



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](#) -> [Jan](#) -> **Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

From: "Steven J. Powell" <sjpowell@access.digex.net>
Date: Mon, 06 Jan 1997 06:16:56 -0500
Fwd Date: Mon, 06 Jan 1997 17:31:56 -0500
Subject: Re: Philosophy of Science and UFOs

> To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
> From: Ernie Karhu <ekarhu@shore.net>

> >But in certain areas, especially in ufology, I think its real
> important to stick with what we know, (what we really know), until
> we've exhausted all that we know, before moving into stuff we aren't
> so sure about.
> I think the most compelling argument is "until we've exhausted all
> that we know..." I think we've done that...and must continue to do so
> with all new data.
> I agree in principle, especially to rule out all that can be explained
> by what we know. However, we do have a considerable fund of data that
> cannot be explained by what we "really" know for certain.

I'm not so sure we're there yet. I think we've done at least a reasonable job on a case by case basis, of at least the major cases, but there still hasn't been good analysis on the higher level of the mass of cases.

> Therefore,
> it seems necessary to consider other well-developed and considered
> hypothetical positions to determine if these positions offer a more
> reasonable or consistent explanation.
> It seems reasonable to search through other "alternative explanations"
> as long as these "alternatives" are or have been presented in our more
> traditional scientific journals and that these positions are presented
> in accord with our traditional scientific method (or an alternative
> method) as long as the presentation is logical, consistent and
> compelling.

Nothing wrong with that as long as we stay close enough to the scientific method to make these alternative explanations testable hypotheses.

> A reasonable next step is to identify a list of "alternative
> positions" to consider. Rupert Sheldrake's theory of morphic resonance
> would be another reasonable candidate high on my own list.

Can you briefly state that theory and how it can be tested?

--

Thanks, take care.
John.

```
([[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]][[]])
[ sjpowell@access.digex.net ]
[ ]
```

