



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1997](#) -> [Feb](#) -> Re: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

From: jan@cyberzone.net (Jan Aldrich)
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 08:57:31 -0800
Fwd Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 10:58:40 -0500
Subject: Re: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

Peter Brookesmith wrote:

> Date: 13 Feb 97 20:33:21 EST
> From: Peregrine Mendoza <101653.2205@CompuServe.COM>
> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> Subject: Re: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

> The Duke presents his compliments, and (strictly on the two-pennorth level)
> these comments:

> > Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 11:20:47 -0800
> > From: jan@cyberzone.net (Jan Aldrich)
> > To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> > Subject: Re: UFO UpDate: Earth lights controversy: back to basics

> > 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!

> If we're going to talk about the tone of the debate, Jan, to me
> at least you are beginning to sound shrill and, frankly, childish.

Rather amazing what creative editing can do. I believe I have only mentioned Persinger in two or three posts prior to Paul's post. That is hardly, constantly attacking him. If it is shrill or childish to point this fact out, so be it.

I dissent from *some* of Persinger's positions--especially some of the more public ones which seem rather extravagant. As I thought I pointed out in my post, I have certain problems with his claims and methods--it appears you do also if I read what your post of 20:33:32 hours, 13 Feb to Chris correctly--but not with him.

I do have an agenda, but it is hardly hidden. I believe--one of the few beliefs I allow myself--that there might be something to this UFO business. By definition anyone who is interested in UFOs is nut. But it is rather bad form to say one has "psychological issues." Someone who had been around here for awhile would know you should accuse the villian of being a member of the UFO-cover-up, the Worldwide Mind Control-Intelligence cabal, a disinformation agent or some such. Much better form than having "psychological issues", don't you think?

> This does not become you, judging from what else of yours I've read.

> Paul knows "quite a bit" because I send him copies of the messages
> on the thread when inviting him to comment. Even if I hadn't, there

> is such thing as the Web archive. Why don't you stick to the issue?

From my daily reads here, it hadn't occurred to me that was a pre-requisite of posting on this list. <g>

> > When they become universal explanations for what I am studying, they
> > can expect some review from this quarter. [...snip...] However, the
> > theories are used to debunk UFO. End of story.

> Since when did UFOs require a "universal explanation"?

Some people seem to think they do. Remember: skyhook balloons, ball-lighting, mirages?

Levelland, Texas is November 1957 is instructive:

Keyhoe: They are space ship.

LaPaz: They are some type military experiment.

Menzel: They are mirages.

We may have well had something that was unique, but no one said so. Everyone had their own ideas. Maybe some type of unusual weather phenomenon or even earthlight for all I know.

Same thing seem to happen in Kansas a few days later. It was not widely reported. Perhaps, we were treated to a-once-in-a-decade unusual phenomenon, but you wouldn't know it with all the preconceived notions immediately trotted out.

> Who is suggesting that GMLs(TM) should be one such explanation?

In the same way skyhook balloons, dust-motes in the eye, ball lightning, etc. were. Would you like quotes around "universal"? Please lets not be too literal here. I don't think Dr. Cotton when he offered his 'dust-mote' theory, or Dr. Liddel with skyhooks, or Phil Klass with 'ball lightning' meant that every UFO could be explained by their theories.

> Hoaxes, misperceptions and hallucinations are used to debunk UFOs,
> too, and quite properly when they can be proven to have occurred,
> within a balance of probabilities or better beyond reasonable doubt.
> Does you mean we should stop looking for hoaxers because not all UFO
> reports can be shown to be hoaxes?

Of course not.

> What do you mean by debunking, then?

Once again, if UFOs are explained by: long lasting 100 foot diameter ball lightning, natural lasers, electrified moon-dust, TST or whatever, then the study UFOs is justified to find more out about these postulated phenomena. *This is my central issue!* However, in the most cases the story stops when the explanation offered. That is what I mean by the use of the postulated phenomena as only a debunking device.

Jan Aldrich

Search for other documents to/from: [jan](#) | [101653.2205](#)

[[Next 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](#).