

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



Navigation

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

Search...

...for this word in:

Page Titles
 Page Contents
 Book
 Title/Author

[Help](#)

New Catalog Items (Random Selection)

[Miracle at Midway](#) (used hc) Gordon W. Prange & Donald M. Goldstein & Katherine V. Dillon - \$5.50
[Bodily Harm: The Breakthrough Healing Program for Self-Injurers](#) (used hc) Karen Conterio & Wendy Lader - \$10.00
[Skiing: The Mind Game](#) (used trpb) Marlin M. Mackenzie & Ken Denlinger - \$12.0
[Other Worlds](#) (new trpb) /s/steiger/ - \$14.95
[Creationism vs. Evolution](#) - Assortment
[Confessions of a Part-Time Call Girl](#) (used hc) Barbara Ignoto - \$8.00

[Other New Items](#) | [Main Catalog Page](#) | [Subjects](#)

2000+ new & used titles, including hundreds you won't find at Amazon!

Log-In Here

For Advanced Features

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

[Our Focus](#)

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged'

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Wed, 23 Jul 1997 09:59:01 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jul 1997 13:09:13 -0400
Subject: Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged'

>From: XianneKei@aol.com
>Date: Mon, 21 Jul 1997 14:22:36 -0400 (EDT)
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Santilli Had Jeffrey 'Pegged'

>To the best of my knowledge Kent called the cameramen's association (don't
>remember the name of the organization but it is in his SCAM article) and was
>given names/phone #'s of three people: Longo, Gibson and McGovern. I think
>the first 3 he spoke to gave him all the same (or nearly the same answers)
>but to be sure I would recommend that you contact Kent for the additional
>and/or correct details. How many should he have interviewed?

>It's easy to criticize what we ourselves have not investigated. You have
>proof that Kent's cameramen are incorrect? Present the evidence and confront
>them but don't do it on the "net" until AFTER you have contacted the men with
>whom you may disagree.

My comments weren't necessarily meant to be critical, but to point out that bias is a factor that may well have come into play. The number of cameramen interviewed is irrelevant if you've gone through a selection process to make sure they can provide the statements you require to make your point. Where he obtained the names, their years of service, and portfolio is interesting information, and could help to lend credibility to their comments. But in the end, he would have to make a value judgement on which interviews to use, and it would only make sense for him to use those that supported his own beliefs (or the viewpoint he wanted to promote).

It was obvious that Kent was convinced that the AA film was a fake from the beginning. I probably would have been more willing to listen to his comments if he had not relied so heavily on the fact that the AA creature looked too human, which he characterized as an impossibility. That opinion certainly can't be proven and seems to indicate pre-conceived notions that many might not agree with. Unless he had a change of heart, any investigation that he performed, or interviews that he conducted, would have been tainted by his beliefs.

[I would note that IMHO this is common in this genre, and without a solid (and acceptable) peer review process we are all left to our own belief structure and knowledge to judge the evidence presented.]

I am not as critical of Kent as others have been on this list, and while I

may disagree with his findings I understand that everyone has to reach their own conclusions and they may be different than mine. His "Scam" article was well written and researched, but that doesn't mean that it was an impartial examination of the evidence. That he changed his stance on Roswell and now accepts the "MOGUL" explanation is somewhat surprising, given his decision to begin an international initiative to gather signatures in search of the truth, but those are the conclusions he has reached.

IMHO, Kent Jeffrey was not a secret "debunker" waiting for the proper moment to throw cold water on Roswell. If that were the case, I think he would have been more subtle and the damage would have been more noticeable. From the discussions I've held with a number of people, Jeffrey's change of heart has had the same impact as the new book by the Air Force, which is relatively minor. But there are many in the genre who compare his actions to that of a traitor, and if he wasn't aware of the negative feelings this would generate he was fooling himself.

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](#).