



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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Jun](#) -> Re: Vallee Hoaxed Corbin, UFO Sweden & Sightings

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Vallee Hoaxed Corbin, UFO Sweden & Sightings

From: 'Jack Hudson' <true.x-file.news@n2news.com>
Date: Sun, 07 Jun 1998 21:25:02 -0700
Fwd Date: Mon, 08 Jun 1998 08:41:31 -0400
Subject: Re: Vallee Hoaxed Corbin, UFO Sweden & Sightings

To Mr. Micheal Corbin, Director ParaNet Information Services, Inc.:

>Michael Corbin wrote:
>To Whomever:

>Is this for real? Usually legitimate press releases
>have contact information in them. I have never heard
>of Marshall Barnes, nor the TRUE.X-FILE.NEWS Internet
>News Service.

We're new. Our e-mail address was attached. He's been around for a while. See <http://ufomind.com/people/s/strom> for an example.

>What is more perplexing is the strong language that is
>used by whoever wrote this press release without
>sufficient information to make such radical claims.

The claims weren't "radical". We provided links to exact evidence to substantiate the charges that Mr. Barnes made. That's more than Vallee did or that you have done here so far.

>For example, I see nothing from Jacques Vallee or
>myself in response or refutation about these claims
>contained in the release.

If you could refute them, you would be doing it now. Vallee has been silent on the issue and has refused attempts to defend himself because he can't. You obviously haven't even looked at the evidence or you wouldn't be referring to "claims". These are "facts" based on the words and statements that Vallee and Dudgeon made, that Vallee, the JSE, Bernhard Haisch, you (though unwittingly) and others have promoted around the world in the JSE and the internet. The statements that were made in the Vallee article and promoted in part by you, have now been proven to be false with evidence which we provided links to. What's so radical about that? About telling the truth?

>It is usually customary, and professional, to make
>inquiries of those being accused before printing such
>outrageous allegations.

Again, your statements and those by Vallee, have been public and were linked to in the release. Your statements and his are on record. The only outrageous thing is that Vallee actually thought that he wouldn't be caught and that you have the audacity to act as if someone has said something without

substantiation. Yet you still have failed to quote one word from our article to back your accusations up.

>Anyway, I am unable to take this seriously until we
>have some way to contact Mr. Barnes and can
>investigate him further to determine where he is
>coming from.

You can't take it seriously because you have egg on your face. Otherwise, you wouldn't be making yourself appear more ridiculous. The evidence cited in the article was compelling enough for Jeff Rense of Sightings On The Radio to post the article as a rebuttal, something that he wouldn't do, I'm sure, if the claims were simply as you describe them. The way that you're making these wild protests without any kind of examples of the ridiculous charges that you're making is keeping me from taking *you* seriously.

>At this particular point I can say that I do not take
>too kindly to the use of my name in connection with
>anything of this sort.

You're the one that connected your name to this matter when you said that is was "good research". That's not our fault. You chose to stand by it. You can walk away now.

>I have known Jacques Vallee for several years and have
>found him to be one of the most professional and
>thorough UFO researchers I have ever met.

What better a profile for someone to engage in such a deception? Who would benefit from such an act? Certainly not Vallee. Ever hear of "agent in place"?

>I have never known him to be dishonest or deliberate
>in anything underhanded or fraudulent.

Well you do now. There's a first time for everything. If Barnes hadn't investigated it, Vallee would still be viewed that way by most. But the evidence speaks for itself. Evidence which it appears that you have failed to look at from an article that you have failed to even quote from.

>It appears that Mr. Barnes is a rank amateur sleuth
>with an axe to grind as he has never contacted me or
>Dr. Vallee, as far as I know,

No Mike, you're obviously the rank amatuer here, not Mr. Barnes. He put together a professional package of evidence that was 89 pages long and then took the time to try to find as much of it as he could on the web so that an electronic document could be assembled that would allow anyone to instantly link to the evidence to see it for themselves. He even provided links to various reproductions of the Vallee article so that no one would think that he was quoting it out of context. That's professionalism of the highest order. Amateurism is claiming that something that you hadn't even check-up on was "good research". *Rank* amateurism is your coming in here making wild accusations about evidence that you've obviously been too lazy or frightened to face up to yourself. In addition, you're talking about things that you know nothing about. We said in our article that Barnes had contacted Haisch and that then Haisch and Vallee conspired to suppress the knowledge that the article was fraudulent. What? You mean they didn't let you in on it? What wasn't in the article is that Haisch and Vallee have known about this for nearly 6 months, and that Haisch even failed to notify SSE founder and President Peter Sturrock that there was a problem that would result in serious ramifications for the image of the Society if it got out. Barnes initially sent Haisch an 8 page letter outlining the evidence that shows the premeditation, method, motive, opportunity and execution behind Anatomy Of A Hoax as a di information project. He did so so that Haisch could put a disclaimer on the JSE web page for the Anatomy article, effectively distancing themselves from the fall-out to come. Haisch refused to do so as we have already cited despite being told that endorsement of the article would lead to questions of ethics, etc. for him and the JSE. If the intent of this scam(trying to prove the PE was a hoax) is so important that it had to be attempted with fraud and lies, important enough for Vallee and Haisch to not give a damn about protecting the reputation of JSE and SSE, for Haisch to risk his own reputation

