



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

Earth lights controversy: back to basics

From: jan@cyberzone.net (Jan Aldrich)
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 11:20:47 -0800
Fwd Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 17:52:09 -0500
Subject: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

> From: DevereuxP@aol.com
> Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 21:57:27 -0500 (EST)
> To: updates@globalserve.net
> Subject: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

> Perhaps it is because I am new to this chat line/subscriber service or
> whatever it is called, that I seem to need some clarifications regarding
> the earth lights debate (of which the TST is only one part).

> Let much just say, first, though, I am taken aback by the venom that

Venom, if it venom you what to see take a look at the Condon
correspondence--now there is venom. All except Dr. Craig, he was always
a gentleman even with his growing distaste for the subject and the people
in it. But please do instruct us as to what was venomous.

> some people, Chris Rutkowski and Jan Aldrich, pour out at Persinger.

Perhaps you should go back and review some of the previous postings
before jumping in with both feet.

Personally I don't care about Persinger. My objections to his theories
and claims where they intersect the UFO phenomenon (a) are:

1. Lack of rigorous investigation. To base statements on Chris
database is rather a stretch. The database only gives *indications.*
Almost all UFO statistics are highly suspect and full of selection
effects. An investigation of UFO phenomena reveals how treacherous the
ground is here. I object to the shoe horn approach of shoving the data
into a mold here. (Now, please do not come back with the argument that I
distrust statistics--- I distrust most UFO statistics.)

2. My opinion that Persinger is way out of his depth saying that
there are some kind of electrical induced hallucinations. This is also a
stretch. If you dance on a string, you better darn well expect that
people will pull on that string.

3. I understand about the political "correctness" surrounding UFO
phenomena. If you say anything at all, you should probably say something
negative. I appreciate this situation. Also, if you grant interviews to
TV documentaries you can expect all good stuff that does not agree with
the producer's ideas to end up on the cutting room floor. However, if
such documentaries show you making sweeping claims with little or no
supporting evidence, you best expect criticism from this quarter.

4. If we have a seismic event 700k away, and we get lights in high
up in the sky or UFO like phenomena all around, and if that is all you
can bring to the party, perhaps you ought to stay home. Some other items
flash to mind: variations in the powergrids, interference with radio
broadcasts, radar problems, etc. The TST effects are manifested and

investigated because they cause UFOs?? Have we investigated for the effects that would back up this contention.

Let's for the sake of argument say that UFOs are the only thing we can hang our hat on here. Then, does it not make sense to get the best data possible, and go where that data is located?

Also, the implications here are that we might have an earthquake predictor. Should we not expect some one to be tearing through UFO files to find the supporting data?

That is not happening. So what is the function of this theory in its relationship to UFOs??? To debunk the subject???

> But, the points I want to make:

> a) The TST seems to be being mixed up with the issue of earth lights. Like
> any theory or hypothesis, the TST will be subject to fair criticisms and
> modification. It is an ongoing process. Even if the TST turns out to be
> entirely wrong (and I doubt that it will prove *entirely* wrong) , that will
> not have any bearing or otherwise on the reality of anomalous light
> phenomena, aka 'earth lights'. Can we therefore keep these issues distinct?

> b) Is there some belief on the part of some TST critics that there is no such
> thing as tectonically generated lights? Can we have a quick statement on this
> from the critics, so we know where we stand? If the answer is that they do
> not believe in earthquake lights (EQLs) at least, then we know they are not in
> receipt of basic factual information, and therefore not equipped to keep
> lambasting everyone else trying to sort the whole matter out. If they agree
> that tectonic events can and do produce light phenomena, then we can better
> discuss the merits or otherwise of the TST, seeing whether it address
> possibilities or not. If critics think that no parts of the TST is valid,
> perhaps in the spirit of being constructive, they will start making
> suggestions as to what mechanisms they would think might be involved?

> c) The 40 percent reference to UFOs and faults goes back 30 years - does Jan
> Aldrich not realise that there has been some further research interim, and
> that therefore statements about earth lights are likely to develop and
> change?

In the 1940s newspaper editors ended yarns in their papers with a statement for the literally minded: "That's a joke, son." That was a joke, son!

> d) No one knows the precise nature of, or mechanisms for, ball lightning,
> earthquake lights or earth lights. That doesn't mean they do not exist.
> indeed, their existence is quite beyond doubt. Is it really cause for such
> hatred

No one hates Persinger. I am sure he loves wife and is kind to children and small animals. Criticism of the ideas and methods are different from criticism of the man.

> that someone like Persinger makes attempts to find answers to such
> enigmatic phenomena? There are plenty of theories and hypotheses for, say,
> ball lightning - do Chris Rutkowski and Jan Aldrich also constantly attack

I don't nor does Chris "constantly attack" anyone. Please choose your words more carefully. You seem to "know" quite a bit after just a few days!

> the authors of those for their perceived inadequacies?

When they become universal explanations for what I am studying, they can expect some review from this quarter. If UFOs are explained by natural lasers, 100 foot diameter--long lasting ball, electrified moon dust, and TST, then there reason to study UFO because they will tell us more about the theory. However, the theories are used to debunk UFO. End of story.

>Or are we looking at
> personal agendas and specific psychological issues here?

Just like with your "hatred" remark you are out of line and out of order.

Jan Aldrich

Search for other documents to/from: [jan](#) | [devereuxp](#)

[[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](#).