



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

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Jul](#) -> **Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book

From: clark@canby.mn.frontiercomm.net [Jerome Clark]
Date: Thu, 31 Jul 1997 12:31:30 PDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 31 Jul 1997 21:53:47 -0400
Subject: Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book

> Date: Thu, 31 Jul 1997 01:06:20 -0700
> From: John Koopmans <john.koopmans@sympatico.ca>
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> Subject: Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book

> > From: clark@canby.mn.frontiercomm.net [Jerome Clark]
> > Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 07:57:50 PDT
> > To: updates@globalserve.net
> > Subject: RE: UFO UpDate: Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book

> > >Date: Tue, 29 Jul 1997 22:24:09 -0700
> > >From: John Koopmans <john.koopmans@sympatico.ca>
> > >To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> > >Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: an alien face in Jung's UFO book

> > Folks,

> > I'm all for restricting the focus. Having spent a whole
> > lot of time studying the question -- and even, long ago,
> > shared sentiments generally like those expressed with such
> > enthusiasm above -- I see no evidence that the "phenomena
> > appears [sic] to be very related [not just related, note,
> > but "very" related] to phenomena" of the sorts our
> > correspondents are discussing here.

> > I see a lot of people making these sorts of sweeping
> > statements. I don't see anybody actually documenting them.
> > In separate studies Eddie Bullard and I have shown why UFOs
> > do not seem to be related to other anomalous or folkloric
> > phenomena. No one has attempted a serious refutation.
> > Ufology, people, is not a branch of occultism. If it were,
> > the CSICOP people would be right, and we'd all be wasting our
> > time. I don't believe we're wasting our time, but I do believe
> > speculations like the above consume attention more productively
> > spent in actual study of UFO reports.

> > Jerry Clark

> Jerry:

> I'm very disappointed with your response. First of all, nowhere did I
> mention, or even imply that Ufology was a "branch of occultism". I
> notice that you conveniently excluded all mention of the scientific
> pursuits which I had included in my message, nor did you even have the
> courtesy to mention that you had "snipped" that part out. The missed
> sentence read:

> "There is also required reading in quantum physics, astronomy,

> conspiracy, psychiatry, philosophy, sociology, cosmology, ancient
> history, archeology, geology, chemistry, mathematics, sacred geometry,
> theology, secret doctrine, etc.,etc., etc."

> This selective choosing of those parts of the data that fit preconceived
> beliefs is a bad habit that too many pseudo researchers seem to have,
> and may be partly a result of too limited a focus. This limited focus
> causes the researcher to deliberately exclude data that does not fit his
> theories. (A perfect example is the ridiculous 3-tomb theory of
> Egyptologists).

> The points I was trying to make are;

> 1) many people studying the UFO phenomena are not as "unread" and
> literature deficient as Bob Shell seems to imply;

> 2) it would help to have knowledge of various disciplinary areas of
> study to come to try to come to some area of understanding of the UFO
> phenomena.

> You mention that UFOs are not related to other anomalous or folkloric
> phenomena. These are the type of sweeping statements to watch out for.
> How can you possibly compare something that is not yet understood with
> something else that is not yet understood? Comparisons such as this can
> be superficial at best. Who knows what unknown forces may be behind
> each?

> We've had 50 years of scientific study of UFOs. As far as I can see, we
> are not much further in coming to any conclusions than what was
> expressed in some of the older books. Most current books simply
> regurgitate what has been said many times before. Maybe we're so lost in
> the forest of ufological study that we can no longer see the fields of
> other disciplines that surround the forest. It may prove worthwhile to
> look at other sources for clues to the mystery, as well as other ways of
> thinking about our environment.

> I'm not talking about New Age channelling, Tarot card reading,
> occultism, or other nonsensical pursuits. I'm talking about borderline
> science where the possibility of new ideas may be obtained. Examples of
> authors include: Brian Swimme, Ken Wilber, Michael Talbot, Lyall Watson,
> John Gribbin, Martin Rees, J.E. Lovelock, Russell Targ, Harold Puthoff,
> Gary Zukav, Paul Davies, Roger Penrose, Fred Allan Wolf and Rupert
> Sheldrake.

> This doesn't mean that we should abandon traditional approaches, but
> that we should enhance them with new ideas. The world hasn't stood still
> for the last 50 years. There are phenomenal new ideas being developed
> every day in many fields of study, that most people don't even seem to
> be aware of. Physics and chemistry do not follow theories that were laid
> out many years ago. Physicists are beginning to prove that some form of
> communication exists between particles that are separated in space.
> Elements are being shown to have behavioural characteristics that defy
> identification (i.e. metals such as rhodium in high spin states are
> transparent to identification devices and are being identified by the
> trace impurities contained within it - i.e. they are being identified as
> silica - could this possibly explain the Roswell debris object that was
> currently tested and found to be silica with unusual ionization
> patterns?). Einstein's theory of Relativity is being seriously
> challenged. Animals are able to communicate with humans and show
> creative thinking processes similar to those of humans. Humans have been
> found to emit magnetic fields from the solar plexis while experiencing
> pain. I could go on and on, but the books above document my points.

> Oh, one other point. Some people have had UFO experiences and feel very
> comfortable researching the subject. Others have had very real
> paranormal experiences and feel very comfortable researching that
> subject. But others have had both UFO and paranormal experiences and
> feel very comfortable with the possibility that there may be some
> connection between the two phenomena. Since I happen to feel comfortable
> with the latter, I have chosen to explore th fields around the forest.

> Unfortunately, many of those in the paranormal field of study do not
> welcome those who have an interest in UFOs, and many of those in the UFO
> field do not welcome those who have an interest in the paranormal field.
> This is to say nothing of the many "camps" within those fields itself.

> What was that famous saying? "Divide and conquer"?

> John Koopmans

John and everybody,

It is a myth that we have devoted 50 years to scientific UFO study. Anybody who knows the history of this subject ought to know that scientists have neglected UFO research for the most part. All but a few of those who have paid attention to it have worked on their own, freed of institutional support, funding, laboratories, or support from colleagues. In other words, real science has barely been attempted. It's silly to assert that science has failed when it's never been given a chance.

I don't understand why, in pursuit of ufological wisdom, John on one hand wants us to read a bunch of occult texts (which he seems to think of equal value to the scientific texts he also recommends), then on the other complains when I say he apparently regards ufology as a branch of occultism. I cannot help noting, by the way, that he fails to recommend literature a bit more to the point: Bullard's debunking of claims for a long historical lineage to the UFO phenomenon and of dubious folkloric correlates, or to Michael Swords' masterly exposition of the ETH's scientific underpinnings. What we're getting here is warmed-over Keel and Vallee. Occult dish, in other words.

I am accused of making "sweeping statements." I plead a desire not to tax the patience of our audience. In fact, I have written at length on these issues, most recently in the FUFOR-published monograph *Spacemen, Demons, and Conspiracies: The Evolution of UFO Hypotheses*. See also, for three other instances that come immediately to my mind, various entries in my UFO Encyclopedia (e.g., "Paranormal and Occult Theories about UFOs" and "Psychosocial Hypothesis") and my "The Thickets of Magonia," IUR, January/February 1990. I also recommend Bullard's "Anomalous Aerial Phenomena Before 1800" in my *The Emergence of a Phenomenon* (UFO Encyclopedia #2).

It ought not to matter that our favorite beliefs make us "feel comfortable." What should matter is that they be defensible empirically, evidentially, and logically. Expressions of faith, or anyway of unexamined conviction, aren't getting us anywhere.

Jerry Clark

Search for other documents to/from: [clark](#) | [john.koopmans](#)

[[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](#).