



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

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Ron Decker <decker@wt.net>
Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 22:13:55 -0500
Fwd Date: Sat, 03 Jul 1999 12:54:19 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 22:40:44 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 05:42:32 -0500
>>From: Ron Decker <decker@wt.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>>Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 15:42:53 +0100
>>>From: Neil Morris <Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>>Yes it was "done" under ambient night conditions, ie darkness<g>,
>>>the BBC team used "nightvision" on the video camera to make the
>>>recording, and as Sean confirmed in an earlier post the circle
>>>researchers had got wind of the hoaxing attempt and were in the
>>>general area trying to track D+D+Co down, so use of any form of
>>>"lighting" out in the landscape would have been a dead givaway.

>>>It proved it could be done, thats all.
>>>It didn't/couldn't prove they were ALL hoaxes.

>>Neil,

>>With all due respect, this is the sort of thing those schooled
>>in the Amazing Randi branch of knowledge will use to confirm
>>that it -does- prove that the balance of crop circles are
>>hoaxes.

>>Their logic goes something like this: 'If I can reproduce it
>>through slight of hand, etc., then the (choose your paranormal
>>or otherwise unexplainable event) must be hoaxed by evil-minded,
>>avaricious charlatans bent on taking your money.'

>Yes, but what you forget is that cerealogists pre-D&D were
>asserting to anyone willing to listen (and buy their books) that
>crop circles could not be done by humans period. Remarkably,
>none of the prominent cerealogists of the time, ie., Meaden,
>Andrews, Delgado, Taylor, Wingfield, etc., tried (as far as I'm
>aware) to create their own circles to see if they could be
>done. They were too busy publishing books remarking on the crop
>circles' alleged miraculous properties.

Dennis,

Let's see if I'm interpreting you correctly. The cerealogists
you note were/are evil-minded, avaricious charlatans bent on
taking the public's money? Bastards!

If I'm not mistaken, the comment to which I replied dealt with all crop circles not being proved hoaxes by the activities of D&D.

And I do recall seeing reports of people trying to duplicate crop circles.

It usually went something like this:

Man creates crude circle in wheat with feet. Camera zooms in and voice-over notes that the properties of the just bent wheat do not demonstrate the same properties of bent wheat in 'real' crop circles (intertwining, etc., whatever). So please don't tell me that no one was attempting to make these things if for no other reason than to demonstrate that the ones they made were entirely different from those discovered in farmer's fields.

>Rather than cashing in on the phenomenon, D&D were routinely
>vilified and ridiculed by the English crop circle community. You
>forget, too, that the Centre for Crop Circle Studies sponsored
>its own hoax context, the results of which stunned many within
>cerealogy. Of those who originally brought the phenomenon to
>worldwide attention, you might ask, "Where are they now?" Why do
>you think Meaden has let the phenomenon lapse into well deserved
>obscurity? Why do you think Pat Delgado has disappeared from the
>picture entirely, as Colin Andrews seems to be in the process of
>doing? You don't hear too much about the phenomenal circles from
>Busty Taylor and George Wingfield these days, either. I wonder
>why? Because they know what you don't.

How noble of D&D (martyrs) not to cash in when they could. I guess that makes anyone who's made a buck off this and any other anomalous phenomenon a snake oil salesman.

If these cerealogists were making such foolish statements to the effect that the phenomena could not be the result of human effort then they deserve to have their chairs pulled from underneath them. In that regard D&D have done the subject a real service.

But the fact that D&D faked a circle (and others as well) does not mean that all crop circles are fakes.

>And before you accuse me of speaking from an armchair on the
>circles, guess again. I was even there when Steven Greer was
>waving his ridiculous flashlights around, the night before he
>got hoaxed by Irving and Schnabel.

I would never accuse you (nor did I) of being an armchair anything. Where did that come from? Do you need credentials to discuss whether one set of hoaxes makes the entire subject the result of hoaxes? I don't think so. How about the UFO field? Does one hoaxed UFO sighting negate the rest?

>>I ran into this sort of medieval thinking with my brother-
>>in-law, an avowed atheist. He saw the PBS (?) program on Doug
>>and Dave and concluded that all crop circles are manmade (by
>>D&D no less). It made no difference to him that D&D are not
>>continent-hopping circle hoaxers; they are responsible for crop
>>circles. Case closed. Mystery solved.

>>How many others out there in TV Land have come to the same
>>conclusion?

>As for your brother-in-law, you have my condolences. Is it too
>late to get another one? One, perhaps, who isn't an atheist, and
>who believes that an alien intelligence, by flattening patterns
>in wheat and other crops, is trying to tell us something really,
>really profound? One, in other words, who believes anything? I
>certainly hope there aren't any of those out there in TV (or
>Radio) Land. Nah, I thought not.

I'm afraid it is too late to get another one. He and my sister love each other very much. Personally I would have preferred a non-atheist but you know how these things go; we usually don't have much say in who our siblings marry.

You have, by the way, described my brother-in-law. Just substitute 'Origin of Species' for the Bible, Carl Sagan/Randi/et al for Moses or Jesus and there he is. He's the flip side of

the coin you're deriding. Like most true believers he'll buy anything if it's from the right source.

Unfortunately there are plenty of 'them' out there in TV Land.

What we don't often discuss are the ones like my brother-in-law. If it's on Nova then, by God, it's the Gospel; Randi duplicates some 'psychic' phenomenon, and the rest of it's got to be faked. On and on. How utterly ridiculous. The professed adherence of an individual to science doesn't necessarily make him a rational creature.

Obviously you prefer my brother-in-law type of true believer to the UFO/Bigfoot/Psychokinesis-believing true believer. Whatever makes you happy. That's why God made chocolate and vanilla.

Very best regards,
Ron.

[[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](#).