

“NASA Unexplained Files” [Season 1 – single 2-hour program] has been aired several times since March 27, 2012, on various cable channels, including the Science Channel and the Discovery Networks International. It is a serious effort to offer competing assessments of some famous ‘space UFO stories’.

The program’s website is <http://science.discovery.com/tv-shows/are-we-alone/videos/nasas-unexplained-files.htm>, and was promoted by “NASA UFO Files Revealed On Science Channel Special”. posted: 03/27/2012 2:19 pm [Updated: 03/28/2012 2:47 am], at [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/27/nasa-ufo-science-channel-special\\_n\\_1380571.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/27/nasa-ufo-science-channel-special_n_1380571.html)

The promotional blurb [<http://www.wagtv.com/shows/detail/showid/35>] states: “Countless mysterious objects have been caught on camera by NASA. Many NASA astronauts have reported seeing unidentified flying objects. In this special, we reveal NASA's top ten unexplained encounters using original footage and revealing interviews with astronauts and scientists. Can these phenomena be explained away through science and detective work? Or have NASA's cameras captured signs of extra-terrestrial life?” It goes on to claim: “*NASA's Unexplained Files* features in-depth interviews with, among others, astronauts Story Musgrave and Alan Bean, physics professor Dr Jack Kasher and NASA space flight operations expert Jim Oberg.”

The program’s production staff [WAG TV Producer/Director -- Nick Patterson; Producer -- Alexis Burke; Executive Producer – Martin Durkin; for SCIENCE – Associate Producer – Katie Pyne and Executive Producer – Wyatt Channell] had carefully laid out their expository narrative, and my taped comments [along with many others] were fit into this format.

The show was aimed at satisfying this editorial narrative, and of course was never intended to be an exposition of my particular views [or anyone else’s]. In so doing, some of my own views may have been presented in incomplete or garbled form. This report is intended to assist viewers of the program to more fully and accurately understand the points I had intended to convey.

Unauthorized copies of the video can be found on youtube, e.g. [www.youtube.com/watch?v=j3Uk\\_31Qy-0](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j3Uk_31Qy-0) and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9mrbmhio2us> and [http://www.disclose.tv/action/viewvideo/110451/Nasas\\_Unexplained\\_Files\\_Full\\_Documentary/](http://www.disclose.tv/action/viewvideo/110451/Nasas_Unexplained_Files_Full_Documentary/) and authorized snippets here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jn-hIrhg9Ac>

A discussion of the program is at  
<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread823836/pg1>

The following scene-by-scene commentary concentrates on clarifying my own investigative results. The comments are linked to the clock time into the program in the youtube versions without commercial messages.

00:00:30

Narrator: They also captured remarkable images closer to home: Objects which seem to defy explanation, lying just outside Earth's atmosphere.

Musgrave: "We see a couple of starlike things..."

Narrator: "Senior NASA astronauts remain disturbed by the phenomenon they see."

Musgrave. "I did not know what that object was and I do not know today."

Narrator:: Can these sightings be explained?

00:01:00

Kasher: "It's my conclusion that we're looking at some kind of spacecraft."

Oberg: "People see things at the limits of.... From their imaginations and from their fears."

01:09 Is there now evidence...

Comments from Musgrave, Mitchell.

Narrator:: Incredible official footage.

D'Antonio: "One thing we can say about this NASA footage, it's unimpeachable."

01:38

"The greatest missions of all time, we reveal NASA's strangest encounters in space."

01:46 Friendship-7

Narrator:: “But then Glenn witnesses something totally unexpected. Darting lights – a mass of them envelope the capsule.”

Image of lights going by, accurately labeled ‘reconstruction’

“He never figured out what they were, and neither did anyone else.”

Comment by Bruce Bleakley, Museum Director, ‘Frontiers of Flight’  
[[www.flightmuseum.com](http://www.flightmuseum.com), 214-350-4215 [bleakley@flightmuseum.com](mailto:bleakley@flightmuseum.com)]

Narrator:: Could he have imagined these so-called ‘fireflies’? Space historian James Oberg thinks this is unlikely.

Oberg: “I don’t think so. Early astronauts had special attitudes to getting through danger.”  
[jeo: This was NOT in response to the Mercury-7 question. ]

Narrator:: So if he wasn’t imagining them, what were they? Fellow astronaut Story Musgrave has witnessed something similar, and thinks they are particles of ice.

Musgrave - quote

04:50

Narrator: Today most experts agree with Musgrave’s explanation.

Jeo: More correct. ALL experts agree, and the program failed to produce a single one that didn’t.

06:50

Gemini-4, spacewalk video

“Command pilot Jim McDivitt watches from inside the capsule.” But video shows Ed White. The next day, “Suddenly McDivitt notices an object outside the craft” [video again shows Ed White].

