



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

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Oct](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 16:45:17 -0700
Fwd Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 21:45:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking
>Date: Tue, 06 Oct 98 13:09:53 PDT

>>Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 16:33:09 -0700
>>From: Ed Stewart <ufoindex@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Failure Of The 'Science' Of Obergian Debunking

>Ah yes, the obsession with Todd's slight coverage in the
>encyclopedia. I was trying to write a history of the UFO
>controversy. Any historian has to make judgments about who is
>important, who isn't, who did what and why, and so on. If Ed
>Stewart believes Todd to be a major figure, he ought to write
>his own encyclopedia. I would have covered Todd more if I'd
>thought him to be somebody important, whether I liked him
>personally or not. (I think Adamski was a bald-faced liar, which
>didn't stop me from writing about him at length, for example.)
>It's just that in my research I didn't come upon anything that
>led me to believe Todd is significant in the way the truly large
>figures (from Adamski to Zeidman) are. Not a single reviewer of
>the book has remarked on Todd's relative absence, so I gather
>that, aside from Todd himself and his apologist Stewart, this
>hasn't been seen as the huge intellectual scandal T and S want
>us believe it is.

First things first. In spite of Jerome Clark's continued demonization of Robert Todd, Todd is on record on this mailing list disavowing himself from my commentaries. He has stated previously that he has never ever cared if his name has appeared in any of his books at any time. But, it apparently tickles Jerome Clark's ego to continue attributing my rhetoric to Robert Todd and vice-a-versa. It is must be sad for Jerome Clark aficionadados to witness such a continuous fiasco and inability to attribute what was said to Todd and what was said by me to me. I am afraid all it does is it provides continuous evidence of Jerome Clark's intellectual dishonesty and contrived pettyness. Maybe, Jerome Clark does not know and understand that every single message/thread on this mailing list is archived and quickly available for anyone interested on the internet through the efforts of Glenn Campbell and UFOMIND. A complete record exists of every message posted on UFO updates since the end of 1996, almost a two year archive.

>I don't claim ultimate wisdom in these matters, so again, if Ed
>disagrees, rather than rant about it he ought to write his own
>history showing why he believes Todd to be a towering figure.

I don't consider Robert Todd to be a 'towering figure'. What he has demonstrated time and time again is overwhelming integrity in his research methodology in the evidence he has discovered through his own personal research and efforts, evidence that is backed-up by a trail of paperwork that can be independently verified by anyone who so desires, evidence that he has shared with the UFO community over two decades. Unfortunately, for those that place their beliefs ahead of the evidence, the documentation uncovered by Robert Todd has proved to be highly embarrassing for the promulgation of their beliefs regarding alleged government involvement and some of their pet beliefs such as MJ-12 and later Roswell. Some of the areas that Robert Todd has uncovered relevant information has been:

- . Research contributions that can be read in "Clear Intent" regarding northern tier 'overflights' over strategic installations.
- . Releases of Air Force Intelligence Files (over 2000 documents) Any discussion of Air Force involvement during the 40s, 50s, 60s probably involves documents first uncovered by Robert Todd.
- . 52 Washington DC overflights. Transcripts uncovered by Robert Todd included National Airport/Andrews AFB transmissions.
- . Projects MOONDUST, BLUEFLY.
- . 1950-56 Special Study Group Of AF Intelligence documents.
- . 2nd release of another 262 pages of Air Force Intelligence documents.
- . NORAD files and Databases.
- . Belgium UFO wave DIA documents.
- . Bentwaters, England, The Halt Memo.
- . FOO-fighter and Ghost Rocket documents.
- . What is now known as the 'Bolender' memo.
- . Insights into Project Blue Book, Project Sign, Project Grudge.
- . and of course documents and evidence related to much of the MJ-12 and Roswell myths.

His main contribution has been the de-mystification of the UFO problem. His intentions, by my understanding, were never to debunk the subject, but to tackle a subject he originally found to be intriguing. Unfortunately, the evidence was not there to support the many government conspiracy models the ET crowd needs to help pump-up their continuing belief system. And there lies the real reason why his contributions have been ignored. He is in good company. Hendry is ignored. Jeffries has been ostracized for his position. Todd has been written out of the UFO Encyclopedia because Jerome Clark claims he can't think of any significant contribution. (GRIN)

>>That is as low as an individual can commit themselves.

>Don't you mean "as low as an individual can commit himself?"
>You mean as low as Hitler, Stalin, Charles Manson, Charlie Starkweather, Vlad the Impaler? History will record that Jerome Clark, who went as low as an individual could commit himself, was one of the vilest villains of the 20th Century, identified as such by no less than that eminent demonologist Ed Stewart.

