



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

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 21:01:34 -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?

Here we go again, can we suppress all opinions that do not fit  
our view of how ufology should unfold? As far as Budd not having  
a medical degree is ufology taught in medical school and must  
the grays be represented as spiritual teachers of mankind for  
the story to be believed. I believe Dr. Mack who has a  
transformational bent to his version of the gray agenda has a  
medical degree but not a degree in theology. Budd has done good  
honest research and I do not believe if one reviews the numerous  
cases he and others have researched that the conclusion that the  
grays are here to further our spiritual or ecological needs can  
easily be reached.

>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.

Who is going to sit on the committee that decides who may speak  
and who must remain silent because their views do not align with  
the majority. I believe we must be careful in our approach and  
not allow irrational arguments to air in the name of ufology  
however we at the same time cannot censure those viewpoints that  
do not fit our own conception of what ufology should be. We risk  
returning to the mindset of the good churchmen of the  
Inquisition.

>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.

I agree that we must be responsible and police our own but at the same time we must not attack our fellow ufologists merely because their conclusions do not match ours and especially if the work presented is based on years of honest research. We must support one another as far as we are able as there are too many who would attack us with no real provocation as a fringe element.

>Otherwise we face the question of setting ourselves up to make  
>moral choices about who should be empowered to speak and who  
>should not. I don't see how we can fairly do that. For the record  
>I would certainly have voted no to Max Burns - except had there  
>been a two way lecture (i.e. Max versus David so the audience  
>could judge the case side by side). This is exactly what I  
>proposed to BUFORA Council over the Santilli farce - that he be  
>allowed a platform at Sheffield in 1995 only if the alternative  
>perspective was simultaneously offered to allow free debate and  
>let the audience make fair judgement. As you know BUFORA  
>scuppered that plan and left themselves open to what are  
>therefore utterly justified criticism to this day over the way  
>they aided and abetted the autopsy promo.

I agree that Mr. Santilli put on a performance first and foremost however there remain serious researchers like Mr. Hopkins out there. I personally do not like to consider the picture of technologically advanced beings with less than positive intent toward humanity abducting parts of our populace but sadly it may be a conclusion that we may reach at the end of the day. I hope it is not however covering our eyes and ears will not make it go away.

>So when it came to Max Burns, I did not scream and shout at  
>BUFORA - I protested quietly by declining to promote the lecture  
>and by not accepting an invite to lecture to BUFORA during the  
>next 12 months. My point was thus, I trust, made without  
>fanfare.

>Rather than us now argue over a lecture that happened and which,  
>frankly, by trying to stop probably made it seem more  
>interesting to some than it deserved to be, lets stop blaming  
>some and shouting at others and do something positive instead.  
>Let us agree a declaration like I have just set out (that  
>obviously needs fine tuning) and those of us who accept it - on  
>behalf of ourselves and groups we represent -then issue it as a  
>proclamation to the UFO world ASAP encouraging other UFO groups  
>to sign up to the initiative. The plan would be to demonstrate  
>globally that we are voluntarily setting standards as regards to  
>the people we invite to give our public lectures - even if it  
>means not inviting some whose dramatic claims and media stardom  
>would attract audiences and put money into our coffers. We are  
>putting the principle of only promoting good, serious,  
>defensible research and theorising first and any personal gain  
>second. This will send a small message that we do care about  
>self policing ufology and making efforts to do the right thing  
>by educating the public - surely one of our primary aims.

>To me doing this is a positive outcome from the Santilli and Max  
>Burns affair. We will be turning it on its head and taking a  
>step forward on behalf of Ufology. So why not? Lets stop  
>fretting over a lecture that's been and gone and use it as a  
>springboard to agree a simple, straightforward but constructive  
>policy initiative for ufology.

We must I conclude be careful not to take a giant step backward and begin to silence our own ranks. While we are busy fighting amongst ourselves our detractors our even busier in attempting to eliminate the issue altogether and all of us as well.

Respectfully,  
Rose Hargrove

---

[ [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](#).