needlessly, what makes you think they'd give a damn about you? You're just a casualty, Mike. You're evidence that there were people deceived by what Vallee wrote. You're evidence as to why Haisch should have done what over twenty of the world's top scientific journal editors (JAMA, Surface Review Letters, The Scientist and Nature, for starters) have now stated that they would have done if evidence that they had unwittingly published a fraudulent article had been presented to them - notify their readers. You're evidence that instead of looking at the evidence and evaluating it like Jeff Rense did, that you have acted like an amateur and resorted to calling names and making entirely unfounded cry baby accusations. Why should Barnes bother to contact you? What verification of anything could you provide? You were one of the dupes! Barnes went to data bases and historical archives that would support or condemn Dudgeon's claims. Barnes did an investigation that, as far as I can tell, completely kicks-ass and makes so-called researchers like yourself look like wanna-be X-File detectives. You've made all these charges and yet you haven't cited one example or quotation from our article to back up the bull that you're slinging, so I'd would just give it a rest. Evidence talks, Mike. You know how the rest of it goes.

>to determine the veracity of any statements made in
>Vallee's article.

What was the need? You sure didn't determine the veracity of the statements in the Vallee article before claiming that is was "very good research by Jacques Vallee and others" (see <http://www.geocities.com/Area51/7354/Hoax.txt> see 3rd paragraph under "Forwarded by:", 2nd line beginning with "I am...") and he gave you the piece of trash himself! We had links to various other versions across the internet. Haisch tried to defend the Anatomy article by saying it was peer reviewed. Peer reviewed or not, the evidence proves that the article is a fraud. No one's being quoted out of context. Barnes took pains to be sure to link to every statement that he refers to. Don't come crying to us. You're Vallee's victim. He used you because he felt he needed to. He played you like a CIA spook plays his field operatives. He played you the way William Moore play Paul Bennewitz, except not as bad. You should refer back to Vallee's book Messengers of Deception where he learned how to do all this stuff. At the top of page 189 where he says he still has a lot to learn from his Major Murphy on how counter-intel ops work. Better yet, go to the second and third paragraphs of page 203 where he shows how writers and editors with agendas could accomplish disinformation cover-up objectives by hiding behind rationalism and supposedly defending science with articles that degrade UFOs and "other ridiculous subjects". Just insert the JSE as the publication and Vallee and Haisch and their Aviary pals over there as the editorial board, and you've got a step-by-step description of what he tried to do with the JSE and Anatomy Of A Hoax. The most incriminating thing about all of this is that he wrote of how he knew of this back in 1979. Looks like Anatomy was supposed to be his dissertation, a deliberate application of the disinformation skills that he admits that he learned. Barnes is the one that sent us all of this stuff. All the evidence is what Barnes found. We checked it out to see if it was all true and it was. No, Barnes is no amateur. If the whole deal hadn't been so simple, just checking out Dudgeon's statements, I'd say Barnes is a genius. You're just one of Vallee's gullible dupes, who isn't even man enough to stand up, admit that he'd been fooled and demand an explanation from Vallee. You're pathetic. Need a hanky?

>ParaNet posted the article, as it does with many
>articles, with a strict disclaimer and
>provides any information that it does with an
>understanding that it is provided as a public service
>to our readers, with no editorial control, therefore
>neither I, nor ParaNet, was "hoaxed" by Dr. Vallee.

Yes you were, when you backed it publically by saying it was "good research." The article even had obvious logical flaws in it. When Dudgeon's story was checked out against Navy records, historical archives, WWII era photos, action reports, everything that we provided links to and more, it completely fell apart. It's the biggest sham that I've ever seen, even bigger than the Hitler Diaries or the Alien Autopsy flick because it was so easily disproven, so much so that Jeff Rense immediately contacted us when he found out, to get permission to post it as

a rebuttal at his site. Rense is a man I can respect. You're the one claiming to be an investigator and you got stung. Get over it. This isn't your fight. Barnes is after Vallee, etc. and he was even after the ONR and set-up one of their PR officers so that the guy would lie to him in writing. Barnes isn't after you. You don't *want* Barnes after you. All that's going to happen if you get in the way is more bad publicity for you because I've already been told that there is increasing media interest in the story. We weren't even the first to break it. If you try to defend Vallee, you're just going to do yourself more damage. It's an OBVIOUS hoax. The evidence is overwhelming. It's clear to everybody who looks at it. Get a clue.

>Finally, if anyone on this list knows how to contact
>Mr. Barnes, I would appreciate the information.

Hey, knowing what little that I know of Barnes now, I'd say he's going to come looking for you!

>More to follow...

More b.s. I'm sure. I'll be sure to wear my thigh high fly fishing boots next time.

>Michael Corbin
>Director
>ParaNet Information Service, Inc.
>303-863-0484 (Voice and FAX)

Jack Hudson, Publisher True.X-File.News

[[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](#).