



# 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](#) -> [Nov](#) -> Comments on Mexico City Video of 08-06-97 - 1/2

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Comments on Mexico City Video of 08-06-97 - 1/2

From: **bruce maccabee** <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 13 Nov 1997 21:44:29 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 14 Nov 1997 10:23:03 -0500  
Subject: Comments on Mexico City Video of 08-06-97 - 1/2

INITIAL COMMENTS ON MEXICO CITY VIDEO OF Aug. 6, 1997

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ----\*\*\*TO BE REVISED AS NECESSARY\*\*\*

THIS IS BASED ON ANALYSIS OF A VIDEO COPY (originating source unknown)

The copy includes the direct video, a 1.6x blowup negative video (sky is dark, UFO appears bright against sky) and a 7x blowup.

The video begins with a "wide angle" shot and immediately zooms in. Once zoomed in it stays that way. The wide angle shot shows numerous nearby buildings. They appear dark against the sky background. What seem to be distant structures are faint in the haze, i.e., they have low contrast with the sky, as expected from atmospheric extinction. The atmospheric extinction coefficient could be estimated from assumed intrinsic brightness of the buildings if the distances were known. This coefficient is probably given in meteorological reports for the time (the "visibility" or "visibility distance"). This could be important in determining the intrinsic brightness of the UFO, assuming it is a real object at some distance. I do not know the distances of buildings in the pictures but something like thousands of feet to a mile or so seems more reasonable than, say, 3 to five miles. There are enough structures in the background so that using parallax one should be able to locate the position of the videographer.

The UFO is generally well centered. The camera jiggle is obvious and looks as one would expect for a hand held camera. The jiggle is much more noticeable after zoom. Once the UFO starts to move to the right the camera pans with it, jiggling as it goes. The UFO motion seems to be at about a constant rate and so is the pan motion. After the UFO disappears behind the second building the camera sighting direction continues to move to the right as if the videographer expects to see the UFO appear from behind the second building, which would be logical based on the previous continuous motion.

The UFO is initially stationary but obviously tilting back and forth or wobbling at a constant rate. A 7x video blowup shows left-to-right motion of diffuse (edges not sharp) darker areas or dark spots which seem to be on the rim of the UFO. If these are fixed to the surface, then they suggest, but do not prove, rotational motion, counter-clockwise as seen from above. (The dark spots could be "moving" left to right on a non-rotating UFO, thereby giving the impression of motion just as changing light

patterns in an electronic sign can give the impression of motion.) I would have to say that the way these appear at the left edge of the UFO and then move to the right is not exactly what I would expect if the spots were fixed with respect to the surface of the UFO. However, the "funny appearance" of the dark spots as they appear and move may be a result of the atmospheric haze (causing low contrast) plus the artifacts of electronic 7x zoom (these features would be very small, almost invisible, in the un-electronic zoomed images). There more be more clarity in the original video. Aside from the "funny appearance," the combination of the motion of the dark spots and the wobble certainly gives a good impression of rotation with wobble or "precession" (see below). An estimate of the rate of the assumed rotation, as based on the motion of the black spots, is 6 to 7 seconds per revolution (about 0.16 rev/sec or 1.0 rad/sec). In other words, it is not spinning rapidly. The wobble requires about 2 sec to complete a cycle (0.5 rev/sec or 3 rad/sec).

After remaining stationary for several seconds the UFO then "instantaneously" accelerates (see below) to a constant velocity which takes it to the right on an upward sloping path. It seems to pass behind the upper left corner of one building and then, because of its upward trajectory it appears above the building. Frame by frame analysis of both the disappearance and the reappearance show consistent "cutting away" of the image, as if it were a real object moving slowly out of view behind the building and then reappearing from behind the building. After reappearance it continues its steady right hand upward motion and wobble. It moves toward a second, higher building. It disappears for good behind the second building.

After the initial camera zoom the UFO image on a 14" diag monitor is about 25 mm wide and about 7 mm high. Since I don't know the effective focal length of the camera lens I can only hazard a guess that the angular size might be on the order of 1/2 to 1 degree. Just before it disappears the second and final time the UFO image length is 20 mm. This suggests that it was about 25% farther from the camera when it went out of sight.

