



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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged'

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Sun, 20 Jul 1997 09:40:00 -0400
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jul 1997 11:53:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged'

>From: XianneKei@aol.com
>Date: Sat, 19 Jul 1997 02:27:29 -0400 (EDT)
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged' -- NOT!!

>I agree somewhat about Kent's latest paper, but I think his paper on the AA
>film was brilliant and has not been refuted to my satisfaction.

>> He makes what I consider to be walleed assumptions which makes it very
>> difficult to believe his intent is anything OTHER THAN debunkary. It is
>> this same brand of quantum leap assumptions Kent tried to apply to the
>> AA film, as alluded to by Mr. Santilli in his Feb. 20, 1996 letter.

>Quantum leap assumptions in the SCAM article? I don't think so. He had some
>things in there people didn't agree with (his thoughts on what life would
>look like) but the interviews with 3 cameramen from WWII was not assumption.

His interview with three cameramen was well done, but how many cameramen
did he actually interview, and what was there selection process. Could he
perhaps have found three other cameramen with different views if his goal
had been to show that the "film" was real? Several military cameramen have
posted information to the "net" that would seem to support the validity of
the technique shown, and in the end all of Kent's statements of proof are
just as anecdotal as everthing else in this circus.

>> I believe Kent wants to get the truth, whatever that is, out of the
>> Government just as we all do. However, he seems to go to extraordinary
>> lengths to refute the very things which capture the public's interest,
>> which is the most effective way to put pressure on the Government.

>I agree that we must get the public interested in order to put pressure on
>the government. But let's do it with the body of the evidence, rather than
>specific cases. Roswell is far from the be all - end all UFO Case. Just
>because people are interested in it, and just because it is popular, does not
>make it real. And besides the government has made it's opinion of Roswell
>pretty clear -- CASE CLOSED.

That Kent has changed his position is not an issue here, but there was
something to be said for the timing of his announcement and the
implications that it raises. Clearly the Air Force wanted to wait until
the last minute to release their new "report" so as to offset the Roswell
festivities, and Kent's decision to issue his findings in the MUFON Journal
raises the same issues.

Of course, I would like to know MUFON's position regarding Kent Jeffrey and
how that organization now views his research and work.

>But take the thousands of pilot sightings, the hundreds of EM effect cases,
>the ground trace cases and get excited and interested in those. Evidence
>isn't just ONE case, it's the thousands of cases.

Well said, but the fact is that the general public will view the entire genre based on information they gather from a few visible sources. Many will incorrectly assume that since one sighting was caused by a secret balloon, that "could" explain the others that have remained "unidentified". Once the decision is made in their minds, it is rarely re-evaluated. How many newspaper reporters do you know that have gone back to re-investigate a sighting after it is shown through research that the initial Air Force statement that the cause was "Venus" turned out to be impossible?

That being said, I would agree that there are many other areas of investigation that should be pursued. But Kent seemed to think that the evidence he could gather would lead him to the truth, and that may not be the case. Whether it is the result of some grand conspiracy, or our inability to interpret that evidence, it is entirely possible that we are not able to develop answers that we could understand. IMHO, Our understanding of the universe around us is vast, but sometimes our limitations become clouded by our ego.

Steve

Search for other documents to/from: [steve](#) | [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](#).