."
>
> Does Knowledge Matter?
>
> More than 50 years have passed, and we are no closer to
ending UFO
secrecy. In
> fact, we are probably farther away than we were during the
summer crisis
of
> 1952, or the peak of UFO activity in the mid-1960s. This,
despite the fact
that
> we know much more than researchers of prior generations.
After all, we
have a
> wealth of material released by the Freedom of Information
Act, something
> unavailable before the mid-1970s.
>
> What has changed, however, is public awareness of UFOs.
Although it is

still
> impossible for most public figures to express their belief in
UFOs, it is
clear
> that many people do. Although I'm not really old enough to
discern this
from
> personal experience (still on the shy side of 40), it seems
clear to me
that
> among younger people in particular there is a receptiveness
to the reality
of
> UFO/ET phenomena in our world. Attribute it to "The X-Files,"
if you like,
but
> there has been a slow and steady shift at the foundations of
our culture.
>
> A century and a half ago, Karl Marx made the then-radical
argument that a
> society's political system reflects and rests upon economic
power and
> relationships. As the economic foundation evolves, at some
point the
cumulative
> changes will be so great as to cause irreconcilable problems
with the
political
> "super structure," forcing changes in the political system.
If we despair
of the
> quick fix of ending UFO secrecy today, we might want to
remember that
insight.
> The foundations of our culture have gone through tremendous
change since
the
> days of the early Cold War, and this includes perceptions
about UFOs. At
some
> point in the future, the dissonance between culture and power
will be too
great,
> and the political structure will have to give. For this
reason, knowledge
about
> the reality of UFOs does matter.
>
> Given enough time, the change in official policy will
eventually occur.
The

> problem is that we do not live in normal times. Given the rapid growth in human
> population, the proliferation of dangerous weaponry, coupled with the alarming
> stress and depletion of natural resources like water, arable land, and (soon)
> petroleum, nothing is assured, not even the survival of our global
> infrastructure.
>
> But all we can do is our best. If we can make it past our current problem, our
> knowledge of the ET presence will indeed translate one day into official
> acknowledgment. Mass culture will continue to change, and will eventually
force
> the issue. The how or when, of course, is anybody's guess.
>
> Looming behind the preceding discussion is the most difficult of all
questions:
> the nature of the UFO phenomenon and alien presence itself, what alien
> intentions might be, and what all this means for our civilization. In my
book,
> and in the articles I've written for this magazine, I have studiously
avoided
> dealing with those questions in any detail. In my opinion, that domain is
filled
> with too many so-called experts who do little more than blow their own
version
> of hot air. Instead, I've tried to stay close to the verifiable facts.
>
> But if you know the facts, at some point it becomes a responsibility to
make as
> much sense out of them as you can. This doesn't mean engaging in wild
> speculation, but it does mean being willing to speculate reasonably on the
basis
> of known facts. That will be the subject of my next article.

>
> ~ Copyright 2002, all rights reserved.
>
> Richard M. Dolan is author of UFOs and the National Security
State. Visit
his
> web page at <http://keyholepublishing.com>. UFO
> From the April-May 2002 edition of UFO Magazine
>

Interesting.