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One of the allegations levelled against Budd Hopkins, by one of his detractors, is that he worked almost exclusively alone, without supervision of any kind and without any credentialed peers to naysay him. One example of why this allegation is demonstrably false is because Hopkins, amongst the many professionals he consulted with, conferred with the former Police Chief of Wellfleet, and veteran NYPD officer, Richard P. Rosenthal about elements of evidence from the Linda Cortile case. Prior to his post as the Chief of Police at Wellfleet Rosenthal put in twenty years with the New York City Police Department, including sixteen years as a detective. Rosenthal retired from the NYPD a lieutenant.

In the Linda Cortile case Richard and Dan initially presented themselves as New York City police officers. They did this so they could tell Hopkins what they saw without having to mention the involvement of a VIP third party who was also with them at the time of the November 30, 1989 UFO abduction incident. The sensitive circumstances surrounding both the identity and career of this third party, as well as the real reason why these three people were where they were at the time of the abduction, was why Richard and Dan initially erred on the side of caution and presented a sanitised account of their experience to Hopkins.

Hopkins consulted with Rosenthal for two reasons. The first reason was because he wanted to get a credentialed New York City police officer's assistance with a specific aspect of the Linda Cortile case. The second reason was because if Richard and Dan were New York City police officers Rosenthal might be able to help Hopkins locate them. In short, Hopkins sought out Rosenthal, an independent and credentialed peer, to obtain his professional, unbiased input on specific evidence from the Linda Cortile case and to potentially gain his assistance in locating Richard and Dan.

Rosenthal's appraisal of the evidence that Hopkins shared with him would either be supported or doubted. In other words, Hopkins, and the evidence he presented, potentially could have been naysayed had Rosenthal found grounds to do so. While Rosenthal did not find any grounds to naysay Hopkins and the Cortile case evidence he was a credentialed peer in a position to do so had he found any evidence of duplicity. It is for this reason that Rosenthal's contribution to the Linda Cortile case demonstrates the inaccuracy of Carol Rainey's allegation that Hopkins worked almost exclusively alone, without supervision of any kind and without any credentialed peers to naysay him. Rosenthal is a prime example of a credentialed peer who was in a position to naysay Hopkins had he found the grounds to do so. Anytime an individual consults with an independent, credentialed professional to obtain professional input on an issue the individual, and the matter they are getting appraised, are placed in a position to be supported or naysayed.

In his work Budd Hopkins consulted with many Psychiatric professionals (Dr. John Mack, Dr. Jean Mundy, Dr. Girard Franklin, Dr. Aphrodite Clamar, Dr. Robert Naiman, Dr. Stuart Appelle). Each of these consultations put him in the same position to be supported or criticised. For one to claim there were no credentialed peers to naysay Hopkins is false given how many professionals he consulted with to aid in his research.
Carol Rainey: ...before you were here.

Richard P. Rosenthal: Well at the moment I’m the Chief of Police for the town of Wellfleet on Cape Cod. Uh, prior to that, I put in twenty years in the New York City Police Department. I retired from that unit, from that agency uh as a lieutenant.

Carol Rainey: And what did you do uh, for the NYPD?

Richard P. Rosenthal: I did a number of things. I retired out of the aviation unit. I was flying helicopters for the department. I’m a commercial pilot and uh prior to that I spent time as an investigator, sixteen years as a detective uh and my uh additional years were spent as either a Sergeant or Lieutenant.

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Richard P. Rosenthal: I think there are, there are a couple of, of basic principles of, of investigative technique that can be used to verify virtually any uh phenomena or phenomenon. Uh in the case of UFOs uh I suggest that your best technique, if you have no physical evidence, is multiple independent, disinterested witnesses. Uh if, if a person has no reason to exaggerate or fib uh or make up a story. If they wish to remain anonymous it’s, it’s a very strong indication that this person is telling the truth, truth to the best of their ability. Uh if, if they’re concerned about their name getting out because of the nature of what they’ve observed I think that’s a strong indication that uh this person is, is basically um they’re trying to come up with the most accurate representation of, of what they’ve observed.

Carol Rainey: Do you...

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Carol Rainey: What would he say?

Richard P. Rosenthal: A precinct captain will say nothing to that kind of story. Um the person...the... what would happen is, is your ushered into the precinct. You, you’re put in line with a bunch of other people who are making uh what are considered nominal, normal complaints. This complaint could not be construed as a normal one. Uh, nonetheless uh, you, your, the information will be taken and it will be put on something called a sixty one. Uh this is a uh a complaint report, uh an initial complaint report uh after that the um, theoretically, it might go up to the detectives. Frankly I cannot see the detectives um doing anything with that information. Um, what could they do? Uh no. Did you get the license number on your UFO, I (laughs). Can you please describe the alien, little grey guy with big, bl, big, black eyes. It’s very tough on a detective. (Rosenthal and Rainey laugh)

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Carol Rainey: ...UFO reports.

Richard P. Rosenthal: Uh most people in law enforcement uh consider UFO reports as, as being either fantasy or bogus or, or uh, um, reports done by people who are seeking some sort of notoriety. Um, I have never seen a UFO myself and, and I’m still, you know, kind of wondering what this whole thing is about but um, I’ve spoken to friends and uh, and uh, and colleagues who’ve seen them. Who’ve been
up fairly close to them. These people never reported their observations to anyone and in fact it was only under unusual circumstances that the subject came up and they felt comfortable talking about seeing such an object. They, they were hesitant about coming forward, even to people who, who they entrusted their lives to.

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Carol Rainey: Do you ever see that?

