



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

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Jan](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

The Two Faces of Ufology

From: **Theresa** <70571.1735@CompuServe.COM>
Date: 12 Jan 97 00:39:26 EST
Fwd Date: Tue, 14 Jan 1997 00:35:28 -0500
Subject: The Two Faces of Ufology

>>From: XianneKei@aol.com
>>Date: Sat, 11 Jan 1997 02:02:01 -0500 (EST)
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Comments on Discovery programs

Dear Rebecca (and All),

I have pulled one specific comment from your message to Bob Shell, and separated it into a new thread. I think it is more important than any one case or claim and encompasses a great deal in the field of Ufology and should be addressed that way.

You said to Bob Shell:

>> Why don't you check out these claims before they are posted
>>because no doubt somebody somewhere will now believe, whether it true or not
>>that Four Winds Production Group is based near the Pentagon and is some sort
>>of gov't. front! >>

Over the past two years something wonderful happened inside the UFO community. Ufology laid down some criteria for what it will accept. Tough new rules were put into place for what is acceptable proof, and tough questions were asked. Claims were expected to be backed up. What a wonderful new image for the UFO community! No longer did the world see it as "those gullible fools that will believe anything and everything".

But what good are these new rules if we only apply them to people or claims that we don't like. Claims made by some people have been scrutinized practically down to the last syllable, while others have been taken at face value. One person that made inaccurate, or inadequate claims was ridiculed mercilessly, and even assigned a diminutive little nickname. Not such a good image for ufology, but if its acceptable to do that, it has to be applied to ALL those whose claims are found to be inaccurate. Regardless of whether they are on the 'correct' side of the fence or not.

Some people state that they are unwilling to do any research on a case until certain requests have been met. That's perfectly alright, it's a personal choice and there are no rules saying that anyone has to research anything. If one wishes to sit quietly on the sidelines and watch they may do so.

However, if they are sitting on the sidelines making claims to substantiate their own beliefs or opinions, should they not also be required to check those claims for accuracy before they spout them? Isn't there the same chance that those claims will be believed by somebody?

And, while I don't personally care for the practice, if they are going to use those claims to try to discredit someone or accuse them of something, shouldn't they be even more careful that the claims are correct?

If the field and topic are ever to be taken seriously there has to be a set of rules and those rules must be applied to every researcher, investigator, expert and witness in every case.

Wouldn't it be wonderful and save us each a lot of time and research effort if we could depend on each person doing their homework! Or we could depend on each other to say they don't know for sure. Then we would know just what we need to check it. But it doesn't work that way. Instead we find things like a researcher making claims, but doesn't even know what Record Group of the National Archives to find documents on the topic being discussed.

(Nothing personal, Ed. I know you only asked me for the references because you thought I didn't have them. I hope you were pleasantly surprised.)

Credibility is everyone's responsibility. We need to be sure that we actually check before we claim anything as fact and if we aren't sure, we say so. There is nothing wrong with saying you don't know or asking for help or information with things.

In the case of the message I quoted you from, that is exactly what Bob Shell did. He heard it from a source and was asking for clarification on it. If you read it over, you will see that. He asked for clarification, which I noted you could and did provide, Rebecca. But you also stated he should have checked before he posted his request??

I personally would like to see the UFO topic taken more seriously. And I would like to see credibility and accountability as standards in the field. But some attitudes and double standards really need to be changed before that can happen.

Regards,

Theresa

Search for other documents to/from: [70571.1735](#) | [xiannekei](#)

[[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](#).