



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: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Peter Brookesmith-Mendoza <DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:28:56 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:27:48 -0400
Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome
>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 99 13:14:02 PDT

>>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:30:48 -0400
>>From: Mendoza - Peter Brookesmith <DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome
>>To: To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>Peter,

>>I believe I was among if not the first to express some outrage
>>in public at Budd Hopkins's regression of small children, in a
>>review in "Fortean Times" of an IUN Sheffield conference in
>>approximately 1993. In his presentations (which I taped, but I
>>write from memory) he actually admitted the children were as
>>young as two and a half.

>Since this is a very serious allegation, I think we need more
>than your memory here. Could we have an exact quote from this
>tape?

Yes, but for me to give you chapter, verse and I context I need
(a) a working cassette player, and all four of mine are currently
on the blink, with a new one on order due in a couple of weeks (b)
about three hours (max.) to listen to both Budd's presentations
from that conference. So bear with me.

Meanwhile, if you look up Fortean Times #72 (1993) pp44-5, you
will at least have a printed reference to Budd's statement and my
reaction to it, written hard on the event, tape machines whirring
and in good order.

>>I don't think Hopkins is honest, although he may be sincere in
>>his own peculiar way.

>Interestingly, I've more than once heard the same said of you,
>for whatever it's worth.

Worth not much. But, as yer man famously said, there is only one
thing worse than being talked about, and that is not being
talked about.

Otherwise, I can't currently do better than Dennis Stacy is
doing to point out the problems with Hopkins' thinking. Know ye,
there is wisdom among the sasquatches.

>>Nor do I think Mad Max is honest. In
>>neither case, however, do I think is there is any question of
>>deliberate misrepresentation or hucksterism. But it surely is
>>self-deception, which I've called intellectual dishonesty (see
>>UFO UpDates, passim), and for which I've been most vehemently
>>reprimanded, most often by people who I'd naively expected
>>would know better. That the strongest detractors are citizens
>>of the United States is not, I think, entirely coincidental.

>Please explain what this last sentence is supposed to mean.

The post you quote was (like Jenny Randles's wonderful satire on censorship) actually intended for distribution only to a bunch of British ufologists and observers of ufology who have been discussing this & that among ourselves, and like Jenny I didn't notice that UpDates (and Jeff Rense, I see) was on the CC: list. None of those in that sophisticated circle seems to have had any trouble understanding what I meant, most of them being somewhat skeptical (in the Truzzian sense), and every one a patriot (guffaw).

But the gloss is that of any random sample of American ufologists, I would predict that more were sympathetic to Budd Hopkins and his claims than you would find in a random sample of an equal number of British - or, indeed, European - ufologists. Thus, criticism of Hopkins might be expected to attract more detractors from the USA than from Britain and/or Europe.

>That it is rendered by a citizen of the United Kingdom is not,
>I think, entirely coincidental. (Or something like that.)

My own think is that an informed Esquimaux ("in his skin canoe", ho ho) would not disagree with me. I haven't counted any more than you have, but you must surely have noticed how often exchanges that could broadly be called skeptic-versus-believer debates on this list divide between the Old World and the New. Given enough time but without too much trouble I could work up a psychosocial hypothesis for the reasons for this that would probably put you in a fine dudgeon: although I think the Esquimaux perspective would be preferable, as more impartial. It would likely be pretty dry about Sir John Franklin, too.

>Cheers,

And to you.

best wishes
Palmreader D. Moonraking
Bootleg Clairvoyant

[[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.

Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

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