



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: Nick Pope's Weird World

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 18:07:23 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 20:16:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Nick Pope's Weird World

>From: Rory Lushman <Oubliette@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO Updates <updates@Globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Nick Pope's Weird World
>Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 22:28:22 +0100

>>From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
>>Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 14:57:36 +0100
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>Subject: Nick Pope's Weird World

>>Over the past few months I d been becoming more
>>bullish in my response to certain people within ufology who'd
>>been sniping at me over the years. Nobody likes criticism,
>>and I'd been getting a fair bit - little of it constructive in
>>nature.

>Maybe if you removed the following from your opening header,
>people would take you seriously.

>>Welcome to the July column, and the latest news and gossip from
>>the weird and wacky world of UFOs, alien abductions and the
>>paranormal.

>"Gossip." By its very nature this shows the level of your
>bulletins. Gossip is going behind people's backs and repeating
>things that aren't strictly true.

>Maybe when you stop gossiping, the waters may become calmer.

>
>Being Nick Pope's messenger doesn't help either. Tell him to get
>on the Internet and do his own messages instead of using you.

>
>If your standard of research is on a par with Nick's, then
>welcome to the Twilight Zone. Don't go on any toll roads, they
>cause you all sorts of problems. Of course we are all looking
>forward to your forthcoming book to set the record straight.

>Cheers

>
>Rory Lushman

>
Hi,

I'd just add, Georgina, that I have no problem with you nor am I
criticising you personally, if I am one of the people referred
to here, but I was very disappointed in the tenure of your
questions posed to me for your forthcoming book on Rendlesham.
Some list members will know (because I have offered full
accounts privately) that I am sadly not willing to do this for
your book to appear, inevitably and not through your fault as
selected bits and pieces. This is because of my desire not to

appear within your pages arguing tittle tattle rather than facts and evidence. You may or may not agree with my views on this case, but I have been involved almost from day one and thus have more to contribute than answering the inane questions you saw fit to pose. I prefer not to appear in your work at all if it cannot be through commenting on facts and evidence that I saw unfold first hand.

Sadly, what you asked was not about the results of my 18 years digging into this case, the things I had learned or my views on the most remarkable set of UFO experiences in the UK. Instead they were all abstract and seemingly based on false innuendo and gossip doing the rounds at the speed of rumour in the way that you of all people should know is no guarantee of truth. These questions were regarding such important issues as my telling you whether I started to investigate in late January 1981 or early February 1981 (as I have contradicted myself on this key issue it seems - for a very simple reason, if it truly matters), or exactly how many people I have interviewed on this case (the implication being that the facts and referenced sources stated in the three books I have authored or co-authored on the case are untrustworthy - otherwise, why would you need to ask for clarification).

As you know, because I told you, I would gladly have answered any serious questions about the case itself, the facts behind it or my views upon it. These, I assumed you might be interested by and your readers would benefit a little from hearing. Instead, it would appear, all you want from me are responses to garbled chatter - which seems at best of oblique relevance to a case with undoubted importance to UFOlogy.

If you perceive my refusal to give you quotable replies to tall tales and trivia as a criticism of you, then I am sorry. But it is not . However, it is certainly a reflection of disappointment that after first telling me a year ago that you wanted to interview me on this case you did not eventually come up with anything beyond feeble gossip to ask me about.

A truly objective overview on this case from someone such as yourself will be welcome to all (myself included - as I am undoubtedly too close to the affair for a good perspective). You still might pull it off, of course, but I am bound to worry that the level of questions that you posed to me serve as an illustration of what you may have asked others.

Still you may prove me wrong. I'll be truly pleased if you do as the case deserves it.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[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](#).