

Why the Sheridan and James group-stalking ('gang-stalking') study is flawed and the information on the Wikipedia Gang Stalking page is misleading

Peter Mooring - STOPEG, 28 October 2023

Abstract

The 2015 study "Complaints of group-stalking ('gang-stalking'): an exploratory study of their nature and impact on complainants" by Lorraine P. Sheridan and David V. James [\[1\]](#) is used on the internet to discredit victims of government crimes, see the Wikipedia page on 'Gang Stalking' [\[2\]](#). Some sentences from the study are copied on the Wikipedia page, the most prominent one: "All 128 'victims' of gang stalking were judged to be delusional". Important information from the study is not mentioned on the Wikipedia page. I read the Sheridan and James study and the Wikipedia Gang Stalking page and present my findings in this document. The conclusion is that the study is flawed and that the information on the Wikipedia page 'Gang Stalking' from this study is incomplete and misleading.

The 2015 study "Complaints of group-stalking ('gang-stalking'): an exploratory study of their nature and impact on complainants" by Lorraine P. Sheridan and David V. James [\[1\]](#) is used on the internet to discredit victims of government crimes, see the Wikipedia page on 'Gang Stalking' [\[2\]](#). Some sentences from the study are copied on the Wikipedia page, the most important one: "All 128 'victims' of gang stalking were judged to be delusional". I read the study and the Wikipedia page. Here are my findings.

1. Most important sentence missing [Study, Wikipedia]

The study ends with a few sentences and one is: "The study is, however, exploratory in nature, and replications of its findings are necessary before they can be considered to be clearly established. " This is a very important sentence that should have been mentioned in the abstract of the study. This sentence is also not mentioned on the Wikipedia page.

2. Anonymous questionnaire on the internet [Study]

The study used an anonymous questionnaire on the internet. The questionnaire for the study was hosted on internet website of a Targeted Individuals organization. What is

more easy to manipulate than a questionnaire on the internet?

3. **Assumption of valid cases [Study]**

The study suggests that all selected Gang Stalking questionnaire cases are valid cases. This assumption can be false.

- Fake victims

If we assume that the Gang Stalking is done by government agencies, then it is obvious to assume that there are many fake victims, controlled by government agencies, trying to make the real victims look bad.

- People with mental health problems

There are many websites about Gang Stalking on the internet and people with mental health problems may conclude that they found fellow sufferers.

- Real victims

How many real victims would participate in such a study? I know victims who would never do this. They want to stay anonymous, stay far away from these types of internet activities, because they still have some kind of life.

This raises the question: How many real victims are there in the selected 128?

4. **Arguable definition of 'delusion' [Study]**

The definition of a delusion in the study was taken from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th edition, also known as the DSM V. This definition is arguable. From the Wikipedia page on 'Delusion':

However: "The distinction between a delusion and a strongly held idea is sometimes difficult to make and depends in part on the degree of conviction with which the belief is held despite clear or reasonable contradictory evidence regarding its veracity."

I suggest everyone to read the 2013 article "You needn't be wrong to be called delusional" in The Guardian [\[3\]](#) that describes the problem with the DSM V definition. Excerpt: "And this is where the larger issue lies. As happened with Martha Mitchell, claims against authorities are often dismissed by suggesting that the person has mental health problems."

Summary: The difference between a delusion and a strongly held idea is sometimes difficult to make.

5. **Not neutral, very biased wordings, used to categorize cases [Study]**

The study mentions that "all 128 group-stalked cases fell into one or more of three categories:

- "Cases where the resources or elaborate organisation required to carry them out made the alleged activities highly improbable (e.g. hostile operatives being inserted in victim's workplace and their children's schools; 24-h electronic surveillance involving teams of men in black vans; surveillance by cameras placed throughout the city; ...)"
- "cases in which the activities described were impossible (e.g. minds of friends and family being externally controlled; use of 'voice to skull' messages; ...)"

- "cases where the beliefs were not only impossible, but bizarre (e.g. docile family dog replaced by exact double with foul temper; remote enlargement of bodily organs ...)"

The, far from being neutral, but instead very biased wordings used are: 'highly improbable', 'impossible' and 'not only impossible, but bizarre'. Let's analyze these more:

- Highly improbable
Fine, highly improbable, but impossible ... no.
- Impossible
No, not impossible. For example, look at the Wikipedia page on the 'Microwave auditory effect': "In 1975, an article by neuropsychologist Don Justesen discussing radiation effects on human perception referred to an experiment by Joseph C. Sharp and Mark Grove at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research during which Sharp and Grove reportedly were able to recognize nine out of ten words transmitted by "voice modulated microwaves".
- Not only impossible, but bizarre
Please research the MK-ULTRA project. Did it ever stop, or did it continue in black budget projects?

