



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [May](#) -> [Re: First 'Grey' Report?](#)

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: First 'Grey' Report?

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Thu, 13 May 1999 21:08:01 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 14 May 1999 08:28:00 -0400
Subject: Re: First 'Grey' Report?

>Date: Thu, 13 May 1999 01:00:31 -0400
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Re: First 'Grey' Report?

>>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: First 'Grey' Report?
>>Date: Tue, 11 May 1999 19:51:46 +0100

>> I am really only challenging the commonly held view that
>>this is a straightforward greys from planet alpha flying here in
>>ships and physically kidnapping witnesses to perform dastardly
>>experiments. Maybe that is what is going on, but I am not
>>convinced - thankfully. If I were - frankly - I would be very
>>worried indeed for the fate of the planet. Let us hope I am
>>right and the truth will be more enlightening than frightening,
>>but I know I might not be.

>Jenny, so far, the cases you have cited and asked us to
>"consider" have mostly been cases that fall more into the realm
>of psychological phenomena. They would make interesting
>psychological studies but I fail to see how they should be
>classified or painted as acceptable examples of a UFO abduction.

>Cases where the "experiencer" is observed by others while the
>individual claims to have been "abducted" may be valuable as a
>study of human consciousness and psychology, but other than the
>imagery that is incorporated they have little to do with the
>fact that many people report close up encounters with unknown
>craft and subsequent interaction with it's occupants. (Or
>missing time in conjunction with the sighting.)

>It is the cases where an individual is fully conscious, has a
>UFO sighting, and then interaction with its occupants that beg
>explanation/investigation/debate. You cite for instance the
>case of the lady in Australia and her "experience" as if it
>somehow fit into the pattern I just described. Other than
>linking a psychological component/explanation to the many
>reports of UFO abduction, (which only serves to further muddy
>already murky waters,) I don't see the point in citing it at
>all. One has little to do with the other.

>There may well be -many people- that are experiencing what is
>a purely psychological/consciousness based phenomena, but
>at the end of the day the cases which incorporate an actual
>UFO sighting and 'abduction' by its occupants will be no closer

>to being explained or solved. The two things must be separated,
>distinctions need to be made, or you are left with an amalgam of
>reports which will never become untangled.

>Just a for instance:

>If the Betty and Barney Hill case was to be used as a criteria
>for defining what comprises a 'contact case' you would
>automatically eliminate about 95% (+ - a few %) of the cases of
>reported alien interaction. Throw out anything and everything
>that doesn't involve the person being 1. fully conscious at the
>time of the incident/sighting, 2. Where a UFO is involved, and
>3. where some kind of interaction with the UFOs' occupants
>occurred.

>It's the old K.I.S.S. concept! :)

>Researchers need to focus and narrow the scope of the
>investigation as much as possible because of the mountain of
>reports and information that is flooding in. It's a confusing
>enough piece of business as it is without also including;
>psychological phenomena, peoples dreams, sleep paralysis, out of
>body experiences, channelling, etc, etc.

>Investigating a straight forward report is much easier and
>lends itself better to empirical analysis if you're dealing with;
>Joe Blow says that he was driving home and encountered a
>landed UFO off exit @#\$ on Highway such and such. (Such as
>the police officer in the UK) The site can be visited, landing
>traces (if any) can be observed and sampled for testing. Joe
>Blow goes on to say that the occupants inserted something
>up his nose during the episode, or that they took skin samples,
>followed by a medical examination, x-rays/MRI, yadda,
>yadda, yadda, you get my drift I'm sure. It just makes more
>sense to limit the investigation -and the debate- to cases
>involving -credible witnesses- that claim to have had -fully
>conscious- encounters with -UFOs- and/or their -occupants-.

>I think both skeptics and believers alike would grant that many
>folks are having psychological or otherwise explained
>experiences. That within that group an interesting and
>intriguing psychological phenomenon is manifest and worthy of
>study. (Probably in the same sense that "copycat" crimes are
>interesting psych studies) But, by lumping them in with -UFO
>related abduction reports- of the kind outlined above you only
>feed the formidable incredulity that already exists in the minds
>of the general public. There is, (whether it is acknowledged or
>not) an urgency to this issue which goes beyond anything that
>has preceeded it.

>You say so yourself, . . .

>>Maybe that is what is going on, but I am not
>>convinced - thankfully. If I were - frankly - I would be very
>>worried indeed for the fate of the planet.

>Nuff said?

Hi,

Yes, I see your argument. But in a sense it is prejudging what
areas we should study and what areas we should not. All CE 4
cases (well - okay - 90% of those in my UK data base) start with
the OZ Factor, elements of ASC and move from there into the
classic abduction. I do not think it is wise to reject cases
where the same starting process leads to a different conclusion
or type of phenomenon because that conclusion is not a
traditional CE 4.

For instance, the Maureen Puddy case is not so different as you
suppose. She had straightforward UFO encounters and an alien
contact with the UFO, before her peculiar observed abduction.
The other cases I cite are even closer to traditional abductions
and some include UFOs that were actually seen by independent
witnesses. Only the CE 4 part was a totally subjective one. With
some CE 4s involving 'real UFOs' - not just 'psychological
phenomena' - how sure can we be that the UFO is any more real
than the aliens Maureen Puddy saw. We still lack the same sort
of proof of objectivity that even UFOs offer - such as photos
and video of aliens, shots inside the UFO, etc. We do have some

good data of thar kind with UFOs and if abductions are equally 'real' then why not any of that type.

Well, yes, there is the Ilkley CE 4 plus photo of the alien - a case I know well. The very reason I have spent so much time on it is that it challenges my argument here. And it does hold up - so I guess I shoot down my own argument. But if this has happened once, why not at other times? We do not just haved one good UFO photo.

You might be right that I am discussing cases that are 'not the same' and therefore not directly relevent. But might not the same apply to you? Might not you be rejecting cases that are part of the same problem because their outcome is not in line with traditional views about the nature of abductions.

I dont know which of these applies, but either might. I'd be happy for an unbiased judge to look at the observed abductions such as the Dandenongs and the ones I cite like Maureen Puddy and see if it is reasonable to study them as basically one phenomenon or two very different ones. I think I know which verdict would apply. But would be happy to be proven wrong.

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
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](#).