



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Aug](#) -> **Re: Rebecca Rants**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Rebecca Rants

From: **Ron Decker** <ron_decker@wavebbs.com>
Date: Sat, 16 Aug 1997 05:45:48 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 16 Aug 1997 09:44:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Rebecca Rants

> From: XianneKei@aol.com
> Date: Sat, 16 Aug 1997 00:19:33 -0400 (EDT)
> To: updates@globalserve.net
> Subject: Re: Rebecca Rants

> > From: John Velez <jjvif@spacelab.net>
> > From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>
> > From: Don Allen <dona@totcon.com>
> > From: Glenn Joyner <infohead@airmail.net>
> > Subject: Re: Rebecca Rants

> I appreciate everyone's reply to my posting and basically, I have to say that
> I agree. I think Mark Cashman's raised a valid point when he said:

[....]

> Maybe we are to blame for not making people more aware of this evidence. We
> seem to get bogged down in the flashy claims -- the implant removals, the
> alien artifacts, the crash retrievals. But it appears that it's these flashy
> claims that people want to know and hear about. It's big news when a mile
> long ET vehicle is stranded over Phoenix and thousands of people see it. It's
> big news when an anonymous man gives a rock he claims came from the Roswell
> crash to the Alien Hunter [TM]. It's big news when an anonymous cameraman
> films an alien autopsy and sells said film to a man looking for Elvis
> footage. Or what about this alien interview footage -- everyone seems curious
> about that. Or.... well, you get the picture. The general public obviously
> doesn't care for evidence, they want to hear Robert Dean tell about a book
> that he allegedly saw. Or David Adair talk about his dealings with NASA when
> he was 17 years old. Or....

Rebecca,

I was reading this and, before I got to the paragraph immediately above, I was thinking, "Boredom is the key here." I think you've summed it up quite well.

BTW, thanks for posing these questions.

IMHO, serious UFO researchers are not to blame for the lack of awareness currently amongst the general population. The general public wants sensational material; it's far more interesting to read about a trip in a flying saucer and sex with lizards than reading some technical piece about trace evidence. So why is anyone surprised when highly sensational (and probably questionable) evidence is consumed and preferred before serious and not-so-titillating evidence?

And, if the public is so willing to eat this stuff up, the law of supply and demand enters the equation. Essentially, there's more on the

way.

I think another key is the inability of the American public to sustain an interest in virtually anything for long periods of time. Flashy and sensational entertainment is the order of the day. More than likely a sub-group of people will continue to gather material and report with little public acknowledgement, approval or interest while the more visible sensationalists will continue to grow and gain more influence.

Unfortunately, one of the components of unveiling the ufo phenomenon is public interest because public interest/opinion is a driving force in determining the sustainability of this field. If the public is content (and even eager) to settle for alien gunfights and lurid sex with people of another world (and sex always sells) then that's where the public focus is going to stay. It's bound to be frustrating for someone doing not-so-sensational investigations to see their work taking a back seat to someone claiming to have direct contact with the space brothers, for instance.

> It's all very discouraging to me. However, I was somewhat encouraged by
> everyone's response to my question until I read:

> > From: Ted Viens <drtedv@smart1.net>

> [a big, fat, arrogant snip]

> Either Ted was being really sarcastic or anyone who questions is a naysayer,
> not just any naysayer either -- an arrogant naysayer.

> So pay no attention to me -- I might really rant.

Go to it. I'd wager it'd make some interesting reading. :)

Best regards,
Ron.

Search for other documents to/from: [ron_decker](#) | [xiannekei](#) | [jyif](#) | [mcashman](#) | [dona](#) | [infohead](#) | [drtedv](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.

To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net

Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

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