

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](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Here

## **UFO UpDates Mailing List**

### **Re: British ufology Has Been Reborn!**

From: Georgina Bruni <[georgina@easynet.co.uk](mailto:georgina@easynet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 1999 20:11:49 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 14 Nov 1999 08:14:08 -0500  
Subject: Re: British ufology Has Been Reborn!

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: British ufology Has Been Reborn!  
>Date: Mon, 8 Nov 1999 20:09:17 -0000

Dear Jenny

Thank you for your reply

You appear to have a problem with my questions; but may I remind you that the reason I joined this thread was because you suggested I was evading the issues you presented about the Lakenheath case. I had not thought to get involved in this debate but as you made that assumption I decided to respond with what I believe were some very profound questions.

Because we are dealing with a very prominent and historical case, and the fact that you are now claiming it is less significant than it originally was, I feel it demands some answers from you.

First, with regard to what you wrote concerning the Official Secrets Act being an impediment to the early release of testimony from pilots involved in the incident, I consulted Nick Pope, who, as you know, has worked for the Ministry of Defence (MOD) for almost fifteen years. He confirmed that this was a complete non - issue. As you well know, the MOD's position on the UFO phenomenon is that it is of "no defence significance". Given such official statements (which have been made not just to ufologists, but to parliament) it would be impossible for the Government to object to the release of material relating to this case. Such an objection would show that the MOD's "no defence significance" statements were incorrect. Surely you can see that the MOD would never put themselves in this position? In any case, it's disingenuous to imply there would be any problem with releasing information about an incident that occurred 44 years ago - especially when numerous details of this case have been in the public domain for around 30 years.

Regarding your interview with the crew: may I request for a second time that you post their statement where they actually say they had no visual sighting because this is not included in the BBC interview. You also say there was no cat and mouse chase, but in the interview it is clear that the object flew down "again" and disappeared when they overshot it, and there is no mention that the object was not on their tail. Therefore, would you mind posting this statement from them too. The reason I ask is because you claim the interview proves the official report was incorrect. If this is so, and in view of it being such a prominent case, I think it is necessary to offer this evidence.

Squadron Leader Freddy Wimbledon, who was in charge of the alert station that night, and the person who actually scrambled the jets, said the first aircraft locked onto the target and ALSO SAW THE LIGHT, which swept around the back of the plane and FOLLOWED it. In the official report there was no mention of the crew seeing an object, just "A BRIGHT LIGHT". So it seems Wimbledon was agreeing with the report.

However, in your revised book (1997) "The Complete Book of UFOs", co authored with Peter Hough, you mention the BBC interview with the crew, (February 1996) where they insist that neither jet made any visual contact and suggest that "their testimony lessens the significance of this famous case". You also write that they [crew] had not considered UFOs until you came along. However, this is all very misleading because it seems they did not claim to know what the object was, so it stands to reason it was a UFO (unidentified flying object). In answer to your questions, asking if they were aware that other ground radar systems were involved and did they know about the visual sightings from below and that a USAF transport aircraft actually was looking down on this thing from 5,000 feet and could see a yellow glow beneath it. They said they did not know until you had just told them. There is a vast difference here.

The fact that they did not know what the ground were experiencing is not unusual. But where do the crew actually say they personally had no visual sighting of the LIGHT or that they were not followed by the UFO or that they did not know it was a UFO? None of these questions or answers appear to be included in the BBC interview. Again, I ask you why were they not included if you find them so important that you are now questioning the significance of this very important case? Indeed, I think we do need to know exactly what the crew had to say about all of this.

>If anyone is being difficult, surely its you for insisting on  
>probing for something that just isnt there. In fact rather like  
>you did over Rendlesham when for your book you asked me no  
>questions at all about my views on the case, or the evidence, or  
>theories of explanation, or anything I'd gladly have discussed  
>with you. Instead your questions were about things like  
>documents you suggested (quite spuriously) that I had withheld  
>from others when - as I had to prove to you at length - I had  
>done exactly the opposite.

I cannot believe you are still going on about that episode. The truth of the matter is, that no way did I accuse you of withholding documents, but was merely asking you questions - the same as I am doing now. It seems you have a problem answering questions Jenny and read into them what you want to believe.

Several months ago I sent you a PRIVATE e-mail with eight questions, which you claimed were based on gossip. You refused to answer my questions, but posted selected pieces publicly on UFO UPDATES. This was, in my opinion a breach of confidence. I asked you to post a message retracting what you wrote, or at least to explain that the information you posted was incorrect, inasmuch as I did not base my questions on gossip but on your own published works and through interviews with your co-authors.

What you wrote suggested we had done some kind of deal that if I don't write gossip about you, you would help with my questions. I sent an update explaining there was no deal. How could there be? I had no intention of writing about you or the gossip that you implied my questions were based on. I explained that my work was about the case - not about Jenny Randles.

When you finally decided to answer my questions, you sent an e-mail of almost a thousand words, when all I wanted was straightforward answers to the eight factual questions, not your life story.

However, that was not the end of it. You recently posted to your colleague Tim Matthews list, again bringing up the accusations that my questioning was more or less based on gossip. This is simply not true!

>you asked me no questions at all about my views on the case, or  
>the evidence, or theories of explanation

Why would I ask your opinion? Were you a witness? Were you involved? Were you on the base at the time? Were you in the military? Were you with any agency or government department? No! This is a book about the witnesses and the experts - not about ufologists. Besides, I've read your latest views and theories and no offense meant, but I have to disagree with you entirely.

Georgina Bruni

---

[ [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](#).