



# 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](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Re: UFO Pop Quiz...

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Re: UFO Pop Quiz...

From: [Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:jsmortell@aol.com)  
Date: Wed, 11 Nov 1998 13:14:12 EST  
Fwd Date: Wed, 11 Nov 1998 18:57:41 -0500  
Subject: Re: UFO Pop Quiz...

>Subject: UFO UpDate: UFO Pop Quiz...  
>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 11 Nov 1998 11:50:16 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
>>Date: Tue, 10 Nov 1998 23:00:05 +0000  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: UFO Pop Quiz...

>>Question #4)

>>If the reason for more frequent night visitations is because the  
>>ETs in question are trying to avoid detection, then why do they  
>>bother leaving their "running lights" on, thereby making  
>>themselves highly visible?

>>Question #5)

>>If the ET's in question leave their "running lights" on because  
>>they want to be noticed, then why don't they show themselves  
>>during the day when detection would be easier?

>>Silly questions. Thanks for your time.

>Roger -

>It's a little strong to call them silly. But they are difficult  
>to answer for a number of reasons:

>1) They assume that UFOs are caused by ETI. While this is a  
>reasonable working hypothesis, only the abduction accounts (the  
>least certain of all UFO reports) purport to provide cultural or  
>motivational information about the occupants. Thus, answers to  
>questions of motivation can only be provided at the cost of  
>accepting accounts which are far from the strongest available.

>2) They assume that UFO lighting is, in fact, lighting. As I  
>have shown in

><http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufolumin.htm>

>the evidence suggests strongly that UFO lighting is luminosity  
>generated by a plasma in proximity to the UFO surface.

>The pattern of UFO behavior and the associated luminosity  
>suggests:

>a) UFO luminosity is not conventional lighting ("running  
>lights"). CE witnesses have seldom seen what could be  
>interpreted as conventional "lights" on UFOs. The Blenheim NZ  
>case of 1959, for instance, clearly shows that rim lighting is  
>generated by some form of luminous plasma. Distance effects are  
>likely to be the cause of some UFO lighting being interpreted as  
>"running lights".

Oh God, here goes my credibility. In another post I gave a  
blanket post rebutting the next ten posts..... I didn't mean to  
lie, sorry!

>CE witnesses have seldom seen what could be  
>interpreted as conventional "lights" on UFOs.

You've been talking to the wrong witnesses, friend!

>1) They assume that UFOs are caused by ETI. While this is a  
>reasonable working hypothesis, only the abduction accounts (the  
>least certain of all UFO reports)

Strange, I always thought that educated, sane and credible  
witnesses were the best evidence... if your opinion of many of  
these people including me, is so low, then there is a problem  
with your research from the get-go.

The question which I would always ask of any theorist is and  
should always be is, "Have you ever sighted a UFO or perceive  
that you've been abducted??"

The answer precludes most of the "theories!" put forth in such  
erudition as is often submitted.

For example, there are a few sightings to which I have been  
witness and both exhibited lights (no matter the method used to  
produce them). These lights fit into all of the following  
categories... they were navigation lights, some flashed and  
strobed, others were constant, but they were LIGHTS. One  
vehicle sighting with multiple witnesses reporting, had white,  
red and a piercing blue-white strobe lights.

Personally I tend to separate these lights from the plasma glow  
(if indeed that is what it really is) which ALSO accompanied the  
vehicle and lit it up quite brightly.

As to distance effects, there was a sighting in my county  
witnessed and reported by about thirty people that I am aware  
of, the vehicle was less than 4000 feet from the observer and  
the atmosphere was clear to the ceiling which was 5000 feet.

Simply, the body of the craft glowed and carried lights some of  
which flashed, some remained on and some came on and off. I am  
not arguing rim lighting or plasma effects, I am arguing running  
lights. I've seen them. Without posting a CV, I spent the  
years between 1966 and 1975 in aerospace as an engineer and  
worked on numerous spacecraft, missile and aircraft systems. I  
am also an astronomer (amateur). Admittedly, however, I do  
ingest jellybeans. This could affect my judgement. I am an  
engineer, and a pretty good one, too. I am trained to observe  
and analyse. I need to have formulas in which to place  
everything. My fondest dream is to have one equation which  
explains God, the Universe and Everything.

