



# 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](#) -> [Oct](#) -> [Maccabee on Becker - 4](#)

## UFO UpDates Mailing List

### Maccabee on Becker - 4

From: Jean van Gemert <jeanvg@dds.nl>  
Date: Sat, 4 Oct 1997 13:51:47 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 04 Oct 1997 08:37:43 -0400  
Subject: Maccabee on Becker - 4

Barbara continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: Barbara's suggestion that Ed's sightings are simply a long story is an extrapolation from information provided by TEENAGERS who attended PARTIES where the intent was to have a good time, and if making up stories was part of that good time, then so be it. There is a big difference between making up a story for a party... a story which the storyteller might have to tell once in his whole life... and making up a story which makes local and then national news and which brings a horde of invesigators asking specific questions over and over.

\*\*\*\*\*

She continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT:  
It appears as if this is less than critical reasoning on Becker's part. She compares committing a crime by a person who tends to be a criminal (a person who steals while "awake" would probably steal under hypnosis) with a person who, as a mature adult, has no known criminal tendencies.

(Note: Ed has admitted that he was a really "bad boy" when he was 19 years old. He stole a car and forged a name on a check to cash it. He went to jail for this for a short time. In late 1988 he appealed to the Governor of Florida for a complete pardon based on his recent life. In making this appeal he brought down a horde of REAL investigators on his head. For over a year they tried to dig up all the dirt they could...AND THEY DID NOT IGNORE THE UFO SIGHTING REPORTS BY ED and the possibility that he was perpetrating a hoax. The bottom line is the REAL invesigators found no evidence of criminal activity by Ed since he was about 20 years old and HE GOT HIS PARDON with complete restoration of his civil rights!!)

\*\*\*\*\*

Becker continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: Ed's children saw the UFO on the night when Ed got his video, December 28, 1987.

\*\*\*\*\*

She continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: Becker is correct in saying it is her OPINION that Ed did this to gain credibility. Ed's reason was more interesting. He stated during the interview on January 4 with Ware and Flannigan (his first interview) that he believed the UFO creatures had placed something in his head that gave him the ability to hear the "hum" while he was in the blue beam on November 11 (1987; the first sighting, after taking his first 5 pictures). He wanted that ability removed. He said that he would be willing to place himself alone out somewhere where they could get to him and do whatever they wanted, providing that they would take away the hum. However, he added, he wanted to have the woods "filled with photographers." What happened on January 24 was a "slimmed down" version of what Ed said on January 4. He tried to get a MUFON investigator to go with him in the truck, but the only person he could contact was Duane Cook. Hence this situation arose out of Ed's desire to place himself where the UFO could get him, but he wanted documentation of whatever happened.

\*\*\*\*\*

Becker continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: "...gets rid of..." Slight bias in the use of language, perhaps? After all, Ed says he did call the MUFON investigators, but got no response.

\*\*\*\*\*

Becker continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: distracts Cook? This is all taped, by the way and Cook paid very close attention to what was happening.

\*\*\*\*\*

Becker continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: "...continues the charade.."? Prove its a charade, Barbara. Duane got out of the truck to film Ed standing on the road in front of the truck. However, it was a drizzly night and it began to rain so Duane got back into the truck to protect the camera...which

he never shut off during this whole event.

\*\*\*\*\*

She continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: Although the pain was gone Ed could not be sure that "they" had departed. He didn't want to take the chance of missing a sighting if the camera were turned off.

\*\*\*\*\*

She continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT: Becker makes an interesting case for "prestidigation" (trickery) in the taking of Ed's Jan. 24 photo. However, she has not mentioned the photo itself. It would have to be a double exposure, no other method would work under the conditions. Not only that but the first exposure would have to be of a rapidly moved model or a rapidly rotated camera, since there is a streak above the UFO image indicating "rapid departure." This would be an added complexity since none of Ed's previous presumably hoaxed photos showed such a streak (so why go to the trouble of putting a streak in this one?). The streak itself is of interest. The image shows that during most of the shutter time the UFO was stationary thereby making a rather good image of itself. However, the presence of the upward streak indicates that it departed upward just before the shutter closed. Considering Ed's tendency to hold the shutter button down for 1/2 - 1 sec regardless of the conditions of the photo, plus that fact that there was little in the image to reflect the light of the flash (only a metal bar on top of the truck) and thereby cause the shutter to close, it is likely that the shutter stayed open for 1/2 - 1 sec. (Note: the possibility of the temporal reverse, that the object moved rapidly to a final position and then stayed there during the remainder of the shutter time, cannot be ruled out from the photo. However, if this is a real photo it would make little sense to say Ed pushed the shutter button before he saw the UFO and managed to capture it zooming downward to a resting position. From the hoax point of view, if this were a model being moved it would be very difficult to move it rapidly to a final position in the field of view of the camera and then stop it without vibration at a final position. The most natural hoax assumption would be that the model was stationary when the shutter opened, remained stationary for a short time and then was yanked upward or the camera was suddenly turned in a downward direction.) Looking carefully at the overall streak one sees that it is actually composed of the collection of streaks of the "hot spots" (bright areas) in the UFO image. Of great importance is the observation that, starting from the position of the stationary image and moving upward one sees that the streaks DIMINISH IN INTENSITY. This could be because the UFO lights were "dimming down" as it moved. On the other hand if the lights stayed at a constant brightness the decrease in intensity would be an indication of extreme ACCELERATION with the velocity continually increasing so that the exposure time at successive locations on the film (moving upward) is less and less. A similar effect appears in a photo Ed took with a Model 600 Polaroid camera on March 8, 1988 (Ed's photo 35).

