



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: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

From: Stan Friedman <fsphys@brunnet.net>
Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 20:12:53 -0300
Fwd Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 08:57:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>From: Martin Phillips <mphillips@btinternet.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 02:46:44 +0100

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?
>>Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1999 18:27:57 +0100

>>>Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 11:27:15 -0500 (CDT)
>>>From: Brian Cuthbertson <brianc@fc.net>
>>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>>>PS. I guess you might call me a "ufologist" instead of a
>>>"Ufologist". It strikes me we really do need a professional
>>>exam for this field. Perhaps Klass could suggest some of the
>>>questions to go on it?

>>In the UK right now a gang of rebels (alright, Dr Dave Clarke,
>>Gloria Dixon - who holds the record score in the test by the way
>>- Tim Matthews, Robert Moore, Andy Roberts and myself for now)
>>(but we're growing!) have been discussing such issues as
>>professionalism in UFOlogy. It is a good idea to have something
>>to add to the self policing that we do. But finding the right
>>balance is not easy.

>>I agree that the field needs to be more professional, and have
>>higher standards, but I don't think it will happen. I've been
>>watching this list from the sidelines for a year, and I've seen
>>slanging matches worthy of 5 year-olds in the playground.
>>usually it's the ETH people and the 'they're all American'
>>people calling each other silly names and arguing over spurious
>>'facts'. Just look at the recent debate on statistics for
>>sightings, with people quoting percentages. They're guesses, but
>>people defend them as facts. The arguments for and against ETH
>>remind me of the debates in the Reformation about what happens
>>in the Communion.

>>For the field to become more professional, there will need to be
>>some big names who will have to change their approach, and stop
>>defending positions that they hold as certainties when there is
>>no conclusive proof.

In civil matters it is a preponderance of the evidence that
matters. Why even bring up such terms as "conclusive Proof" or
"Confirmed alien contact"?.. Evidence there is aplenty.

Stanton Friedman

[[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](#).