

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: **John Heptonstall** <[john@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk](mailto:john@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 19:41:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 17:06:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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?

<snip>

>Comments please.

>Jenny Randles

I think the fundamental test for any 'theory' has to be that it has sufficient direct evidence to warrant reasonable discussion. Evidence can be witness testimony, flight logs, police data, and any other materially significant information that an objective reasonable person would accept as valid, or that creates room for sensible debate.

It may be that some of this evidence has been obtained by, what some feel is, 'dubious' means such as 'regressive hypnosis' but that should not exclude the evidence as long as it is not the sole basis for a theory - there has to be some material/direct or witness recall (without recourse to hypnotherapeutic techniques) data from which the theory can be derived.

Mouton Howe, Good, Lear, Lazar, Warren, Hopkins and numerous others have been criticised by some UFOlogists - it appears to me - more because of their 'findings' than the fact that they cannot supply evidence that can be debated. That's not objective reasoning. I also have reservations about 'regressing children' but it may ultimately be found to be a relatively safe, and effective, means to find out what is going on - especially if there is an ET dimension to their experiences, and that the only way to identify the scope and depth of the problem is to provide such a modality in a safe, properly controlled, way. Yet we have

detractors, such as Kevin McLure, who would deny the right of both investigator and witness to that modality - not from a scientific or legal base, despite his weak arguments to the contrary that have been easily shot down ( and not reported as so by him ).

We have to extract subjective opinion from the arguments and stick to objectivity; if say the IUN decides to publish a theoretical argument that does not sit well with many of it's members - tough shit - as long as the argument has supportive evidence, as opposed to opinion, it will find it's level; those who cannot take objectivity because it flies in the face of their scepticism, that's their problem and they should be seen as not capable of accepting a reasoned argument. It's not long since Jacques Benveniste was part of a debate on TV about his 'proof' of 'the memory of water. One of the debaters, Jonathan ... ( forgot his name, doctor and theatrical personality ) tried to argue against the theory which flies in the face of current chemical understanding, and in the end he said he 'would not believe it if he saw it with his own eyes'. We seem to have more that one or two such sceptics in UFOlogy - we can do without this, let them support their own point evidentially before having their views widely published.

BUFORA made the fatal mistake with Max ( and regularly do ) of failing to require supporting evidence before they entertain a 'speaker' or 'author'. The IUN must hold better standards but have to be ready to publish views that may not be popular. BUFORA have done that!

Unless criticism is supported by objective reasoning and evidence, it should not be entertained; when one reads professional magazines, it is common to find that articles, and 'letters', will not be published if they are not supported with reasoned argument. This must become part of UFOlogy, it is not at the moment and that detracts from the subject enormously.

This must also go for criticism of another's work, or point of view; if the latter is based on sound evidence, then it goes without saying that any criticism or opposing view must be required to be accompanied by sound theoretical argument. I hope we are all able to take criticism of our points of view - but we should not have deal with 'emotional' outbursts which have no evidential base.

Regards

John.

--

John Heptonstall

Search for other documents to/from: [john](#)

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).