Richard P. Rosenthal: In the Linda case, number one uh I think it’s important to know that Budd Hopkins spoke to me years before he wrote the book. And he was, he was confused. It was such an un, a bizarre case, such an unusual case. Uh it’s difficult uh to accept the facts as, as they’re laid out. Uh here the case purportedly has a large unidentified flying object hovering over a lower Manhattan apartment building uh at, at some early morning hour uh taking uh um a citizen out of a window, apparently through metal bars, levitating this person up into an aircraft, uh this is, ship or whatever it is. Uh, uh and a few other people observing it and Budd was asking me my opinion about this. He had at that point gotten two different viewpoints, one from some law enforcement officers that were under the FDR drive and, and another viewpoint came from the woman who was abducted. Uh, and, and he wanted to find out who, how we could determine the identity of the law officers.

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Richard P. Rosenthal: When Budd first spoke to me about the report of this incident he told me about Richard and Dan and he asked me uh where they might come from. Obviously uh he came to me because, number one, I’m the local Chief of Police but beyond that um I’m a former New York City police officer and he suspected that they were somehow connected with the New York City Police Department. Uh I have listened to at least one or perhaps two of the tapes that he received from these people. Uh and they sound, the person who was on the tape could very easily have been, or is, a New York City police officer. He uses a jargon, he has a texture of vo, of voice and tone that I’m used to, you know, have, having been among, around many, many members of that department. Um yet from the story the man (Richard) is telling it would appear he’s either assigned to a highly unusual specialty unit within the department or he has transferred over to some federal uh agency or perhaps the United Nations uh which is not unusual um a number of police officers each year do, do that kind of a transfer.

Carol Rainey: Mm.

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Carol Rainey: …questions.

Richard P. Rosenthal: Only that I, I had, I have known Budd since uh I came into this job which was um 1990 and I know Budd is an honorable man and Budd honestly believes he has got very good information here. Um I don’t believe Bu, Budd is the victim of a hoax. I don’t know what he’s got. I don’t think Budd truly knows what he has. Um was it Sherlock Holmes who said Eliminate the impossible and you’ll wind up with whatever is left has to be the facts of the matter. So, I, I don’t know uh how we handle this.
Carol Rainey: (laughs) I don’t think we can eliminate the impossible here.

Richard P. Rosenthal: Yeah that’s, that’s the dilemma.

(Cuts to another video with Rosenthal)

Richard P. Rosenthal: Uh, uh that’s, that’s a good point. How, how does one verify an impossibility. Here you’re telling me, you, generic you, uh here we have a flying saucer, it’s hovering soundless, basically, well lit, over a building, lower Manhattan, city of many millions of people uh thousands of people had to see it from all over and I mean it’s high so people from all over had to actually witness this. Uh that’s not a rational thing to believe yet you’ve got independent witnesses who have no gain coming forward and saying this is what I observed, now tell me what I saw. Well I, I for one wouldn’t deem to tell anybody what they were seeing here um and, and frankly I have no explanation for this even after reading the book. Um it’s a very uncomfortable subject because of, of, of the nature of what was observed. Either these people are totally out of their minds, we have a mass hallucination, generated by what I have no idea, we have an incredible hoax to no end, no gain, it’s been going on now for seven years uh which is uh very patient people involved in this hoax uh or we have a truly remarkable situation uh that we really don’t have a good explanation for.
Notes on Rosenthal's Video Interview

When Rosenthal gave the video interview he indicated that Linda's case had been going on for seven years, this is not quite accurate. Rosenthal arrived at seven years by counting back from 2003, when he gave the video interview, to 1996 when Witnessed was first publicly released. Linda's case had in fact been going on since 1976 when Linda saw the ear, nose and throat specialist who found a surgical scalpel scar inside her nose despite her never having surgery. This specialist was the first witness to her case. Linda's experiences related to her case go back further still but the first witness to aspects of her case was this specialist which Linda went to in 1976.
1) The two best-known abduction investigators, Budd Hopkins and David Jacobs, work almost exclusively alone (separately, although with extensive telephone exchanges), without supervision (and are unwilling to accept any), and without any training in medicine or psychiatry or neurology. A bit of comparative religion, anthropology, and folklore under the belt wouldn’t hurt, either, in dealing with these difficult-to-interpret human experiences. They’re not required to get authorization for their experimentation on human beings from an Institutional Review Board (IRB), a clearance that’s required of every legitimate institutional researcher in the country. It’s peer review of a proposed study using human subjects, it’s strict, and researchers are required to report back to the IRB with their findings. None of this applies to UFO researchers.
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2) Personality Disorder. Unfortunately, these ufologists work without supervision of any kind. In the Emma Woods case and in the
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So, given all this freedom and no creden-
tialed peers to naysay them, what do you
suppose happens to two investigators (who
are also each others’ best friends in the
world) in their search for knowledge in a
wacky, marginal field like “alien abduction?”
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Richard P. Rosenthal's video interview is published here with his permission. The video was obtained from Linda Cortile and is used here with her permission.

Fair Use

The video interview of Richard P. Rosenthal is presented here with his permission. That video, as well as the quotes that have been used in this webpage, are also used here in accordance with the Fair Use doctrine contained within the United States copyright law. They have been used to refute Carol Rainey's inaccurate allegation that Hopkins worked almost exclusively alone, without supervision of any kind and without any credentialed peers to naysay him. The video footage is used to specifically demonstrate Rainey's full knowledge of her allegation's inaccuracy given that she was the one who filmed the video interview with Rosenthal.

The purpose and character of the use of the video footage and quotes is non-profit education intended to increase public awareness about the validity of the Linda Cortile UFO abduction case. They have also been used here to provide a free public information source about the case to aid those interested in learning more about it. In addition to this they also demonstrate the dishonest tactics that have been employed by individuals in their attempts to discredit the case.
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