



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

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

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: The Two Faces of Ufology

From: XianneKei@aol.com
Date: Sun, 26 Jan 1997 00:22:28 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 27 Jan 1997 09:49:07 -0500
Subject: Re: The Two Faces of Ufology

This message has been altered. I worked very hard to get it to conform to the 70 character rule, which requires taking it out AOL's mailer and putting it into a text editor. Hope it turned out ok. I tried to twist as many of Theresa's words as possible. JUST KIDDING.

HI Theresa,

Welcome home. A lot was happening as you were boarding the plane for the Nevada... I held my response until you were hopefully back at home safely.

> > Why Thank you for calling me two faced! I might have several names;
> > however that does not necessarily mean I am two faced. In fact, if I
> > were two faced I might put on a better one than this. <g>
> No, no, I wasn't calling you two-faced. That title actually comes from an
> article that I never finished writing about Ufology in general. Heck you
> are one of the few people that I have had a chance to meet and that I
> actually like and respect! I just thought I could use your response to
> Bob S. as a starting point. It seems to happen all over the field tho.

Well, I'm glad you cleared up THAT confusion. Thanks for the complement.

> (I'm still trying to figure out how the reports that Brazel found the
> debris at least a couple weeks before he reported it are addressed in the
> classic Roswell story, when it is claimed that the UFO didn't crash till
> the
> first week of July.)

That would probably be a good question for the Roswell people, like Kevin Randle and Stanton. I'm not an expert on Roswell by any means and there certainly seems to be a wide variety of ways of telling the story.

> > Am I required by one these new rules in ufology to respond to every
point?
> > Where are these rules posted anyway?
>
> That's a good question. I don't think I have seen them written down yet.
> But I have seen investigators/researchers refuse to investigate until the
> witnesses "prove" their story. That's new. Or that something is fake
until
> proven real. That's new. I wonder how these things would work if they
> were applied to abduction reports, for instance.

I think that is a pretty good unwritten rule, don't you? I think claimants should offer something to back up what they are saying. Ray hasn't offered much to back up his claim about having the film of an alien autopsy. Simple questions with simple answers would suffice. Like who did the film to video transfer. You know, Ray has been very protective of the cameraman but now we learn that he has sold the cameraman's interview to the Japanese. What's the story with that?

> And on the Discovery program they show some footage that is marked

> "Official Army Footage" of a medical procedure that is in B&W. If
> colour was the norm, I wonder why they couldn't show official footage
> in colour. Certainly would have gone further to prove their point.

I can't speak for what Four Winds Productions did. And McGovern did say that all medical procedures were filmed in color. But what we don't really know is what he meant by "all." That sounds kind of odd, I know, but I know for a fact that it was NOT only McGovern who made the claim about medical footage done in color. Gibson and Longo have both said it as well. Could it be that is what they did and they were speaking from their experience. What do you think? Probably wouldn't hurt to try to clear this up.

> I have a fax that is a response from one of my queries to the National
> Archives about the Little Henry footage that is in the USAF section. It
> sorta leaves open the question of whether or not it was shot by the
> military, but has some other information in it. That information reads
> to me like even if it was filmed by a military cameraman, it could
> not possibly have been the alleged autopsy cameraman. I would
> like some opinions on it, but don't think I should post it here,
> since I didn't go there physically and view the footage myself.

> But I would like to forward the fax to you and get your opinion/
> interpretation of it.

I'll send you my fax number in a private email or would you rather put it in some sort of file. I am not even close to an expert on these things but I would be happy to take a look at it and see if I might be able to tell you who might be of help.

> Oh, that was just an FYI, advanced notice thingie. <G> In case anyone
> wondered later where I disappeared to.

So tell us, how was the conference? I was there last year (only for a day or two though) and it was certainly an experience that I won't long forget. <g>

> I am a little bit worried about it. I don't see any skeptics on the
> guest speaker list, and I like the balanced conferences.

When you find a balanced conference, let us know. <g>

Rebecca

Search for other documents to/from: [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.

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