On January 8, 1990, IN THE PRESENCE OF OTHER WITNESSES, Ed took several photos of a UFO that was alternately hovering and darting around in the sky. Ed's camera was mounted on a tripod. One of his images shows a similar effect: a bright overexposed region with a streak off to the side of the picture, indicating that the object remained motionless during most of the shutter time and then streaked away just before the shutter closed. This is described in UARHTP.)

\*\*\*\*\*

She continues:

**[The quoted text that was once at this location was deleted by the webmaster on 10/9/97 in response to the threat of lawsuit by Barbara Becker, who claims copyright infringement. [See Here](#) for more information.]**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### COMMENT

The "SRS" or Self Referencing Stereo Camera was created by Ed at my suggestion. After he had taken stereo pictures with the Nimslo camera it occurred to me that proof of hoax could be obtained if Ed used a stereo camera with a larger lens spacing. I presented the idea to him as a way to prove he was "telling the truth" by getting photos of objects which we could determine by calculation were long distances away. I pointed out that the greater the camera spacing the better the distance resolution. I did not point out that the same SRS camera could prove his photos were fakes if the distances turned out to be short.

The basic idea is this: use the parallax to determine distance by triangulation methods and then use the image size along with the focal length and parallax distance in a simple equation to get the object size. (Results of such calculations for the May 1, 1988 photos taken with the rebuilt SRS camera have already been presented above.) I suggested that Ed get a second Polaroid 600 camera (he had bought one on March 7, 1988) and place the them one foot apart on a board which would be mounted on a tripod. When I made the suggestion I didn't really expect Ed would do it. After all it was (a) time consuming and (b) DANGEROUS if all these sightings were fakes. Use of a stereo camera could provide photographic information that would show if a UFO was a small model close to the camera. If one assumes these photos are all hoaxes, then one could conclude, if Ed made the camera, that either he was so naive that he didn't understand the capability of the camera to measured distance (in which case I would have caught him in the trap), or else he was so photographically experienced and clever that he immediately realized how to fake the parallax.

To my great surprise about a week later Ed said he had made such a camera after borrowing a second Model 600 from Duane Cook. I asked him to test it out by photographing objects in back of his house. He sent me several photo PAIRS (two pictures per "photo") and a photo of the camera itself. Whereas I had suggested a 1 foot spacing (which I estimated would be good for determining distances at least to several hundred feet), Ed made the spacing 2 feet, which thereby potentially increased the range. I found that if I was told the measured distance to one reference object in the "photo" I could calculate the distances to the other objects in the photo out to 500 ft or more.

The SRS camera worked. However, as I studied these pictures I realized that there were potentially three problems which would affect its accuracy. These were (a) the two cameras were not rigidly mounted to the board (he strapped them on so they could be removed), (b) the board itself could twist on the tripod and, (c), he had to press the shutter buttons on the two cameras but he might not press the buttons simultaneously. (I didn't realize (c) was a problem until Ed sent me the first test photos and described how he had taken them: he carefully pushed the right hand shutter button and then the left hand button. He didn't realize that they had to be pushed simultaneously. I told him to practice squeezing the shutter buttons simultaneously and he said later that he had practiced). Fact (a) meant that the relative pointing directions of the two cameras could change slightly so that calibration at one time would not assure calibration later if the camera had been subjected to mechanical stress. Fact (b) meant that if he pressed the buttons one after another he could twist the cameras slightly one way when he took the right picture and twist it slightly the other way when he took the second picture. Fact (c) meant that if the UFO were moving when the pictures were taken and if the shutters weren't simultaneous the parallax triangle was "broken." The above potential problems meant that if I were handed a "photo" (left and right camera pictures) I could calculate a triangulated distance (assuming the sighting lines crossed; if they diverged then no triangulation was possible). However, the distance could be in error by a some amount because of the potentially random errors in camera pointing direction and time lag between the shutters.

Ed took three photos with the SRS camera in 1988: March 17, March 20 and May 1. The first two of these and their analysis is discussed in detail in AHGBS. The reader of that paper will see how I attempted to estimate the errors in distance measurement. Brief descriptions of the analyses of all three photos are presented in the last chapter of GBS (which, if Barbara read, she didn't understand!). Of these three stereo photos the May 1 photo is clearly the most important because it shows two UFOs with different parallax values

and it also shows lights at known distances which allow for a calibration of the parallax.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Science, Logic, and the UFO Debate:  
<http://www.primenet.com/~bdzeiler/index.html>

---

[\[Next Part\]](#)

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

---

[ [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](#).