>b) UFO luminosity is not, however, a byproduct of the lift  
>producing system of the UFO. UFOs have been observed to  
>extinguish lighting when hovering, and yet that UFO continues to  
>fly. However, it does appear that UFOs cannot attain speed  
>without displaying luminosity, and that full body luminosity is  
>a characteristic of the highest speeds (though it may still be  
>maintained at lower speeds, perhaps because the cost of  
>renergizing the sheath is high enough that this is more  
>efficient).

>(Note that this is a provisional conclusion; it is certainly  
>possible that "extinguished lighting" is simply emitting in  
>nonvisible regions of the spectrum.)

>c) Other forms of UFO lighting, such as light beams, also do not  
>seem to be the result of conventional lights. UFO light beams  
>also have some of the qualities of plasmas, particularly 1) slow

>propagation speeds, 2) diffuse edges, and 3) ability to be  
>extended and retracted to specific lengths. However, even when  
>considered as plasmas, UFO light beams have some unique  
>qualities.

How are you specifically using the word "diffuse?"  
Concentrated? Focused? If so, I agree (based on my experience).  
Linear and bordered? Agreed once again in my experience.

>Obviously, the reason that UFOs carry lights seems to have only  
>a few possible answers:

>1) Lighting is an byproduct of some process in the UFO and it  
>cannot be separated from that process any more than we are able  
>to separate sound from a jet engine or wind from a helicopter  
>rotor.

>2) UFO occupants don't care, because the performance of UFOs is  
>such that being observed will not lead to a problem for them.

>3) UFO occupants allow themselves to be observed because they  
>are attempting to get us used to their presence.

>Frankly, I suspect (1) and (2) in combination are probably the  
>best answer. The evidence of the past 50 years seems to me to  
>suggest that we are not the subjects of some sort of vast and  
>organized scientific study, nor are we being qualified or  
>developed for membership in some sort of Star Trekian  
>"Federation".

Sorry, my two cents again. The words you selected are, "THE  
EVIDENCE OF THE LAST 50 YEARS..." Key on the word evidence.  
While there is indeed, evidence, there is little or no evidence  
of intent. None whatsoever. In fact, many books (I refer to  
the most credible by the best of researchers - and even the  
worst) but most testimony reveals divers reasons for the  
abduction. Pick the one you wish to believe. There's a whole  
bunch.

- o Prepare for Armigeddon
- o Prepare for their coming
- o Prepare for earth changes..... oy, a whole bunch more.

>BTW, you should also realize there are a number of problems with  
>relying on any answer provided to your first questions as to the  
>ratio of daylight to evening sightings. First, remember that we  
>cannot determine the frequency of sightings, only of reported  
>sightings.

>1) The proportions have varied over the years. It is not clear  
>whether these are selection effects based on what is thought  
>worthy of reporting by the observer, changes in air traffic  
>patterns (which might make modern witnesses less conscious of  
>unusual distant airborne objects in the daytime), or even a  
>change in the behavior of UFOs.

>Further, there are selection effects based on the greater  
>visibility of luminous objects at night compared to reflective  
>objects during the day.

>Finally, the study of UFO witnesses suggests that the witnesses  
>likeliest to see UFOs are those who are outside, and since most  
>people work inside during the day, and are inside during most  
>daytime hours during the winter, this may also affect the number  
>of daytime vs. nighttime sightings.

Then there are those sightings day OR night in which the observer  
is somehow compelled to go outside and look! Phooey!

>It seems to me to be difficult if not impossible to provide an  
>answer which does not simply indicate what time of day  
generates >sightings more likely to be reported. This does not,  
of course, >actually indicate the distribution of sightings. >

>2) Averaging reports across a variety of population densities  
>may mask effects which bear on the result. For instance, it is  
>possible that there are more daylight sightings in isolated  
>areas than in more densely populated areas.

>3) As you may know, Vallee did extensive studies on the time  
>pattern of UFO reports. He found that the time patterns varied  
>by the classification of the UFO in his relatively simple

>behavioral classification system. Obviously this would also  
>corrupt any attempt to provide a general answer to your  
>question that was meaningful.

>Hope this helps.

Now for the couppie de grassey.... my entire point in this post  
is to clearly indicate that the one thing missing in every  
theory, every sighting, every research, every abduction and  
every radio and TV show, everything is an answer in which the  
words often selected can be used... "prove, shown to be, are,  
etc."

I get very worried when I hear or read words that appear so  
definitive as to be represented as fact. Phooey!

Jim

---

[ [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](#).