And Jerome Clark continues his intellectual dishonesty creating allegations that originated in his own head and attributing them to me. Nowhere, at any time have I ever associated him with any of the characters above. Yet, he keeps repeating the same jargon every time he posts. The archive of this mailing list shows that. Maybe Clark was not aware that his intellectual dishonesty has been a continuing part of the archival record available to anyone on the internet.

>Apparently Ed is so desperate for ammunition against me, since
>little or none seems to exist in the real world, that he's
>manufactured a statement I never made.

Anybody interested in what is fabricated and by who, has the archival record to guide them. One of the reasons I always use quotes when attributing a statement to some else, is so that there is no question of my integrity. I have not manufactured any of Jerome Clark's quotes, yet he has failed to quote me when accusing me of his fabricated improprieties. Ufological wisdom at its best. Red herrings and strawmen arguments are logical fallacies that can never support a legitimate argument. Why Jerome Clark continues using is beyond my comprehension.

>>So? You wish to defend ufology on the basis that it is not
>>responsible for its own consequences, be my guest. That is
>>exactly one of the positions Oberg's paper points out to as one
>>of the reasons ufology can't seem to get up. The point is not
>>what has/has not happened TO ufology. The point is what
>>responsibility has ufology taken on itself for its own
>>condition?

>I believe I've already answered that. Those of you looking for a
>balanced, rational discussion of ufology's problems re science
>are, I'm afraid, not going to find them in our friend Ed
>Stewart's frenzied and tedious polemics.

No, It hasn't been answered. If ufology had ever taken any responsibility for its own sorry state, I wouldn't be here bringing it up.

>It always amuses me that Ed Stewart is forever accusing _other
>people_ of creating demons -- apparently he has never heard of
>the psychological phenomenon of "projection" -- when Ed himself
>may as well be a demonologist for all the hate-filled
>accusations he hurls, without evidence or logic, against any
>number of targets. Actually, I don't like Todd for the same
>reason many people don't like him: he demonizes others and he is
>rude to the point of incoherence and even unintentional comedy.
>Gee, does that sound like anybody else we know? Somebody, say,
>with the initials ES? Nah, couldn't be....

What I don't understand is how a mentally normal person can be simultaneously intellectually dishonest and believe their own rhetoric? We know from the archival record of this thread that your rhetoric is intellectually dishonest. That leaves two choices. Either you do not believe your own rhetoric, or you are not normal? I think you believe your own rhetoric as dishonest as the archival record shows it to be.

>(Incidentally: Ed never did answer my challenge to him to
>provide evidence that Oberg and other debunkers have ever --
>even once -- tried to clean their own house.)

Who really gives a hoot what skeptics or debunkers do in their own house? That is not an issue or concern to the state of ufology. It reverts back to whether ufology has ever taken responsibility for its own state of being? It is obvious that Jerome Clark is not willing to take that responsibility and continues to point a finger as if that relieves or enhances ufology in the eyes of the world. That is in direct relevance to what Oberg pointed out two decades ago. Ufology is not willing to take responsibility for its own state of affairs. Maybe all it will ever be is an 'hysterical pregnancy'.

>And for that matter, a question you and Todd have never
>answered: Am I charlatan or a true believer? I couldn't be both,
>after all. You've got to get your ad hominem straight, my
>friend. One big problem with the insults-uber-alles approach of
>Stewart and Todd is its bewildering incoherence. It is funny,
>though.

What is hilarious is that I have never called you a charlatan. But your intellectual dishonesty compels you to attribute that statement to me. I suspect that you consider it fashionable to come across as a 'true-believer' on this mailing list, but I have seen you shuffle many times in the past over the decades so I strongly suspect that whether you are a true-believer or not is temporal in nature. What has been established here is your continuous intellectual dishonesty.

>An excellent paper on the strong involvement of scientists in
>the UFO controversy, especially in the 1970s, is Steven J.
>Dick's "Edward U. Condon, UFOs, and the Many Cultures of
>Science," read at the History of Science Meeting in Washington,
>D.C., on December 28, 1992.

I haven't read this paper, so I can't address it. I will track
it down and read it. I am familiar with Dick and his role as a
SETI historian.

