

Earth



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here

Earth



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

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:36:02 EDT
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 16:05:54 -0400
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about
>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.
>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed
>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the
>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not
>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield
>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd
>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing
>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays
>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.
>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that
>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially
>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably
>suppress them all?

Interesting set of words ... that of Burns and Hopkins being
alike (" ... not a lot of difference here"). And further, " ...
honest ufologists expressing a view that _most of us_ consider
... wrong and offensive." And finally, " ...can we ... suppress
them all?"

Burns and Hopkins are not alike, except in that place which is
occupied by the opinions of some men (and women). Whose
opinions certainly may not be valid, as it is with many
opinions. Name those features of each man which appear to you to
be alike... one at a time.

And expression of opinion that _most of us consider wrong_ is
another good set of words. Who, pray tell, is MOST of US? Is
that a group of serious researchers the likes of which _the rest
of us_ have not heard of as yet? Ah, the MOU-fon group? Most
Of Us Group? Never heard of 'em. I even aksed Gesundt.

And finally, why would one wish to suppress anyone, let alone
suppress them all? I thought they outlawed the practice of
suppressive communism in the west.

Personally, and as a witness to the good which Mr. Hopkins has
done during his lifetime, I find your telling of it offensive.
It is obvious that your opinion regarding hypnosis is not
favorable, however the reasons I've heard are inadequate to form
the solid level of belief some embrace. That many, including
psychologists and psychiatrists, differ as to the efficacy of
hypnosis, should be a warning sign to those who "believe as well

as disbelieve." The verdict is not in, Mam. (That's an American-ism...)

To quote Fr. Balducci, "Generalized denial stems from illogical fanaticism..." The opinions expressed often on this list, regarding hypnosis as well as many subjects, sound too much like Balducci's observation to me. Total skepticism is completely unjustified in this case as well.

>My argument here is not that BUFORA were right. I don't think >they were. Free speech is no substitute for allowing nonsense to >be set before the public in your name. But the point is one that >requires deeper consideration as to a degree we all do the same >thing without probably being aware of that fact. So - perhaps, a >general consensus that we could agree and issue as a >proclamation about is what we need to emerge from this mess. If >we agree to abide by this working practice we would set an >example to Ufology.

What you appear to be attempting to verbalize, is that there is a requirement that anyone with an opinion practice a reasonable level of responsibility in the effort. Please, that'd be nice. And unexpected.

Your desire for a consensus, in my opinion at least, will not work. First, ufology is not as yet prepared for the level of responsible expression you and many of us, desire. The proof of this are various and sundry opinions expressed right here as fact, opinions so diverse as to be oxymoronic. Oh me of little faith.

>What example? Let us all take the decision here and now that any >public event we organise involve the invitation only of serious >researchers who can put forward hard evidence with a >demonstrably scientific basis and who do not endorse patently >absurd, unscientific ideas without support. Nor that we should >invite anyone who sets before the public a scenario that has >damaging moral or ethical repercussions. As these things require >common sense and someone to make a value judgement we don't want >to set ourselves up as the thought police. So I suggest we >agree a second principle, if we make a value judgement and yet >someone whom we invite still clearly offends the sensitivities >of people out there - such responsible criticism should be >heeded. If it is apparent there is concern over an invite then a >free vote is offered over the net - a simple yes/no to whether >that person should be considered suitable for invite and that >the decision to run with that lecturer or to cancel the invite >be abided by whatever the outcome of this vote.

Oh my Gawd! Have you ever been involved with more than yourself, in setting up a conference of any kind, let alone THIS subject? Huh? What you are asking for is the ideal. See my previous para on idealism.

However I do have several questions...

- 1) Who chooses those "serious researchers" to whom you referred?
- 2) Please, define that "hard evidence" you spoke about!
- 3) And about those sensibilities you referred to, whose sensibilities are you speaking of?
- 4) Have you ever been to a Chinese fire drill?

> Respectfully snipped

>Comments please.

OK, how about "Oy voh ist mir!?"

Jim Mortellaro

[[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](#).