

from spacecraft, the contrary has likewise not been proved. Good examples are the Ubatuba fragment and the Socorro (Zamora) cases, with which I assume you are thoroughly familiar.

4. "...a \$10 million study..."

In fact, it was a half-million dollars (approximately). You were, of course, referring to the Condon Commission. Your statement can lead people to believe the study was very much larger than it in fact was.

5. "...there was nothing to be gained."

So the U.S. Government claimed. In fact, many of the best-documented cases brought to the notice of the Condon Commission were not investigated by it, and of those cases investigated, approximately 35% could not be identified by Condon et al. Dr. Condon chose to ignore this important fact in his summary of the report which has been taken to represent the true findings of the inquiry. Condon's conclusions are not supported by the data in the report itself. Numerous scientists in the U.S.A. and elsewhere agree on this point. It is not just my opinion.

6. "...lecturers and authors who stand to make money from continuing interest in UFOs."

True in some cases, but not all. I am one of many exceptions. When I published my own book ten years ago, I deliberately established the selling price so as to simply recover my investment in the project (several thousand dollars). In the end, I was out of pocket a couple of hundred dollars. No monetary gain was sought.

In the case of my lecturing, I have spoken (without fee) on a great many occasions and have never sought payment. In the case of my current lectures at Algonquin College (which I assume you know about) I am being paid, but this lecturing is at the request of Algonquin College. I did not seek the task. Many other serious investigators are in a similar position to myself, so the statement does not apply to all lecturers and authors by any means. Very misleading, and it casts all lecturers and authors in a bad light.

7. "...those who photograph airborne hubcaps or frisbees..."

Most Ufologists readily recognize such hoaxes exist and these can usually be readily determined. However, these constitute IFOs (Identified Flying Objects), not UFOs.