



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 - 5

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Maccabee on Becker - 5

From: Jean van Gemert <jeanvg@dds.nl>
Date: Sat, 4 Oct 1997 13:51:58 +0200 (MET DST)
Fwd Date: Sat, 04 Oct 1997 08:38:48 -0400
Subject: Maccabee on Becker - 5

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 appeared in the only spot in the park..." No, the UFO did not appear at a spot "in the park." There was a collection of trees and bushes surrounding on 3 sides the small area where Ed had the camera set up. People in the parking lot outside this small area had their view of the southwest blocked by those bushes and trees.

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: How does she know how hard it would be to tell. The outer cardboard box is sealed and presumably this could have been opened and resealed rather easily. However there is a thin inner foil covering which is glued to the sides of the box. This would not be easy to break or cut and then reseal. I talked to Neumann. He was of the opinion that the two boxes were new.

However, this is a moot or useless point anyway. As the following discussion shows, the suggested hoax method involves the substitution of a previously prepared film pack for the pack that Neumann opened. So, what the heck...let him open a truly new pack of film!

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: I have experimented with a Model 600 (I bought one as soon as I learned that Ed had bought one). Reloading of film packs etc., may be possible, I haven't tried it.

Barbara never does outline the hoax method in her paper. Therefore I will do it for her. To begin, assume that Ed had two "previously prepared packs" with the same serial numbers as the new packs. (The serial numbers were different for left and right cameras.) He would substitute these prepared packs for the packs that Neumann opened. Assume that Ed has prepared the packs so that the "ufo pictures" were the third in each prepared pack. Then, after the people left, he could eject the packs that Neumann opened and insert the prepared packs. This would set the counter to 10. To bring the counter down to 7 he would turn off the camera flash (to prevent other potential witnesses from seeing the light from the flash), press the shutter button of each camera twice, thereby ejecting the first two (useless) photos and leaving the prepared photos for the next shot. He would then turn on the flash and take simultaneous pictures of the foreground bushes using the prepared photos. (It would be OK if other potential witnesses saw this flash, since it would coincide with the "UFO" photo.) This would establish the location of the photos.

This is the scenario which Barbara infers may have happened. However, she has not specified just how these special pictures would have been prepared. I'll do it for her.

The Model 600 camera automatically ejects the picture immediately after it is taken. Through a Polaroid representative I learned, weeks after Ed had taken Model 600 UFO photos, that there is a means to do a double exposure. One has to defeat the ejection mechanism (which starts the development process) by opening the film pack insertion cover (a little "door" that holds the pack in the camera) instantaneously after pushing the shutter button. Then, if the picture gets ejected a little bit, it must be pushed back into the camera. Then one can take a second exposure, this time letting the motor eject the film. I managed to create double exposures that way.

Assuming that Ed might have figured out on his own how to do a double exposure with the Model 600 (no independent evidence of this, however!), one might assume that he would prepare his special pictures by photographing a model UFO in a room where the model was silhouetted against a dark screen (the first step of the SDE method). In this case it would be a small model showing just the top light and the bottom light since the central portion makes no image in the pictures. The problem is this: he has to have one picture for the left camera and one for the right camera and THEY HAVE TO HAVE A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF "PARALLAX". If, as Barbara assumes, Ed wants these fake SRS photos to be "proof" he has to have (a) a recognizable image and (b) a calculatable parallax. The first part is easy, but the second is not. How does one synthesize the parallax? Let's suppose he takes the picture for the right hand camera first. The image will appear at some location in the picture, say slightly above center. He then has to photograph the same model with the left camera, but the pointing direction of the left camera must be DIFFERENT, but NOT GREATLY DIFFERENT from the pointing direction of the right camera. He could not simply set up the SRS camera in a room with a small model, point the camera at the model and take left and right photos. If he did, the parallax effect would be so great with a 2 foot baseline that he would be caught RED HANDED as they say! Instead, he would have to be clever...very clever...EXTREMELY clever to figure out either (a) how much to rotate the SRS camera clockwise (as seen from above) after taking the right hand photo before taking the left hand photo or (b) how much to move the model sideways (to the left) after taking the right hand photo before taking the left hand photo. Either method, I realized WEEKS AFTER Ed had taken these pictures, could be used to synthesize parallax under controlled conditions. But, if he rotated the camera or moved the model either too little or too much he could create an "unbelievable" stereo pair of photos. If he rotated the camera or moved the model too little he would get very little parallax and this would lead to a very large calculated distance (thousands of feet or miles) and a resulting UFO size could be unbelievably huge (hundreds of feet). If he rotated the camera or moved the model too much he would get too much parallax leading to a very short calculated distance (10's of feet or less) and a resulting UFO size that would be small (inches or feet in size). Or, if really screwed up and rotated the camera counterclockwise or moved the model to the right he could lose parallax altogether (the sighting lines would seem to diverge) and there would be no distance estimate: the SRS photo pair would be no more valuable than a single photo. HOW TO DETERMINE THE EXACT AMOUNT TO ROTATE THE CAMERA OR MOVE THE MODEL? Point: there are no books (that I am aware of) where you can read about how to synthesize parallax. There aren't even many books on stereo photography for the amateur (specialists doing photogrammetry are familiar with the principles, but it is not in the books you can typically buy in a

