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**Introduction**

Between 1992 and 1995 five separate rebuttals, written by five separate people, were published in the *Journal of Parapsychology* in response to the inaccurate and unfounded allegations of George Hansen. These rebuttals came from a cross section of individuals:

1) Edward F. Kelly – Psychologist and Research Professor
2) Gertrude R. Schmeidler – Experimental Psychologist
3) H. Kanthamani – Investigator
4) John Beloff – Psychologist
5) Richard Wiseman – Psychologist and member of CSICOP

These five pieces of documentary evidence are presented and referenced here to demonstrate the examples and patterns of inaccuracy, distortion and subjectivity in George Hansen's critiquing efforts of the paranormal prior to his purported critique of Linda Cortile's UFO abduction case.

This evidence also demonstrates that Hansen had a history of publicly dismissing paranormal cases with unfounded hypotheses of conspirator based fraud which, when put to the test by independent parties, were ultimately proven to be untenable.

These five rebuttals, viewed and studied collectively with the multiple, subsequent rebuttals to Hansen's purported critique of the Linda Cortile case, demonstrate Hansen's critiquing exercises for what they truly are, premeditated and predetermined dismissals.

Were Hansen's critiquing efforts limited to paranormal or scientific concepts the bones of contention anyone might have with his work could be discussed and argued in a relaxed and scholarly manner as no one was being victimised by the theories he was purporting. Unfortunately his modus operandi has historically necessitated a public human toll. He achieves this by publicly libeling innocent individuals involved in the cases he critiques.

Linda Cortile and her family were publicly branded hoaxers by Hansen in his purported critique of her case. His proof of this accusation, a series of allegations that when scrutinised turned out to be lies, errors or omission reliant distortions (See “Critique Rejected” and The October 3, 1992 "Showdown" Meeting at Budd Hopkins' Apartment webpage at this website for more information).

These five rebuttals have been reproduced, with permission, at this webpage.
Permission

1) The article "Contra George Hansen's Flawed Critique of the Work With B.D." by Edward F. Kelly is reproduced here with Edward F. Kelly's and John Palmer's permission.

2) The article "Response to Hansen: Background, Corrections, and Amplifications" by Gertrude R. Schmeidler is reproduced here with John Palmer's permission.

3) The article "A Response to George Hansen's Critique: Some Supplementary Notes on the Research with B.D." by H. Kanthamani is reproduced here with John Palmer's permission.

4) The article "The Research with B.D.: A Reply to George Hansen" by John Beloff is reproduced here with John Palmer's permission.

5) The article "Testing the notion that a "foot shiner" could have been used during the Delmore experiment" by Richard Wiseman is reproduced here with John Palmer's permission.
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