



# 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: Judith Jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 19:35:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:36:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

Dear Jenny,

I've been reading with interest the responses to the fact that Max Burns was "allowed" by BUFORA to present what he believes to be evidence in the disputed case of the Howden Moors Incident. There are a million and one things that I could say, but I'm not going to say them on this forum. From bitter experience I have learned that nothing of constructive value is ever accomplished over e-mail. In electronic communication, those who wish to distort and cause foment have an unchecked medium in which to do so.

I will say only one thing, although I'm probably wasting my time. BUFORA has never at any time proclaimed that it endorsed Max's point of view, nor any other speaker invited to lecture to BUFORA, for that matter. There is an incredibly important point of principle involved here, one which, since I'm writing to intelligent recipients, I don't presume I need to elucidate. Contrary to what some seem to think about the BUFORA membership, they too are intelligent, perceptive people and do not like being told to whom they can, or cannot, listen. Who will be blacklisted next? Margaret Fry, a veteran British ufologist of some thirty years standing, because she happens to disagree with Andy Roberts' explanation of the Berwyn Mountain case? Myself, because I dared to suggest that the Rendlesham Forest incident is anything but closed, contrary to the beliefs of the "experts" like Ian Ridpath who found it fitting to call me "an empty-minded airhead" without knowing anything about me, my research or my credentials? John Mack, a professor of psychiatry who presumably knows more about the workings of the human mind than anyone on this recipients' list, and yet is convinced of non-human intervention? (unless of course he's spreading disinformation for his CIA masters!) Jenny Randles, who had the courage to put pen to paper and write "Star Children", a little "off-the-wall" perhaps for some people's tastes? I could go on, and on, and on.

I understand fully, Jenny, your desire for this subject to be taken seriously, one that is shared by all committed researchers. But in our inordinate desire for our subject to be validated by the scientific and academic community we risk negating it as a truly astounding human experience ( minus the knowns , the misperceptions, the man-made technology ), something which is touching people's psyches, their consciousness, their visions of the future, their intellectual endeavours. Perhaps the close encounter experience cannot be subjected to scientific empiricism, may never be, no matter how far we advance. Maybe the reason we cannot find answers after 50yrs. is because we're asking the wrong questions - perhaps we need to take a side-step and look at the whole phenomenon from a different perspective, thereby leaving behind the clay-footed, unimaginative dinosaurs

with which paranormal research is so heavily populated, hanging on for dear life to their god of science. If I may be pedantic here, science, we must always remember, is a Greek word "skientia", which simply means knowledge, with no mandatory recourse to physics, chemistry, biology or engineering. No scientific or philosophical breakthrough has ever been made without the gifts of courage and imagination, often at the great expense of the initiator. This is why I feel slightly uncomfortable with your idea of placing so much importance on physicists and engineers and the like. Do we really need their approbation? Their co-operation, yes, but their control, no.

A symposium of "experts" is fatally flawed. There are no experts, only opinions and vested interests. What about the percipients, the experiencers (as the Americans like to call them)? Do they not have a hugely significant role to play? Without them it would be like studying zoology without any animals, botany without any plants, physics without any energy. The best you can do is guess, and dress it up as "science", or science as we would like it to be. If we cannot even define the vast parameters of our subject, how can it be subjected to scientific scrutiny? That doesn't mean that we shouldn't take objective empiricism as far as it can go, but then we have to take courage and use the greatest and most profound faculty we have, imagination, without which nothing would be known, nothing would come into existence.

I am put in mind of some of the greatest thinkers in history - Socrates, Copernicus, Galileo, Willhelm Reich (even), who were persecuted and even murdered for daring to fly in the face of conventional mores. It's not an easy stance to take, and one for which you will surely be vilified. What has been happening recently in British ufology resonates uneasily with the antics of the early Catholic Church - silencing and extirpation of all unacceptable belief systems, the Gnostics, the Cathars, the Albigenses etc., and I'm not alluding in particular to Max Burns, but to the whole ethos of "control" and censoring material for the masses, or at least denigrating "unscientific" theories. Do we have the right to mock and deride those who are inclined to believe in non-human intelligences? The ETHERs may well yet have the last laugh ( and for the information of those ex-members of BUFORA Council who believe that BUFORA officials are muddled in some sort of New Age belief system, this is not so. There isn't one member of BUFORA Council who rates the ETH, apart from Malcolm Robinson, tentatively, and he may one day tell us all "I told you so!" Anyone who was involved with BUFORA and didn't know this must have had his head somewhere where the sun don't shine.)

Peter Brookesmith has made a plea for intellectual honesty, a laudable appeal ( and I really mean that ), but I am also making an equally heartfelt appeal for intellectual generosity. Retain one's views and opinions, but respect those of others. Wrong ideas will ultimately be exposed as such, in the natural order of things. Life is more profitably spent in enriching one's own life, than in destroying another's.

In the word's of William James, "A great many people think they are thinking when they are merely rearranging their prejudices".

Regards to all

Judith

---

[ [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](#).