



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jan](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Guilt By Association?

From: **Rebecca Schatte**<xiannekei@yahoo.com>
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 21:40:11 -0800 (PST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 12:30:09 -0500
Subject: Re: Guilt By Association?

>Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 20:13:58 +0000
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Sean Jones <seanj@tedric.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Guilt By Association?

>Hi Errol, Hi All, esp Bob Shell <G>

>With the "Tent Footage" fully debunked by Tim and Phil, the
>Alien Autopsy must also be fake/hoaxed/bogus purely because it
>came from the same mill does it not?

Not necessarily, but in this case, the AA has not been shown to
be what Santilli has claimed.

>NO!

>This is guilt by association. Many people on this list have
>criticised Gary Alevy specifically for this "crime".

Leaving Gary out of this for the moment, shouldn't our
suspicions be raised just a little, were it not for all the
other problems with the AA?

>As far as I know, (I will stand corrected if someone can show
>me the evidence) the actual Alien Autopsy film has stood up to
>all the scrutiny but due to the extremely dubious way it was
>made public was immediately frowned upon by many big names in
>Ufology (capital U?). So straight away the smoking gun was cast
>into shadow.

First off, we should have been dubious from the beginning. Being
dubious is not necessarily a bad thing.

>I often wonder how many people consider the AA to be genuine but
>are afraid to say so for fear of ridicule? After all it is easy
>to mock than support is it not?

I think that people who genuinely believe in the AA film (the
Michael Hesemann's of the world) aren't afraid to be ridiculed
for their opinions.

>Is it not possible that the AA is a genuine artefact but it
>was deliberately released in such a manor as to cause conflict
>within the ranks? I was once told by a certain person a few
>years back that the people who orchestrated the release hold
>critical information that used properly could prove or
>disprove the AA as genuine.

Of course the people who released the AA hold all the cards.

>I wonder is it time to take a vote people? All those who believe

>the AA genuine hold your hands up, OK now all you who think its
>fake hold your hands up.

I raise my hand up for FAKE and that is based on the dubiousness of its release, the cast of clowns who represent it, the conflicting stories which have been told, and because Theresa Carlson proved it to my satisfaction with her tireless research into the AA.

Check out:

http://www.uforeport.com/carlson_1.html

Rebecca

[[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](#).