



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](#) -> [1999](#) -> [Jul](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: IFOs

From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 22:20:13 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1999 15:56:20 -0400
Subject: Re: IFOs

>Subject: Re: IFOs
>From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>
>Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 10:38:28 -0400
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 16:37:59 +0100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: John Rimmer <jrimmer@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Sheffield UFO Incident 2?

>>We can play with statistics as long as we like. I could argue
>>that if Jim Deardorff is only able to explain 50% to 75% of the
>>UFO reports he comes across then he's not doing his job
>>properly! Other investigators find they can explain 95%. Maybe
>>they're being over-zealous in explaining cases, maybe they're
>>just more thorough in getting the facts.

>Or maybe the set of cases is not filtered toward paydirt cases,
>but includes a lot of chaff like LITS, distant reflections, and
>other small angular size, small strangeness events.

>As investigators, I believe that if we have a 95% IFO rate, then
>it is more likely we are investigating the wrong cases, not that
>we aren't looking hard enough for the answers.

Unfortunately this introduces a very subjective element into the gathering of statistical data. Any individual investigator's view of "paydirt data" will vary. It is clear that many researcher's view of paydirt is anything which will support the idea that at least some UFO reports represent structured craft, hence vague lights-in-the-sky type reports are of little interest to them, and can be ignored when compiling statistics, inflating the "unexplained" cases at the expense of the "insufficient data" column.

But researchers with a different agenda, promoting the earth-lights hypothesis for instance, will find the distant star-like objects extremely interesting, and would want to include them in any definition of a UFO worth studying.

Ultimately we have to accept that the figure on which we must base our percentage of "unknowns" is the totality of events which are reported by the percipients as UFO events, and not just the ones we personally happen to find interesting.

--

John Rimmer, Magonia Magazine
www.magonia.demon.co.uk

[[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](#).