



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](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: 'Electrically Induced Hallucinations'

From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>
Date: Tue, 04 Feb 1997 13:00:38 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 04 Feb 1997 20:09:46 -0500
Subject: Re: 'Electrically Induced Hallucinations'

>From: Chris Rutkowski <rutkows@cc.UManitoba.CA>
>Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: 'Electrically Induced Hallucinations'
>To: updates@globalserve.net (UFO UpDates - Toronto)
>Date: Sun, 2 Feb 1997 17:19:35 -0600 (CST)

>> Uh-oh. 400 miles away is probably way too distant, but I'd allow up
>> to a 100 miles, maybe 200 miles.

>You're more generous than I am; when I presented the TST to the rest of
>the geophysics department, they were amazed that Persinger was getting
>away with saying such things. And, BTW, I showed the TST to Persinger's
>own thesis advisor, who agreed that the TST was way off base.

On a clear day you can see forever <grin>. I don't what a good distance
limitation is. I don't know if (or how) 'earthlights' travel, how fast,
how wacky their transit is, etc. Heck, maybe 10 miles is correct, I just
don't know.

>> I'm astounded that the time window is 6 months either way! More like 6
>> HOURS surrounding the total event. Are we talking about a series of
>> seismic events spread out over time, or clearly isolated-in-time seismic
>> events?

>Steve, first of all, if you didn't know what Persinger was claiming,
>why were you defending him? :)

I wasn't exactly defending him <grin>. I'm very interested in the
coincidences involving magnetic fields and their affect on humans in
general.

>Yes, his "lag" and "lead" time was clearly stated as 6 months. He would
>accept as correlated data a magnitude 3 seismic event 6 months before
>a nocturnal light observation several hundred miles away.

Does he provide a basis for that time window? What's the reasoning? It
kind of seems to me that any geologically active area would have an event
or two per year, and it kind of seems to me that every 700 or so miles
you'll find a geologically active area, so it would be the same as saying
everything is TST without the requirement to prove it...

Wouldn't a detailed definition of an 'earthlight' be required before you
could reliably select a time window and geographic area? I mean, if we
knew what they were exactly and knew (for example) that they have a
duration of 2 hours maximum and a possible speed of 100mph maximum then
doesn't that automatically create the necessary parameters?

>> Do you know where I can get the raw data?

>Oh, yes, that minor little point. He never presented the raw data, only
>the graphs.

What!?!? No data??? Has anybody aske him for it?

>There's one exception, of course, and that was when he "proved" that
>UFOs in Manitoba were correlated with weak seismic events in southern
>Minnesota, >700 km away. In that study, he used my own MANUFOCAT for
>the UFO data (in others, he admitted using newspaper clippings!). Since
>I know the demographics of the MANUFOCAT data, it was easy to see how
>silly his correlations were. And if that was typical of his methodology

Hold it a second. You're saying he used newspaper clippings for the "raw data???"

>> If you reduce the observation distance to 200 miles and the time window to
>> 24 hours what sort of correlation do you get?
>In Manitoba, that would be zilch. Elsewhere, who knows? In California,
>probably pretty good! :)

Hahahha!!!

Well, should we expect geologic activity to be similar worldwide? Should we then expect 'earthlights' to be similar worldwide? (Isn't a seismic 3 in China the same as a seismic 3 in Brazil?)

>> Majority, sure, but I don't know about vast majority. I do know that many
>> (virtually all) of these cases are investigated post-event. Its
>> convenient, perhaps accurate, to attribute a star (and the cute trick the
>> mind plays when staring at a stationary object far away) to the sighted
>> object. But how do we know that's really the right answer?
>> Fireballs, balls of light, ball lightning all play into this also.

>Well, that's a very good question, and one aspect of ufology which
>really deserves study.

>The simple answer is that post-hoc studies are usually never done
>because once something *seems* like it was a star, satellite or
>airplane, there's no need to proceed further. However, your objection
>to this approach is a basic, philosophical issue, and one that needs to
>be addressed in detail.

>In other words, just because the "UFO" is stationary for 4 hours,
>twinkles like a star and sinks slowly into the west, does that mean
>it's a star? There is no question that aliens, wishing to disguise
>their activities could decide to masquerade as a star, but is that more
>likely than the possibility than the witness was really looking at a
>star?

>I think I know which choice I'd make, based on my investigation
>experience. I know how poor are the observing capabilities of most
>people, so my own view is that if it smells, tastes and looks like
>****, it probably is ****.

Sure, with those parameters I'd go with 'Star' too. But there a cases where the witness says it moves oddly, etc. If a witness says he was facing exactly East at 7:00pm in Chicago and saw a bright light sort of stationary but wobbling slowly for 3 hours then zip off northwest what do ya do?

>These questions make one thing very clear: investigative ufology is one
>field which has been ignored long enough. It's at the core of all
>ufological research and theories, and we need to take a long look at the
>basics again (if ufologists ever did at all).

I think long before our present time folks did work hard on that, nowadays they just seem to want to include anything a witness says.

>> Well, it was you good folks up North who first (so far as I know) decided
>> to back-burner any single-witness short-duration sighting by default (as

>Not me, baby!

Hahahah!!

>> On the other hand I'm generally skeptical of explanations that merely sound
>> good. How do we know a sighting was a misidentification of an airplane or a
>> star? I've read sighting reports that conclude airplane misidentification
>> simply because an airport was less than 50 miles from the event site, yet
>> the witness cited they also saw an airplane elsewhere in the sky.

>I'd answer: 1) experience; and 2) probability. Also, see above.
>Witnesses' observational capabilities are *terrible* in most cases.

Terrible!? Geez, I've been thinking that for years and everytime I mention

it I get mugged <grin>.

I personally think its another good reason to side-step the single-witness cases...

>I'd be willing to develop a paper on investigative ufology and present
>it at some upcoming UFO conference. Of course, it wouldn't be as big a
>draw as Linda Howe or Colin Andrews, so I won't be looking for my plane
>tickets in the mail just yet. :)

Too bad for that, it would probably be much more useful and important than the alternatives mentioned!

>> >;) Must be the NSA stooges in our midst!

>> I only live 20 minutes from NSA HQ (therefore I must be in their employ
>> <grin>) so I'm used to them...

>And those black cadillacs with the smoked windows are sooooo blaisee
>these days! ;)

Sure, almost everybody has one!

Search for other documents to/from: [sjpowell](#) | [rutkows](#)

[[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](#).