

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: Budd Hopkins**

From: **Jenny Randles** <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 15:59:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From Dennis Stacy

>John, you have to much to say that is good regarding people,  
>whereas I often don't. Am I getting cynical in middle age?

>Actually, I had an article lined up by Budd for inclusion in  
>UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers. Some of you may  
>have seen it, most of you haven't. It was called "Sane Citizen  
>Sees UFO" and originally appeared in The Village Voce for March  
>1, 1976. It was a classic example of an investigation of a  
>single case, that of George O'Barski, who ran a liquor store in  
>Chelsea where Budd routinely bought his dinner wine.

>I particularly wanted to use it because it was a damn good case,  
>and I thought it would somewhat recast the public perception of  
>Hopkins B.A. -- Before Abductions. Off the top of my head, I  
>can't remember why it didn't make the final edit, but if memory  
>serves (and often it doesn't in my case), I think the Village  
>Voice was late in granting reprint rights, which they eventually  
>did.

>In any event, it demonstrates that, prior to researching  
>abduction cases in the main, Budd was an excellent foot soldier  
>when it came to investigating UFO cases per se.

>To the best of my knowledge, however, Budd declined to  
>participate in the MUFON Abduction Transcription project, for  
>reasons only he can fully delineate. In a somewhat similar vein,  
>I've not heard much of late about the attempt to have his  
>collected alien writing samples analyzed by outside parties. In  
>the meantime, Mario Pazzaglini, who might have made a  
>significant contribution to same, unfortunately passed away in  
>November of last year.

>This is Budd's material and he is of course perfectly free to do  
>what he wants with it, even if that extends to withholding it  
>from the scientific and ufological community (until the next  
>popular book is published), while continuing to publish  
>broad-sides against Carl Sagan and NOVA for not treating the  
>abduction phenomenon seriously and scientifically.

>The question remains: is Budd himself scientific or not? That  
>is, is his approach to the abduction phenomenon that of a  
>scientist or that of a concerned human and therapist, or  
>something of both? Does he keep anything even remotely  
>resembling statistics from his own investigations? (Not much,  
>according to Sandow himself.) Does he routinely publish his  
>findings for other researchers to peer review, comment upon, and  
>(god forbid the possibility!) criticize? A quick glance through  
>recent issues of the MUFON Journal, IUR, and JUFOS doesn't turn

>up too many case investigations with his name on them.

>An article in the Intruders Foundation newsletter remarked on  
>the fact that the aliens never expressed interest in the human  
>heart; until I pointed out that one of the Allagash abductees  
>drew a picture of aliens opening a human chest cavity and  
>hauling out the heart. (See the cover of the April, 1993, MUFON  
>UFO Journal for same, or Fowler's book on the case.)

>  
>I've met Budd on several occasions, and like nearly everyone  
>else, found him an imminently likeable guy. By most accounts  
>I've read, so was Sagan.

>If likeability were the issue, there wouldn't be any issue. But  
>it isn't.

>Budd is heading down a long, dark tunnel with no headlights on.  
>It may not happen tomorrow, it may not happen the day after  
>tomorrow, but it will happen. Sooner or later, one of his  
>"patients" (or their families) is going to file a serious  
>lawsuit against Hopkins over his use of hypnosis and there will  
>be all sorts of hell to pay. One of his friends ought to take  
>him aside and warn him of its inevitability.

>Contrary to what you (and others) might think, I wouldn't like  
>to see it happen to such a nice guy. But Budd is playing with  
>fire. Not necessarily Boylan fire, but fire, nonetheless.

Hi,

I want to support all that Dennis says here. I like Budd a great deal. I respect him because - whilst I strongly disagree with both his methods and conclusions - I think he is genuinely doing what he believes is right. That makes it all the more important to make him see why he is not, because Dennis and I (and surely others) can see the road he is travelling all too well. And we don't want that to happen to him.

But there is a broader issue - if hypnosis has a long term detrimental effect on ufology. I am absolutely certain the latter is the case. Why? Not some arbitrary guesstimate that's for sure. I base my conclusion on three things.

1: That data without hypnosis is as useful as data with it.

