



# 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](#) -> [Jul](#) -> [Earth Lights - Objections](#)

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Earth Lights - Objections

From: **Mark Cashman** <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>

Date: Tue, 29 Jul 1997 03:01:22 -0700

Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jul 1997 17:42:57 -0400

Subject: Earth Lights - Objections

In reading the discussion about Earthlights, I must admit to being unconvinced - and not because of being a die-hard ETH proponent (which I am not), but because of dissatisfaction with what I know about the hypothesis.

1) Energy requirements: We have cases from Vallee (Confrontations, ISBN 0-345-36501-1, p23-35) a) claiming energy output in the visible spectrum of 2.3MW for approx 5-10 mins, disappearing for half an hour, reappearing at the same location where it disappeared, and then producing the same energy output for another 5 mins before flying away to the west; b) claiming energy output of 15KW; c) claiming energy output of between 160KW and 5MW; d) claiming energy output of 500MW. Obviously, these energy output levels are significant. How could this be sustained by an object given an initial impulse of energy and thereafter unable to take on new energy (i.e. an object without an internal power source)? How could such an object be dark for an extended period and reappear? Other sightings, such as the 11/7/90 case over Montreal, last for extended periods (that observation was for over 2 hours). How could such large energy outputs be sustained for such periods?

2) Source and sink: We have objects entering and leaving the oceans, but these represent a relatively tiny percentage of the total. A few cases show a UFO landing and then disappearing while on the ground without an observed departure. Most UFOs come from the sky and return to the sky. Yet an earthlights hypothesis would seem to me to require a high statistical frequency of objects emerging from the ground and returning to the ground to disappear, a frequency which is not present in the data.

3) Movement: UFOs exhibit significant maneuverability and movement across extended portions of the sky for extended periods of time. Why should a plasma demonstrate such movement? One possibility is to follow a course to ground, as with ball lightning. What would make earthlights behave differently from BL? BL has been demonstrated fairly well in the great Klass debates to be insufficient as an explanation for UFOs IMO. Wouldn't the movement of a plasma require the release of energy in addition to that required to sustain ionization and generate light output, thus exacerbating the problem in (1)?

3) Dark objects: An energetic plasma is always going to emit some sort of light. Yet many UFOs are dark in color (Loch Raven Dam case, for instance). Plasmas are also at least semi-transparent due to density. Yet close sightings reveal none of the transparency which might be expected.

4) Solidity: Trace cases (such as Trans-en-Provence, Socorro, Quaroble) demonstrate solidity by showing through the depth of the trace the weight of the object. In these cases, the weights have been on the order of tons. Why should a plasma have such a weight? How large would an atmospheric

plasma have to be to attain such weight? Is there any reason to believe that an atmospheric plasma could exceed the density of air? Other cases demonstrate solidity by physical contact (California, 1974 (see Paul Hill, Unconventional Flying Objects, ISBN 1-57174-027-9) P 38) as in striking the object with a flashlight or bullets, and, of course, there are cases where the UFO has been touched with bare flesh. Interestingly, there have been contact cases (bare flesh) without the immediate burns and radiation effects which one would invariably expect from a plasma.

5) Occupants and interiors: Occupants have been seen to be within and without UFOs. How can these be consistent with earthlights? Hallucination is not an acceptable answer, lacking specific and demonstrable proof in realistic settings (outdoors, at a distance greater than 150 feet).

6) Correlation with faults: It is not a question of whether sightings can correlate with faults (and some earlier posts have indicated that these correlations are loose in any case), but even if tight correlations exist, could they be due to chance? After all, the presence of faults in almost every area of the earth is well known. Thus one would expect sightings to happen near faults, whether or not UFOs are earthlights. The fact that areas like France and the Northeast US have numbers of sightings though tectonically inactive, while areas like Japan do not have orders of magnitude larger numbers of sightings, would seem to be another factor against acceptance of earthlights as an explanation for UFOs. (Vallee did this type of test for orthoteny - have the earthlights advocates done it?)

I have no wish to reignite a debate which has obviously occurred before, but the above seems compelling to me. Why should earthlights be considered even a possible explanation of ANY UFOs?

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of the Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Lofts/5623/>  
[http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The Temporal Doorway Storefront](http://www.infohaus.com/access/by-seller/The_Temporal_Doorway_Storefront)  
Original digital art, writing and UFO research  
mcashman@ix.netcom.com

Search for other documents to/from: [mcashman](#)

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[ [This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#) ]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - [updates@globalserve.net](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:webmaster@ufomind.com)

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).