



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](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Re: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth'

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth'

From: KRandle993@aol.com

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 1997 08:27:08 -0400 (EDT)

Fwd Date: Wed, 18 Jun 1997 10:27:43 -0400

Subject: Re: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth'

>From: XianneKei@aol.com

>Date: Mon, 16 Jun 1997 20:18:28 -0400 (EDT)

>To: updates@globalserve.net

>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: 'Roswell-- Anatomy of A Myth'

>>Date: 16 Jun 97 09:48:53 EDT

>>From: BOB SHELL <76750.2717@CompuServe.COM>

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Kent Jeffery's [sic] Debunking Article In The MUFON Journal

>Hi Bob,

>> In his latest newsletter Phil Klass comes down hard on me for being critical of Kent Jeffrey. Here is what Phil says:

> [snipped]

>That's not all he came down on you hard for -- you left out the last part of what Phil had to say about you:

>_A_CASE_OF_"SOUR GRIPES?"_ Shell's harsh comments may stem from the fact that Jeffrey was one of the first Roswell crashed-saucer proponents to publicly denounce the Santilli film as a hoax in 1995 while Shell was strongly endorsing its authenticity. For example, on Aug. 28, 1995, Shell said there was a "95% probability that the film was manufactured, exposed and processed in 1947... I know who the cameraman is, I know where he is." Shell's reluctance to denounce SCAM as a hoax recalls the sage observation of

>French philosopher Charles Peguy: "He who does not bellow the truth when he knows the truth make himself the accomplice of liars and forgers."

>Sounds like a nice way to call you a PR Flak, no?

>> As you found when you read it, Ed, it is simple debunkery, and not very sophisticated debunkery at that. Are we to believe that Kent was really a serious, dedicated Roswell researcher and then had his mind changed by this puny "evidence"? I think not. My advice to others is read it. It's pretty widely available now. And if this reads like someone who has had a serious change-of-heart (to borrow Phil's hyphens), then so be it. But if, instead, it reads like a debased attempt to throw road blocks in front of serious disclosure and research, all should join in your call on Jeffrey to remove himself from the issue at once. He can only do harm now.

>So you don't think Kent was serious... do you have any idea? I'm going out on a limb here, because I don't really know what these guys will say, but I wonder what the other serious Roswell researchers will have to say about

>Kent?

>Kevin Randle, I'm positive that you will disagree with Kent's conclusion,
>but do you think Kent was serious? Do you think he is controlled by som
>evil-alphabet soup agency?

Of course I disagree with his conclusions. I see that he accuses us of selective use of the data and then does exactly that. I think we can challenge each of his points without too much trouble.

Yes, I think he is serious, though I hesitate to say anything positive about him. This should not reflect on Kent but more on Don Schmitt. After the magazine article accused Schmitt of being dishonest, I wrote a long letter defending him, read it to him and he thanked me. Not once did he suggest that I might want to hang on to it. He left me twisting in the wind. However, I don't think that Kent is dishonest nor do I believe he is a government agent. I just think he's wrong on this point.

What I'm appalled at is not Kent's article but those who think it should be suppressed. Hey, this is America where we have the right to say any damn thing we want. I might not like it, but Kent has the right to say it, just as I have the right to ignore it, refute it, and challenge it. If we don't like what he says, let's prove him wrong rather than try to bury his work.

KRandle

Search for other documents to/from: [krandle993](#) | [xiannekei](#) | [76750.2717](#)

[[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](#).