6. **Conclusion not based on investigations but on studies of previous individual stalking cases [Study]**

Then suddenly there is the sentence: "Group-stalking belongs within the general category of false claims of stalking.". Followed by: "The group-stalking cases in this study shared similarities with false stalking cases in the earlier reports, in that they were reported to have continued significantly longer, were less likely to be associated with activities that produced hard evidence of stalking and were associated with higher rates of reported suicidal ideation."

Despite mentioning "... or the individuals were victims of elaborate and extremely expensive behaviour organised, for no apparent reason, by those with huge personal wealth or by government agencies.", the study did not make any attempt to investigate any claim of the group-stalking cases, nor did it mention COINTELPRO, MK-ULTRA, anti-terrorist measures since 9/11, etc. Instead, group-stalking cases were compared with studies of previous individual stalking cases.

And this where the sentence "All 128 'victims' of gang stalking were judged to be delusional" comes from.

7. **Police stalking court cases in 2005 and 2006 in the Netherlands**

To illustrate that stalking by police is very real, here are two cases from the Netherlands.

1. ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2005:AU7314 [\[4\]](#) (2005)

"In early October, P. noticed that she was being followed inconveniently. She was regularly called by an officer and daily the police monitored her home. 'Often they get out of the car or ring the bell, it's out of all proportion, I can hardly sleep myself,' said P. According to the mayor, the disturbance was necessary because P. is a threat to public order. Cassette tapes with very radical texts were allegedly found on her premises. According to P., none of this was true.

...

The court determined that the disruption had to stop immediately.

...

Important is the court's consideration. 'It is plausible that these measures lead to great psychological pressure on the 'disturbed', partly because the continuous police action cannot escape the neighborhood as well,' the ruling said. Such an in-breach is only justified, the European Convention on Human Rights states, if a number of conditions are met. Among other things, disturbing P. must be "necessary" and the grounds on which it is done must be "relevant and sufficient."

2. ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2006:AV4173 [\[5\]](#) (2006)

"He is no longer suspected of belonging to a criminal organization. There is no question of any criminal judgment against him and the goods seized from him have been returned.

...

The disturbances consist of the walking pace of police cars recognizable as such through the plaintiff's street; the stopping of police cars in front of the plaintiff's house for about 5 to 10 minutes, also with the engine running and during the night hours; staring at the plaintiff when he leaves his house; following the plaintiff when he leaves his house; the passing by the plaintiff's house by police officers and the calling by police officers for an appointment when there is no reason to do so.

...

The nature and extent of the disruption applied is also deemed proportionate. The current instruction, as stated above, involves the police driving identifiable vehicles through plaintiff's street three times a day and stopping in front of his residence. "

In the first case, the judge ruled that the police had to stop the disturbance. In the second case, the judge ruled that police could continue the disturbance. These cases caused a huge stir among criminal lawyers and human rights advocates. There has been, and still is, much criticism, because of the vague criteria.

I want to add that **the methods used by the police in these cases look very much like (psychological) torture** . And although these cases are from the Netherlands, I have no reason to believe that this is different in other Western democratic countries.

If you research further, you will find much more information about police disruption activities.

Summarizing, we can only conclude that the study by Sheridan and James is flawed. And by mentioning on the internet "All 128 'victims' of gang stalking were judged to be delusional", without at least adding the sentence from the study "The study is, however, exploratory in nature, and replications of its findings are necessary before they can be considered to be clearly established. " the Wikipedia page on Gang Stalking is misleading.

Contact me if you have questions or want more information.

Peter Mooring

STOPEG Foundation (STOP Electronic weapons and Gangstalking)

Netherlands

peterpm@xs4all.nl

Ph: +31 6 4124 3030

<https://www.stopeg.com>

Buys Ballotstraat 40

4631 GW Hoogerheide

Netherlands

References / Links:

1. [Complaints of group-stalking \('gang-stalking'\): an exploratory study of their nature and impact on complainants](#)
or [here](#)
Lorraine P. Sheridan and David V. James, 2015
2. [Gang Stalking](#)
Wikipedia, 28 October 2023
3. [You needn't be wrong to be called delusional](#)
Vaughan Bell in The Guardian, 4 August 2013
4. [ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2005:AU7314](#)
5. [ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2006:AV4173](#)
6. [Innocent citizens put on terrorist lists by Dutch police unit TOO!](#)
Peter Mooring - STOPEG, 4 June 2023
7. [Pulsed Microwave Attacks on US, Canadian, Embassy and Security Personnel: The Havana Syndrome](#)
Peter Mooring - STOPEG, 17 August 2023 (last update)