



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: Budd Hopkins And The Big Confusion

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 20:27:38 +0100
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 07:52:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Confusion

>From: Jean-Luc Rivera <JLRIV1@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 05:30:23 EDT
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

>>Listfolk:

><snip>

>>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,
>>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.
>>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he
>>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not
>>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has
>>never conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,
>>has Jacobs.

>Having been privileged to know Budd Hopkins for more than twenty
>years now, I can confirm what Jerry just wrote: Budd has never
>hypnotized children and has always refused to do so. All of
>Budd's research associates can certify it.

<snip>

Hi,

I want to respond to the way this 'debate' has degenerated into
this story of a 'big lie'. Frankly, I am horrified.

To summarise, so far as I know I have NEVER (yes, I know that is
rude and shouting on the net) argued that Budd Hopkins is not a
decent, honest, compassionate man who cares deeply about the
people he works with. I have met Budd several times over the
years, always been impressed by him and have repeatedly
expressed my positive views on him in print. Read any of my
books concerning abductions and that will be obvious. We
disagree on the interpretation of CE 4s and on the use of
hypnosis but that is not important to me as I disagree with many
UFOlogists on many things and I have never had anything but
respect and admiration for his work or for himself as a person.
So I hope that is completely clear.

Consequently at no point have I ever even contemplated
attacking, name calling, rebuking or whatever a man whom I
admire. This whole issue is about hypnosis - something Budd

supports and I don't. He might be right and I might be wrong. Everyone else is entitled to their opinion on the matter. But surely we can debate this as a question of issues without turning it into a needless fight about personalities.

The whole thing stems from two things which need to be clarified and re-emphasised in case anyone has not followed the full debate. Firstly, a reply that I sent to a UK posting circulated between ex BUFORA members criticising a lecturer who gave a presentation that they did not support. I thought I was responding just to those UK people. Unknown to me the message was forwarded to this list as part of the cc list of one of those in BUFORA.

In my reply I deliberately set up the UK critics by taking their argument through irony to an extreme - suggesting that we should all ban various people from future lectures because we don't like what they were doing. Budd came up in the course of that as an example UK researchers would comprehend (he is one of the few well known American researchers to regularly lecture in the UK). This piece was a set up, designed to show what taking this censorship to an extreme would achieve. People were lured into the idea of creating a declaration banning UFologists before realising its implications.

Immediately the reactions set in I posted an explanation. This showed the folly of the argument - how, for instance, many of those calling for a ban had themselves invited Budd to the UK, how I was lecturing with Budd (by no means for the first time) shortly so should ban myself, how it was just absurd to reach the point where arbitrary censorship by people who set themselves up to do this dictated ufology.

From this innocent premise (which made the point in the UK and ended the debate on the disputed lecture) the thing took off into a tangent about why I had suggested (and completely none seriously as you can see) that Budd would be censored from UK lectures. This was his alleged work with children and his use of hypnosis (banned in the UK by BUFORA, but by no means by all groups). The row took off (now despite me). It became seen as an attack on Budd.

Jerry Clark then asked Budd if he did regress children, he categorically stated he had never done so and would not do so. Jerry termed the claim that he had ever done so as being reckless and irresponsible. Further words followed from other postings suggesting jealousy was a factor and seemed to be implying that the attack on Budd had been deliberate rather than an accidental misunderstanding.

I cannot speak for anybody else who has offered comments on this list - only myself. I have explained above how this even got to be debated at all - never with the slightest intention to slur Budd that's for sure. I have also explained in another posting why I was under the impression Budd did work with children. It was as a consequence of a lecture he gave in 1993 in Sheffield. I understood then that (obviously in fact I evidently misunderstood then that) from his paper. Peter Brookesmith on this list (who raised this lecture first) confirmed he got that impression too. In Fortean Times Issue 72 reporting on the conference (with photos of Budd, etc) there is a detailed report on his lecture which notes this comment. And at the conference a BBC reporter was wandering around recording views from people present and was asking them what they thought of this new development - therefore presumably getting the same misunderstanding as we did.

I have absolutely no qualms whatsoever about accepting Budd at his word. I know he is as honest as the day is long and his statement is good enough for me. But somewhere, out there in the videos and transcripts of that 1993 Sheffield conference the reason for this widespread confusion must exist. But it was clearly an innocent and completely honest mistake made by quite a few people who were at that conference who were simply reporting what they took to be a new twist in the subject to be taken on board. That's all.

I won't be seeking this proof, since as far as I am concerned Budd's word is all I need and that's the end of the matter for me. I have apologised to him for the misunderstanding. But if any of you harbour any doubts that there was something more to

this such as jealousy or an outrageous attack on Budd then I assure you otherwise .

Incidentally, although this list has reacted as if the suggestion that children are regressed is a criminal act and tantamount to someone attempting character assassination, I never saw it that way. I knew that regressing children has been considered in both the US and the UK and almost certainly has happened somewhere. Teenagers certainly have been regressed. I am genuinely delighted that both Budd and David Jacobs would not ever contemplate this. It certainly matches my feelings about them and increases my existing positive impression of their work. But even had they done so, I would not have considered them criminals merely unwise in doing something I personally disagree with but expect other folk do not.

In fact, if you think about it, the abreaction I think this mistaken impression about regression work provoked rather illustrates my point. It was widely perceived as a horrible comment to make and something that would be seen as terrible to do. Rather more horrific than I ever perceived it myself, in fact. But if so, then why? Merely because children should not be regressed? If so, at what age do we regress them? 12? 15? 18? Is it okay to regress a person who might suffer from epilepsy (the reason why the UK ban was introduced when such a session went wrong)? Or people who are in any way beset with some kind of psychological stress? Or is it okay to work with children by whatever method to try to dredge out memories of some terrible hidden trauma (hidden one assumes for good reason by their conscious mind)?

None of this is a simple issue, but it is an emotive one. I am totally happy to live with Budd doing things his way and take on board his findings and integrate them with mine and those of others who use different methods again. It would be a poor world if we all had to do things the same way and could not tolerate any different approach. Indeed we grow from diversity of method. I just have my views on hypnosis and I am prepared to stand up for them. I am glad others of different mindsets are willing to do the same.

Remember also that I do not ignore abduction data (including Budd's) and take it pretty seriously - at least to the point of discussing it alongside non abduction data in my books. So I am neither advocating a witch hunt against Budd or against Hypnosis itself. I repeat that my postings were expressing my reasons for not trusting hypnosis and I will freely debate counter arguments which I realise does exist and has merit. Who knows you may even change my mind - as I have changed it once myself. Between 1978 and 1988 when the ban was introduced I took part in at least 20 hypnosis experiments and regarded it as the best way to go. Evidence and experience persuaded me otherwise. So who knows about tomorrow?

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[[Next 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.

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

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