



## 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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> **Re: Lie Detection in UFO Controversies**

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Lie Detection in UFO Controversies

From: Jean van Gemert <jeanvg@dds.nl>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jul 1997 16:10:56 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jul 1997 13:41:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Lie Detection in UFO Controversies

>From: KRandle993@aol.com [Kevin Randle]  
>Date: Thu, 24 Jul 1997 09:00:27 -0400 (EDT)  
>To: updates@globalserve.net  
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Lie Detection in UFO Controversies

>A careful reading of The Randle Report will show that I have  
>reservations about the McCarthy test ...

Your characterization of the McCarthy polygraph test is that it "SPEAKS VOLUMES" [my emphasis] about Walton. This, we're supposed to believe, is your style of expressing strong reservations about it?!? I'll buy that when hell freezes over, Kevin.

>And, when we get to a point where a story has been told so often, has  
>been shared with the world, has been documented in books, and in which  
>the subject has undergone hypnotic regression, the the results of a  
>test administered some twenty years after the fact might be flawed.

Oh yes, that's the inventive twist you came up with. What you are saying is that Walton convinced himself the event was true, or for most part the retelling and regression made it 'easier' for him to lie, and this then accounts for Walton's passing of the 1993 test. The bottom line then is, according to Kev, Walton's a pathological liar influenced by his own story and books. If true, could he beat the polygraph? Dr. Honts makes it perfectly clear "the suggestion that telling a story over and over would make you comfortable with the story and enable you to pass the test is most unlikely." There simply is no empirical support for Kevin's wild contentions here.

How you're willing to extend this to the rest of the involved parties is an even greater conundrum. Are you saying Dalis and Rogers too had become top-experts in beating a state-of-the-art polygraph test? This probability is simply vanishingly small, leaving in sum (given combinatorial probability), highly conclusive confidence in the validity of their claim.

The bottom line is that you are not adding anything of substantive value here, Kevin. Instead, you just reiterate your, by now very familiar, arguments without exhibiting any indications of willingness to consider the variety of scathing criticisms offered. I am sure the phrase "don't bother me with the facts... my mind is made up," is applicable here.

>But the real point is that I reject the Walton case, not only  
>because of the failed, or allegedly failed polygraphs, but on  
>other evidence as well. We must look at the whole package and  
>not just a small segment of it. Look at the deception of both  
>the Lorenzens and the Waltons concerning the first test. That  
>is very revealing.

The only thing that comes to mind here is... Huh? Where's the causal relationship between APRO's suppression of the McCarthy results and Walton's alleged lying? I fail to see how APRO's clumsy, and irresponsible, handling of the McCarthy polygraph test result would have any significant bearing on the overall truthfulness of Walton's account. Especially considering that the McCarthy test itself is utterly useless.

>As for Gulf Breeze, the polygraph information is just one small  
>part of the whole picture. Again, it is all the other evidence  
>that I find to be persuasive when arguing against the reality of  
>the Ed Walter's Gulf Breeze sightings.

Details, Kev. I want details.

---

Science, Logic, and the UFO Debate:  
<http://www.primenet.com/~bdzeiler/index.html>

---

Search for other documents to/from: [jeanvg](#) | [krandle993](#)

---

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

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

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