2: That a frightening number of abductees have spontaneously told me (and many more agreed when I actually asked them away from the therapists and ufologists who had hounded them into regression) that hypnosis was not a help and left them more uncertain than ever as to what was real.

3: Because I have personally been regressed on several occasions and therefore seen it unfold first hand. I know how tempting it is to see images and presume their reality status. My UFO encounter consisted of 50% stuff I could check and 50% stuff I never could. The stuff I could check was as much fantasy as actual memory. I wrongly reported basic facts in the order of the day of the week, etc. With such a track record it would obviously be foolish to base opinions on ufology on the uncheckable data that emerges via hypnosis because this test proves to me that a good portion of it is certain to be fantasy and possibly all of it is.

I know the counter argument. Ufologists do not rely on hypnosis testimony as the judge of truth. If a case matches another case then this proves hypnosis has contributed to the quest for knowledge. Sadly not. In my tests I also uncovered clear signs of cryptomnesia - a factor also noted by other researchers. The mind loses data on prior alien stories, stuff it has no idea it has recorded. These subconsciously incorporate themselves into the future hypnotic testimony creating an impression of matching prior cases that is an illusion. I learnt to look for what I call 'cultural tracking' - signs that storylines keep pace with our technology and the latest UFO fad. They are everywhere.

Incidentally, none of this is meant to infer that I reject the reality of an alien contact. I suspect this may well be occurring (although I am not convinced of it). There remain important puzzles, like what I call the 'Star Trek' effect. By this I mean compare the 1960's Star Trek with the 1990's

versions. You will see why they had to set them years into the future fictional Star Trek universe. It was because the technology invented in the 1960's sci fi as being futuristic became old hat by the 1990s. Our own technology invented microchips and laser displays and various things that had not been imagined 30 years ago. So the supposedly fantastic earth future of Captain Kirk featured anachronistic images like clunking number counters. To overcome the dilemma they had to update the science to be more in keeping with what we now have, which meant setting the story in the Star Trek future. Of course, its inevitable that 'Voyager' will look old hat to the watchers of 2029 because of then mundane science we dont yet have or can imagine.

My point is abductions from the 1960's to 1990's dont show the same technology erosion. We have accounts that were as magical then as they are magical now - indeed a relatively consistent magical technology with the signs of cultural tracking tweaking the storylines. This, to me, infers that there is a fundamental alien reality underpinning the evidence.

But, back to hypnosis. The problems with it clearly tell you that hypnosis is not the way to access this fundamental reality - just to read peoples dreams and fantasies. These may well be based on a fundamental reality but we would be very foolish indeed to base any conclusions about what this world is like simply by tabulating 1000 peoples dreams based upon it. But that is in effect exactly what we are doing.

Of course, the problems go deeper. It is not merely an academic question about whether hypnosis helps or hinders - such is the scientific debate there are serious reservations about long term effects on imposing a cultural nightmare onto the population (the idea of aliens kidnapping and xperimenting on us) when we have no proof this is real. Doing this on very young chgildren is a risk none of us should be supporting.

When Britain was doing regresssion we avoided that trap. I recall the Aveyley abduction (occurred 1974, investigated 1978/9) and Britains first serious CE 4. It remains one of the best cases world wide as it had no input from DNA grabbing 'grays' (they were unknown in the UK pre Hopkins and Strieber) and so shows both the similarities and differences with UK cases. The overlap between this case and an NDE is quite stunning. The witnesses even saw their own bodies below them during the on board alien visit. My point is our research pursued just the two adults. Three young children were witness too and had patchy recall. Much as I would have loved us to regress them at the time (when we still had a love affair with regression even here) we resisted the tempstion. It was not right to do this to kids.

As you know we had a proper debate in UK Ufology - such as has never occurred in the US - and took a voluntary decision to ban the use of regression hypnosis at BUFORA. I am very proud of this - I regard it as one of the most important things that happened during my 12 years as BUFORA Director of Investigations. Even since they tossed me on the streets (internecine warfare is rife here too!) I am pleased to say the investigation team (which in BUFORA has near total indepedence) has reinforced the move. It is seen to be the right thing to do.

I only wish that more if you understood why we chose this option. Because Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid, UFology will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for allowing it to get that far.

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](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](#).