

Re: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article

From: campbell@ufomind.com (Glenn Campbell, Las Vegas)
Date: Wed, 15 Jan 1997 09:42:39 -0800
Subject: Re: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article

4 responses to Campbell's complaints about Newsweek Conspiracy article....

<http://www.ufomind.com/area51/list/1996/dec/1996/v096n032.html>
<http://www.ufomind.com/area51/list/1997/jan/a08-002.shtml>

=====
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 1996 08:54:52 -0800
To: campbell@ufomind.com (Glenn Campbell, Las Vegas)
From: "A.J. Craddock" <craddock@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: AREA 51: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article

Nice to see some vintage Campbell editorial writing again!

You are so right in your analysis of who is actually doing and accomplishing anything (and who is not!)

Fortunately you are performing a great service in acting as a lightning rod for Area 51, and raising public consciousness about the whole issue.

And like him or not, Dr. Steven Greer of CSETI (<http://www.cseti.com>) with the Project Starlight initiative is also selflessly and proactively pressuring the control groups for public disclosure of clandestine extraterrestrial matters.

These kinds of collective pressures are reluctantly forcing certain (albeit weak) revelations from the Government such as the recent "Life on Mars" pronouncements.

So all the efforts are to some degree efficacious.

=====
To: campbell@ufomind.com
Subject: Re: AREA 51: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article
From: dark_iz@juno.com (Andrew W Martin)
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 1996 21:01:53 EST

Glenn-

As much as we love you and value your opinion, and we certainly don't complain about your work at the research center (well, at least I don't), please, please, please try to keep away from your soapbox. Once in a while is fine, but sometimes it just overwhelms us (us meaning me). I appreciate it when you go on at length about Area 51 and related topics, but we (once again meaning me) don't need commentaries about media ethics cluttering our mailboxes.

OK, I just needed to vent that. I'm fine now. Really.

=====
From: glewis@usit.net (George Lewis)
To: campbell@ufomind.com (Glenn Campbell)
Subject: Re: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article
Date: Sat, 28 Dec 1996 17:19:06 GMT

On Sat, 28 Dec 1996 08:24:47 -0800, you wrote:

>The problem is that I don't recall saying those words. If I said the first
>sentence, it was accompanied by a lot of qualifiers, and I am certain I
>didn't say the second sentence at all. I pride myself on precision of
>speech, especially when talking to reporters, and I don't have any sources
>at Area 51. How, then, could I hear anything from them?

Glenn, you hit the nail on the head. You could be asked "do you like

the color of red on that truck?" your response "no, I don't like that color of red on that truck." printed quote "No, I don't like the color red."

I did an interview once (local news TV) and they asked me all sorts of stuff. they took "one small part" and used it (out of context of course).

>people who DID work at Area 51, but they are as much groping for answers as >I am. (I don't consider "Jarod 2" an Area 51 worker and never refer to him >as such. He tells an interesting story taking place elsewhere, but like >others it is entirely unverifiable.)

while I found the Bob Lazar story interesting (and somewhat verifiable), I found the Jarod2 story to be kinda, I dunno, something was wrong there. Asking permission from his boss? something doesn't sound right.

=====

From: John Pike <johnpike@fas.org> [Permission given]
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 1996 08:24:31 -0500
To: campbell@ufomind.com
Subject: Campbell featured in Newsweek conspiracy article

>Yiiipes! I guess the mark of celebrity is being frequently misquoted in >major magazines.

Yes, that is about the size of it -- if they spell your name right, everything after that is just icing on the cake.

>The problem is that I don't recall saying those words.

Yeah, happens to me all the time -- there are some reporters who are very good about verifying quotes, and there are others [who will remain nameless] who have been known to insert things that approximate what I might have said if they had bothered to call me which they didn't, and yet others who would not give me an attribution regardless of how much I might have helped him write the article -- it takes all kinds, it seems.

>things I don't recall saying. Reading these articles, I discover a Glenn >Campbell I never knew.

At times these folks feel they have to make things "a bit clearer than the truth." But let us expand on this a bit -- this is the fundamental difference between broadcasting and mass media versus the narrowcasting of the net -- the mass media reporters almost never return to stories other than "big" stories about Presidents and Kings and Princes and powers and principalities, so frankly, Scarlet, they don't give a damn about the tradeoff between telling it like it is versus telling a semi-fictionalized version of the story that has been "improved and enhanced" for mass consumption and comprehension -- in your case, the problem is that the full nuance of the story would have just been too complectified to fit into their news hole, and would have left the gentle reader bewildered.... This tradeoff seems almost inevitable with the mass media, and is always present in any authorial exercise, but I would get off on an excessively longish rant if I tried to solve this matter here and now....

>(I certainly can't complain, though. Throughout most of the Freedom Ridge >era, I basically got a free ride from the press

Those who live by the sound.byte die by the sound.byte.

>I guess another mark of celebrity is not caring too much about how millions >may see you.

Precisely!!!! My wife, who is not celebrated, is continuously horrified at my uninhibited public behavior [for instance, the way in which I burst out in laughter at a private joke in a restaurant yesterday -- she sez I act like a madman] but I know from long years of corrosive exposure to celebrity that it just don't matter ...

>lesson I am beginning to learn is that it makes no difference at all what >millions of people think, because those millions don't do anything.

IMHO this is not entirely correct, but there is a kernel of wisdom here -- the reason the New York Times is "important" is not because a million people read it, but because the dozen key folks [on whatever story] *know* that it is read by a million people, and therefore contemplate anew whether there is a desirement for them to alter their role-playing for this vast audience, on the off chance that the million *might* do something -- we are gettin into

some pretty tall grass here

>People look to publicity that same way they approach aliens: they expect it
>to break down barriers, solve problems and lead them to truth. In fact,
>the only thing publicity accomplishes is worldwide humiliation of one party
>or another, which sometimes can be useful (when, say, the poor Air Force is
>the foil) but often backfires. There is still only those dozen people who
>will do anything -- and they don't have time to read Newsweek.

I would not dis-associate myself from these insights.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [Archive Main Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Mailing List](#)]
[[Area 51](#) | [UFO Topics](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Top Level](#)]

Area 51 Mailing List - [Standards and General Information](#)

Sponsored by the [Area 51 Research Center](#). Moderated by Glenn Campbell.
Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

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