



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Bookstore 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

Our
Bookstore
is **OPEN**

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [2000](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: 60% of Abductees Are Gay - Randle & Estes

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2000 15:46:03 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2000 17:38:21 -0500
Subject: Re: 60% of Abductees Are Gay - Randle & Estes

>Date: Sun, 06 Feb 2000 22:30:08 -0500
>From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@temporaldoorway.com>
>Subject: Re: 60% of Abductees Are Gay - Randle & Estes
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@sympatico.ca>

>>Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2000 10:42:34 -0500 (EST)
>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Subject: 60% of Abductees Are Gay - Randle & Estes
>>To: updates@sympatico.ca

>>>You need to find what Mark Cashman, in many posts here,
>>>has called "discriminators" -- things that would be true if
>>>abduction imagery was derived by science fiction, and would
>>>_not_ be true if it was derived from real encounters with
>>>aliens.

>>What would be an example of such a discriminator?

>>>And, no, you can't first ask for proof that the aliens are
>>>real.

>Hi, Bob!

>Information about the normal scientific process as applied to
>UFOs can be found at

><http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/methodology/whatkindofscience.htm>

Hi Mark, hi Bob, hi All,

I'd just like to try to 'tie in' this conversation to the original subject of this thread which is Randle & Estes' outrageous claim that "60% of Abductees Are Gay." They claim to have arrived at those figures by conducting some kind of "abductee" survey/poll which no one seems to be questioning.

The 'silence' from the Randle/Estes camp has been deafening! I have asked repeatedly for information regarding 'how' this "poll" was conducted, what criteria was used to either include or exclude a respondent, and then to find out how many alleged "abductees" they polled. (The whole thing is a circular joke. How do you 'poll' something you are claiming doesn't exist! - UFO abduction victims -)

No response from Randle or his 'tag team' partner Russ Estes on these all-important questions.

The fact that the statistic has been 'put out to the public' without equal disclosure provided for the 'methods' used to

arrive at it, is an outrage and just plain sloppy (amateurish) science. I like Stan Friedman's little 'tagger' "Science by decree!" That's exactly what Randle and Estes are doing by putting out a stat like that with no background info on how it was arrived at.

No one else seems to be questioning it either. This thread has moved on to another whole topic. Randle's stat stands unquestioned, forgotten, uncrowdd unexplained. Where the hell are all the 'scientists' that are always placing demands for empirical proof (granted they are valid, but that knife should cut both ways!) on UFO witnesses. Why aren't you up in arms when it is a Ph.D that is attempting to pass off 'speculative anecdotes' as if it were proven fact?

I'm not a 'pollster' or a 'statistician' so I'm not terribly familiar with the criteria used to determine the statistical validity/relevance of any given poll.

Mark, Bob, anyone...?

What kind of "discriminators" need to be applied to a poll/survey in order to determine it's validity? How many respondents would be considered statistically significant? What criteria would you need to use to determine if the respondents should be included in a survey of "abductees"?

Tough questions eh? I'm asking you guys because Randle/Estes haven't responded to simply explain their statistic and how they arrived at it.

Between you and me and the walls, I blame their collective silence on the fact that in the end, I don't think they will be able to justify their outlandish statistic.

This is an interesting thread gentlemen (discussing discriminators) but please don't forget the original topic of the thread. Stats like the one above need to be questioned. The Nazi's counted on the fact that no one would challenge or question their 'stats' regarding race and human anthropology. We all know where that ended up. No, I don't think there will an 'abductee holocaust' because Randle & Estes call the majority of them Gay, but tell me then, what 'eventually' happens to the number and credibility of the abductees and witnesses that come forward to report when guys like Randle/Estes can publish unsubstantiated/unproven "facts" like the one we are discussing without any fear of having 'it' or their methods questioned by anyone.

Anybody want to field this?

John Velez,
- Tired of having important issues swept under the rug. -

[[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](#).