>He [Bullard] is also a regular contributor to IUR (which, as some of you
>know, I edit) and the Journal of UFO Studies, which CUFOS
>publishes. Among his papers are some powerful debunkings of Ed's
>intellectual mentor Klass and CSICOP,

A continuous weakness of ufological wisdom is the introduction
of illogical fallacies into their arguments. It is not enough
for Jerome Clark to state a truism (i.e. Bullard's papers
include debunkings of CSICOP and Klass), but apparently he has
found it necessary to create a dishonest construction that they
are my intellectual mentors. Allegedly, this makes the statement
somewhat stronger. I would have thought that the mention of the
truism by itself would be the stronger statement to make. As
anybody ever noticed how often Klass and CSICOP are attacked in
Jerome Clark's commentary? Are they that powerful that their
image needs to be tarnished continuously? Actually, they are not
even relevant to this or any discussion involving the state of
ufology because they are not responsible for ufology's woes. The
introduction of them into a negative statement is simply a
logical fallacy technique, an appeal to the gallery, employed to
make it appear that the argument is stronger than actually is.
It is a sign that the user has low esteem for the position they
are trying to defend and actually weakens ones own argument by
employing it. But, it raises cheers in the gallery. The gallery
just can't understand why the home team has been in the whole
for the last fifty years! If they understood logical fallacies,
they would know.

>I personally find it distressing that so much Klass polemic
>seeks to demonize those who disagree with him (Klass even, in
>one particularly notorious instance, tried to get James McDonald
>into legal trouble), but I can understand why Ed has no problem
>whatever with this approach.

Another example above of Jerome Clark's intellectual dishonesty
and addiction to illogical fallacies. The above is tantamount to
asking someone if they have stopped beating their wife?
Recognize these illogical fallacies in arguments. It helps a
reader in recognizing how feeble the argument being posed
actually is.

>It is hilarious, however, that
>while Ed is accusing others of bad science, he is praising and
>quoting Klass as a great authority.

Further example of Jerome Clark's intellectual dishonesty. How
he gets the above from my statement that we sat together for
five hours with Eddie Bullard, Richard Heiden, James Moseley and
Robert Girard and enjoyed each others company is simply
unbelievable? Yet, Jerome Clark apparently feels compelled to
make these absurd interpolations even though the archival record
is showing them to be false. I keep bringing up these examples
of his intellectual dishonesty up because Jerome Clark is
allegedly a recognized UFO historian. Somebody who you would
allegedly trust to write books that would capture truth,
resource books for future generations. If Jerome Clark can't
keep his arguments close to the truth in an ongoing mailing list
discussion, what chance is there that his encyclopedia books
reflect true history?

>For a treatment of the relationship of Hendry and Klass, see my
>"Phil Klass vs. the 'UFO Promoters'" (Fate, February 1981) and
>The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp. 482-83 and 855. (Thanks for
>giving me an excuse for another plug, Ed.)

Why don't you explain to the readers why Hendry left the field
of ufology in such total disgust? Never to come back!

>. Now, take a couple of aspirins and lie down before you have a
>coronary, my friend.

Your sentiments are tacky at best. Everyone that knows me personally is aware that I suffered a major stroke last February. My capacity to even type at the computer has been drastically curtailed since then. Your continuous references to my alleged state of health only show to display how consuming your pettyness is. You are a real scumbag. That is the only way I know to describe you and it has nothing to do with your intellectual dishonesty. That character flaw is separate.

>You've got a problem, Ed. You may well be emotionally incapable
>of participating in adult discourse, for all I know, but the
>ranting and raving approach isn't getting you anywhere. It
>certainly does not make you sound rational, and it obviously is
>not making you happy. Maybe it's time to leave a field you hate
>so much and go into something else -- though something tells me
>that if you entered stamp-collecting, you'd behave pretty much
>the same way.

Actually, I bought a house from profits I made dealing in postal history. I specialized in the 1850s. Great historically active postal era!

Much to your chagrin, I don't hate this field and have no plans in leaving. This is a relaxing hobby for me. I strongly suspect that time will show who has the problem here and who is incapable of adult participation. Your character and your intellectual dishonesty is already a part of the archival record. Unfortunately, that is not the issue here. The issue is whether or not ufology has lived up to its promises? So far you haven't produced any good arguments for your position.

Ed Stewart

```

-----
Ed Stewart ufoindex@jps.net | So Man, who here seems principal alone,
There Is Something | Perhaps acts second to some sphere unknown.
Going On! ,>'?'<, | Touches some wheel, or verges to some goal,
Salvador Freixedo ( O O ) | 'Tis but a part we see, and not a whole.
-----oo00-(_)-00oo----- Alexander Pope, Essay on Man -----

```

[[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](#).