An official communication log – [labeled ‘reconstruction’]

08:01

“The closest manmade object they locate is 1200 miles away.”

jeo: mention was not made of the beer-can-shaped Titan-2 booster was much, MUCH closer.

Nick Pope: “There was a discrepancy between what James McDivitt saw and reported, and what NORAD was suggesting that he had actually seen.”

Narrator: "Some observers believe that the object was part of the Gemini craft." [jeo: garbled -- the prosaic theory is that it was a segment of the Titan launch vehicle]

N: "McDivitt disagrees." 08:36 Oberg: "McDivitt still says it was not his own booster." [jeo: This quotes me to refute MY own theory, since I immediately afterwards listed reasons McDivitt might not have recognized it himself!]

N: "Was it a secret spy satellite?"

Oberg: "There were satellites being launched... you never could be sure what was out there."

09:00 Narrator: "...but NASA confirmed no secret satellites were in the area."

jeo: No, they didn't, ever. NORAD does that, but did not confirm this. On this occasion. They appear to have also concluded he saw his own booster [Phil Klass was told this by a source in NORAD].

June 7, capsule lands.

Oberg: "I've seen the flight film... it's pretty clear he did not capture what he saw..."

Oberg: "But what it could have been -- was a real mystery..." [jeo: EDITING: Cuts my following phrase, "until I did my study."]

Narrator: "To this day it is not known what McDivitt saw."

Jeo: I disagree. The case for the Titan booster has been accepted by Dr. Franklin Roach and by NASA Mission Control experts, and most everybody else.

JEO: My 1979 report here: <http://www.jamesoberg.com/gemini4.html>

11:50 Gemini-7 "have a bogey"

12:40

Narrator: Jim Lovell uses the term "bogey". "A way of designating an enemy aircraft."

Jeo: wrong -- a 'bogey' is an unknown, while a known enemy aircraft is a 'bandit'.]

Narrator:: "Borman later claims the bogey was the spacecraft's own booster, but official transcripts suggest a different interpretation." jeo: Borman's OWN later words saying it WAS the booster are not shown in order to use the words of somebody else who wasn't there. See them here: <http://www.jamesoberg.com/borman.frank.pdf>

13:30 N: Nick Pope doubts astronauts would mistake the booster for another object.

Jeo: Pope has never investigated a single astronaut UFO case and has no professional or academic familiarity about astronaut eyeball observation skills.

Quote: best you can get with regard to observation...

13:55 Narrator:: Some space experts claim that the bogey was part of a larger cluster of debris. But Pope remains unconvinced.

Pope: "The real answer is, we just don't know."

JEO: A mission description explains why Borman's own claim is valid:

<http://www.jamesoberg.com/gemini7.html>

14:15 Gemini-11

[Launch video is of Atlas-Agena rocket, not correct Titan rocket, with Gemini air-to-ground comm overlain on sequence]

Narrator:: "The following day, the astronauts see something outside Gemini-11 that they cannot identify..."

15:16 Narrator: "...a bright object that seems to change shape before their eyes."

Jeo: inaccurate: Both astronauts saw the small, structured object, slowly tumbling, and never reported it 'changing shape'. The blobby photographs do have different shapes, typical of highly-enlarged film imagery.

Oberg: "The crew noticed something bright coming toward them. They reached for cameras, took some pictures of something going past their windows."

15:30 Scene: Extreme magnification blob rotating, and passing down towards horizon. NO caution label about 'reconstruction' or 'simulation'.

Narrator:: "Again, officials try to identify the object. They claim that the nearest manmade object was a Russian satellite orbiting 280 miles away."

Jeo: untrue: Other manmade objects were MUCH closer.

Bruce Maccabee investigated: "It could not possibly be the Russian satellite."

The satellite was 3000 miles away... "What they did see is up for grabs."

“It becomes what I call a truly unidentified flying object, if, after I – if after careful investigation it still remains unexplained.”

Jeo: Omission: Brad Sparks has suggested the object was a pack of surplus tools manually jettisoned several hours earlier. The reported angular motion more closely resembles that, than any more distant object in a crossing orbit. This most likely explanation is left out of the story.

18:35 Apollo-11

Reportage, Al Bean [Apollo-12] general comments.

20:38 Narrator:: Three days into their mission, the astronauts see a flashing object.”

Armstrong asks about the S4B ‘with respect to us.’

20:55 Kasher on them seeing a flashing object: “They’re not going to radio back that they’ve seen something unless it’s something they can’t explain.” [he is quoting a comment Buzz Aldrin made in a TV interview]

Oberg: “The NASA guys said their tracking data suggested it was about 6000 miles away, which would have been difficult for them to see.”