The first nearby building that the UFO goes "behind" - or appears to go behind - has some square windows 5 mm on a side on the monitor. Hence the UFO initially appears to be about 5 times larger than these windows. If, for example, the window were 5 ft wide, then the UFO was more than 25 ft in diameter (assumed round, but there is no proof of this - no "top view" or "bottom view"). Assuming it was as it appears, farther away than the building. All further dimensions are scaled according to this assumption, lacking any further information. The UFO was apparently farther away than the building, perhaps as much as twice as far, but not very much farther because it would have been barely visible in the the smog/haze. The UFO image has areas that are darker than the sky background, an important factor discussed below. If the UFO were miles away it would "fade into" the haze and the dark areas would not be as obvious as they are.

If the UFO were twice as far as the building, then it would be about 50 ft in diameter, assuming as before that the square windows are 5 ft wide.

I have studied the UFO acceleration by plotting the position of the right end of the UFO image relative to the building it (seems to ) disappear behind. For several seconds the spacing is constant with fluctuations (83-85 mm on the monitor). Fluctuations in the spacing are a result of the continual wobble of the UFO combined with the frame-by-frame fluctuations in the image shape and "edge fuzziness", a phenomenon caused most likely by electronic noise in the video camera. Then, suddenly, there is motion to the right (toward the building). The abrupt change from stationary to moving is noticeable to the naked eye when running the video forward (in time). The UFO image is seen to suddenly start moving to the right, what seems to be an "inertia-less" (instantaneous) onset of motion, with what appears to be a constant velocity.

When viewed in reverse, the UFO is moving constantly to the left and appears to suddenly stop, as if hitting an invisible brick wall. (Crash dummies inside?)

The left edge of the building is sufficiently sharply focused in the 1.6X blowup video negative (sky dark) to allow reasonably

accurate (to within 1 mm on the monitor) measurements of the spacing between the left end of the UFO image and the image of the edge of the building. This method allows for measurement of the UFO motion irrespective of the camera jiggle, i.e., by using the building as a reference the camera jiggle is essentially removed. (It still has the effect of smearing the edges of the images slightly.) A graph of spacing vs frame number shows the following odd result: in one (or less than 1) or at most 2 frames the UFO achieves its full forward speed. There appears to be no swinging as one would expect for a model hanging on a string. Also, the rotation and wobble (precession) do not appear to be affected by the onset of motion. (More precise analysis using the original video may turn up some slight changes in the rotation and wobble.) Using the estimate of the UFO being 25 ft in diameter, the steady speed to the right corresponds to about 16.9 ft/sec or about 11.5 mph. This would be doubled if the UFO were twice as far away (and changed in proportion to the assumed UFO size and distance scale). If it achieved this 16.9 ft/sec speed in 1 frame, 1/30 sec, then it achieved an acceleration of about 16 "g's" (16 times the 32 ft/sec<sup>2</sup> acceleration of gravity). If in two frames, then 8 g's. This sort of acceleration would be enough to cause wobble in any model hanging on a string.

This acceleration, since it seems to cause no effect to the "normal" wobble and rotation of the UFO must be acting through its "center of mass" (else, there would a torque or twisting motion that would change the wobble in some way). If the UFO weighed 1 pound and accelerated in 1/30 sec, then the force applied would be 16 pounds. If it weighed 1 ton (2,000 lbs) the accelerating force would be the equivalent of the weight of 16 tons.

NOTE: THESE SPECIFIC NUMBERS ARE ONLY ROUGH ESTIMATES TO GET "IN THE BALLPARK". THE ACTUAL VALUES DEPEND UPON DIMENSIONS WHICH ARE PRESENTLY ONLY GUESSED AT.

CONSIDERING THE HOAX HYPOTHESIS:

In general there are three possibilities: a hoax, a misidentification or the "real thing" (a True UFO - unexplainable as conventional a phenomenon). The possibility of a misidentification seems unlikely because of the shape. Even if one could prove that there was a 25 - 50 foot blimp with a gondola on top that was hovering and rocking so that the front and rear ends alternately went up and down (but not rotating) and having dark areas moving long the side near toward the camera, this would not explain the "instantaneous" acceleration. That leaves only the hoax or the real thing.

Factors to be considered and their relevance to the hoax hypothesis are: 1. The presumed hoax must either use a model of some sort or it is an electronic construction

1a. If a model, then it is not likely a full sized model at a great distance (thousands of feet, beyond the buildings) from the camera (rotating, wobbling, accelerating), but more likely a small model within a room where the video was shot. Therefore reject the full sized model hypothesis. (However, it is to be noted that this is the only method that could potentially create witnesses to the "UFO" who were not associated with the hoax.)

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

---

[ [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](#).