

Earth



# Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Are contactees ever lied to?

From: **Jim Deardorff** <deardorj@ucs.orst.edu>  
Date: Wed, 30 Apr 1997 17:52:35 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 01 May 1997 08:47:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Are contactees ever lied to?

> From: Vince\_Johnson\_at\_TENSOR\_HSTN@ccmailsmtp.hstn.expl.pgs.com  
> Date: Tue, 29 Apr 97 18:16:50 cst  
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>  
> Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: Kal Korff Admits He's NOT A Spy! [Jeroen  
> . . . .  
> You seem to be ignoring the possibility that these guys, Adamski  
> and Meier, deliberately made this stuff up (lied). Naturally,  
> neither was in possession of information concerning the weather  
> on Venus -- which, if you accept their stories at face value,  
> they should have known before Carl Sagan.  
>  
> Either they made these stories up or the Cosmic Space Brothers  
> lied to them. Which do you think is more likely?

Now that ufologists can accept that abductees are genuine (since about 1985), one can first ask a question like that about them. Haven't we read of a lot of abductees being told and shown things that either didn't turn out to be true, or that conflicted with or contradicted each other? We have come to realize that most abductees' stories of having been abducted are true; but does that require us to believe that everything they are told or shown is also true? Obviously not! So I see no reason why contactees need have been treated more honestly by their contactors, especially those whose experiences are supported overwhelmingly through witnesses' reports as well as UFO photos/movies. Such a contactee would need to be fed disinformation that would lead ufologists, scientists and the news media into thinking they are fakes, would they not, in order that the aliens not blow their own coverup and violate their "Prime Directive?"

I don't know enough about Adamski's case to try to defend him; obviously IF he met aliens who told him they were from Venus (or rather the surface of Venus), we suspect he was fed a lot of bull. Meier was told by Semjase that Adamski was a fake; was that mostly bull?

In the case of Meier, he didn't meet "Venusians" and didn't see any signs of life on Venus on his five-day space trip to various spots. He didn't see the surface of Venus at all until they emerged below cloud base, when he was told they were down to 40 km above the surface. He describes it (this was following his 15 July, 1975, contact) as wild looking and covered with craters, with some not-too-high mountains on one side.

He was told he could not photograph through the viewing screens as he had done when they were much higher up above the clouds, because their view screens that permitted photography had to be closed down when they got lower, due to Venus's high temperatures nearer the surface; yet he could see through this other view screen lower down. This doesn't sound very plausible to me. Though Meier would of course accept what he was told at face value, why should we? He could have been shown anything through those view screens, for example, including the apparent cloud formations he did photograph from pretty far out, and we might not be able to tell if it was deception or not.

> Adamski & Meier's Venusean/Plieadian Space Brothers have been

> heavy on the platitudes, but light on hard data. If they wanted  
> to be taken seriously, don't you think they might have passed  
> along some useful tidbit such as verifiable, but previously  
> unknown, scientific or historical data that would unquestionably  
> establish their emissaries' bonafides?

How about the 40 km figure for Venus cloud-base height? That's not too far off from the 45-47km figure I find from browsing various articles in Science. Though this cloud-base height was known within the planetary science community by 1975, it seems improbable it was known then by a man who did not get past elementary school in his formal education.

But a key question is: would the aliens want their contactee to be taken seriously by ufologists first, then by scientists, then by the news media and the general public, after having gone to such pains over 50 years not to let the coverup come unraveled prematurely with respect to UFO sightings in general or abductions either?

Jim Deardorff

Search for other documents to/from: [deardorj](#) | [vince\\_johnson\\_at\\_tensor\\_hstn](#)

---

[ [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](#).