Narrator: “The sighting remains unexplained.”

jeo: I disagree. Analysis of this and similar sightings on other outbound Apollo flights, and ground-based telescope views, strongly suggest the object was a tumbling ‘SLA’ panel off the Saturn-V’s third stage. This explanation is OMITTED.

22:19 Narrator:: “Throughout the 1960s, as the number of missions increased, so did the number of sightings of unidentified objects.”

Narrator: re Condon report... Mitchell comment.

23:52 Pope: “In the Ministry of Defense [and] in NASA footage, there are things that cannot be explained.”

JEO: My 1982 book chapter on the myths: <http://www.debunker.com/texts/apollo11.html>

JEO: compare to SLA panels on Apollo-17

<http://www.openminds.tv/nasa-ufo-transmissions-make-the-news-and-the-latest-daft-punk-album-1119/>

JEO: telescope image of Apollo-13 and 4 SLA panels nearby, 1970

<http://www.w7ftt.net/apollo13.jpg>

apollo-12 <http://www.eclipsetours.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/APOLLO121.jpg>

24:02 Skylab-3 September 1973

Jack Lousma [Narrator: pronounces 'loose-ma'] spots something out wardroom window.

25:00 Bean reads from diary: "Out the wardroom window we saw a bright red light."

Bright-dim cycle about 10 seconds, "drifted along with us for 20 minutes or more. It was the brightest object we'd seen."

Garriott took four photos. Narrator: "But the fourth also captures the object's bizarre shape."

Jeo: unjustified claim. The fourth image had a squiggle, and the question is open whether it was the object's shape [counter to all three eyeball reports and 3 of 4 images], or an imaging artifact. The misleading script slips the desired conclusion into what should be the raw description.

Oberg: "One of the pictures they took was widely published because it showed what looked like a squashed spider, a squiggle, a squashed slinky toy. . . . It's more likely that picture is more likely a camera aberration, an exposure setting error..."

Maccabee disagrees: "One thing I'm quite sure of is that the structured image is not an accident of aberrations in the lens. Exposure time was probably about 1/250 of a second, that's fast enough to stop almost any hand motion."

Jeo: Such squiggle effects even on star images from handheld cameras are not unheard of. I have other examples. Narrator: quote Bean on satellite, "that's what it probably was."

36:20 N: "But Oberg is not convinced." Jeo: Opposite is true – I WAS convinced.

36:24 Oberg: "No satellites are predominantly red, you'll probably never see a red satellite coming by overhead."

jeo: Misunderstanding of my comment. I told them that insulation fragments off the Skylab MDA had been seen before and were reddish in color. They omitted that. This comment was made regarding large satellites seen from surface of the Earth [hence the phrase 'passing overhead'].

“During the encounter, astronaut Owen Garriott times how long it took the object to fall into Earth’s shadow compared to Skylab. Bruce Maccabee uses this information and the photograph to gauge the object’s size.

[Inaccurate: The crew timed the extinction, when object went dark, but could not identify the shadow that caused it to go dark – THAT is the central unanswered question, NOT a pre-assumed conclusion that it was ‘sunset’. I told them that the geometry of the viewing direction compared to solar illumination would cause a shadow of Skylab itself to be cast right across the path that the object appeared to be following – they withheld mention of the presence of that shadow]

26:45 Bruce: “You come up with something that’s a couple of hundred meters in size, much larger than anything that was in orbit, much larger even than the Skylab itself, which was the biggest thing that was in orbit at the time.”

GUESSING: This requires two dubious assumptions – there is no shadow cast by the Skylab itself, and the three astronauts vision was too poor to see the large structural shape.

26:55 N: “The exact nature of the bright red object seen by the astronauts on Skylab 3 remains a mystery.”

JEO: My debunking here: [http://www.debunker.com/texts/SkylabUFO\\_1973.html](http://www.debunker.com/texts/SkylabUFO_1973.html)

27:05 Kasher teaser: “It’s not space junk, that doesn’t change direction... It’s my conclusion we’re looking at some kind of spacecraft.” JEO: IMAGINARY FACTOID BY NON-EXPERT: Nearby small stuff often changes direction as thrusters fire, it’s an effect familiar to Mission Control operators, flight crew, and other observers.

27:30 STS-48

Oberg worked at Mission Control when it occurred [video of me driving onto JSC]

27:48 Narrator::“the STS-48 video is probably the classic shuttle UFO chase”

Narrator:: “Physicist Jack Kasher has analyzed hours of NASA footage... He rules out the most obvious explanations”

Kasher: “It’s not space junk -- that doesn’t change direction.”

Narrator:: “Oberg believes the object is a small piece of ice.”

