```
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.qhost-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
quarantees 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
> 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
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
> compared with other areas of subterranean history.
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
> classified technology--which is the basic media response--we
still have
> 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
> 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
> 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
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
> 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
> 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
> 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
> 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
> 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
> 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
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
> 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
> 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
> 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

UFO

> 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

> 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
> 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
> among younger people in particular there is a receptiveness
to the reality
> 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
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
> 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,
> 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.
```

Interesting.