Oberg: "The way stuff moves around outside the shuttle is unearthly, as you'd expect ... When a thruster fires or something leaks out, it can be blown on a different course."

29:20 Kasher disagrees – "The object moves over and really physically stops for half a second. Now if this thing is an ice particle it can't do that."

"I think that any skeptics that try to disparage that and make these into ice particles are just simply wrong."

29:44 "It's my conclusion we're looking at some kind of spacecraft."

The flash? Particle beam weapon?

Narrator:: "The STS-48 sighting remains unresolved." JEO: Unjustified description. Nobody 'sighted' it. Crewmen shown the video said it was typical of nearby particles.

JEO: My numerous analyses and documentation of STS-48 explanation:

[http://www.jamesoberg.com/ufo\\_astronaut.html](http://www.jamesoberg.com/ufo_astronaut.html)

30:24 STS-75

Interviews Franklin Chang.... OMITTS his explanatory assessment of the ufo videos

32:08 Marc D'Antonio on "All they could do was continue to film it, and that's what they did .. And this was the POYSE [??] that became the STS-75 incident"

Narrator: "The camera captures a swarm of ...."

33:20 Narrator:: "But D'Antonio believes the footage ISN'T what it appears to be."

Experiment uses not thin tethers but wide ribbon.

"Nothing more than a video illusion."

JEO: My May 2000 assessment: <http://rense.com/general/stsd.htm>

34:40 STS-80 Shows Tom Jones in spacesuit, Story Musgrave

Narrator: At night, the camera is pointed back to Earth, when it suddenly captures this event."

Oberg: "Objects appear, as if from behind Earth, behind a cloud..."

Narrator: "They seem to move into a cube", then a circle.

Narrator: "Some investigators believe this represents an attempt by UFOs to communicate."

D'Antonio: "merely blinking"

Narrator: His theory to account for the blinking? They are tumbling."

Oberg thinks the objects are debris near the shuttle.

Musgrave believes the STS-80 xxxx can be explained.

JEO: My report here: <http://www.realufos.net/2008/04/sts-80-ufo-best-high-quality-version.html>

JEO: Crewmen Musgrave and Jones debunk the UFO story here:

[http://www.jamesoberg.com/musgrave\\_debunks\\_sts-80\\_ufo.pdf](http://www.jamesoberg.com/musgrave_debunks_sts-80_ufo.pdf) and here

<http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread690924/pg2#pid16845532>

Jones on his own website: <http://skywalking1.wordpress.com/2011/04/18/did-ufos-visit-sts-80-columbia/>

Musgrave snake on two missions.

STS-115 Brent Jett

Narrator: "...something experts find very hard to explain."

EJ Jett, captures an unexplained image.

"This object's shape and movement attract attention."

Kasher: "We see triangles

D'Antonio: "This makes it look very interesting."

He thinks it's a reflection in the window through which the astronaut is shooting.

JEO: the program shows post-ET separation video of the weird-looking 'interface ice' that often comes off the connector between the shuttle belly fuel lines and the separating drop tank' [several missions have shown this], and allows Kasher and Nick Pope to speculate it is a triangle UFO when any NASA spox could quickly have sent

them more videos of the same prosaic phenomenon. D'Antonio tries to explain it away as window reflection, so he strikes out too.

Discussion here: <http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread448680/pg1>

Similiar ET sep ice release on STS-121, 1:00 into this video:

[http://mfile.akamai.com/18565/wmv/etouchsyst2.download.akamai.com/18355/wm.nas-a-global/sts-121/ksc\\_070506\\_sts121\\_et.asx](http://mfile.akamai.com/18565/wmv/etouchsyst2.download.akamai.com/18355/wm.nas-a-global/sts-121/ksc_070506_sts121_et.asx)

STS-124 1:56 and then 4:04 and after

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=4J\\_e9WLqxMY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=4J_e9WLqxMY)

STS-118 example:

[http://www.youtube.com/feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/feature=player_embedded)

also STS-115

I posted this message: posted on Jul, 17 2009 @ 05:27 PM

The same shape showed up in the downlinked ET sep images from 127 on Friday. When seen closeup, it turns out to be an ice imprint of the fuel line interface facing. It shows up often, precisely during and only during this maneuver.

<http://www.closedtruth.com/ufo-activity-in-space-video-atlantis-shuttle/>

Medusa [http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:STS-115\\_UFO\\_enlarged.jpg](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:STS-115_UFO_enlarged.jpg)

Conclusion

Oberg: "People see things at the limits of their vision and fill in the rest of the details from their imagination."

Narrator: "No one knows what NASA has encountered on many of its missions."

Plait: <http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/badastronomy/2009/06/02/nasa-ufos-explained/>