book store). ED HAD TO FIGURE THIS OUT ON HIS OWN.

Are you as smart as the skeptics assume Ed is? Want to try it yourself? OK. Assume a 2 foot baseline and assume the camera lens axes are parallel. Assume a small model, 9" = 3/4 foot in diameter (such as the model found in Ed's old house) is 10 ft from the camera. Now figure out how many degrees to rotate the baseline between pictures to synthesize a parallax distance of 200 ft. What angle change corresponds to 20 ft? What angle corresponds to 2,000 ft? What angle change corresponds to infinite distance? How sensitive is the calculation to angle accuracy at 200 ft? Now repeat the calculation but instead of rotating the camera calculate how much you would have to move the model sideways to synthesize 200 ft, 20 ft and 2,000 ft. What is the sensitivity to position-shift of the model at 200 ft? What distance corresponds to infinite distance? What would be the calculated size of the UFO at 200 ft, 20 ft, 2,000 ft?

Easy...ONCE YOU'VE FIGURED IT OUT, you genius, you. (I have calculated the answers to these questions. If you want to know, contact me.)

Ed has NEVER given any indication of having any more than very basic knowledge of photography, such as "point and shoot." I can't imagine that he would have figured out how to synthesize parallax under these condition.

And this goes double, triply, pentuply, etc. for the May 1 stereo photos where there are two UFOs of different distances and different sizes OVER WATER!

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: Speak for yourself, Barbara. However, in a sense she's right: I presume we will never know EVERYTHING that happened.

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: Whoa, there. How does she know Ed "embellished" his accounts of the incidents as presented in the book? How does she know that he wasn't just giving a MORE COMPLETE VERSION THAN HAD BEEN PRESENTED IN THE ADMITTEDLY BRIEF ACCOUNTS PUBLISHED BY THE INVESTIGATORS WHO DIDN'T HAVE INFINITE TIME AND MONEY AND SPACE IN A MAGAZINE TO PUBLISH EVERY DETAIL?

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:

Where are your credentials as a psychologist?

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.]

ENDING COMMENTS:

Of course there is much more in the GBS book than Barbara has cited. In particular there is the last chapter where I presented analyses of many of the events she has discussed. At the very least, if this is a hoax it is exceedingly COMPLICATED and involves many other people. Such a thing would be difficult to "pull off" for months in a convincing way. TGBS, AHGBS and GBWE all described numerous OTHER sightings by OTHER witnesses which are consistent in one way or another with Ed's sightings. For example, not mentioned by Barbara in regard to the March 17 SRS photo sighting, is the sighting by Brenda Pollak of a bright ring light traveling over Gulf Breeze toward Shoreline Park. Brenda saw this moments before Ed's photo as she was driving to the park to join the skywatchers. If this is all a hoax, how did Ed arrange that?

Part of Barbara's problem is that she doesn't understand the analytical details and calculations that have gone into the analyses of these sightings. She also does not understand the significance of the numerous experiments that were done to test the validity of Ed's photos and sightings. It is my considered opinion that, as of 1997, Ed Walters has done MORE experiments related to sightings than ALL OTHER INVESTIGATORS AND WITNESSES COMBINED.

Many of these experiments were specifically designed by me to test Ed's veracity. Of course, I didn't tell him the real reasons behind some of the experiments.

A major example of these experiments was the creation of the SRS camera. Ed could have simply refused to create such a camera because either it was too much trouble or he didn't have the time, or both, and I wouldn't have been any the wiser. However, he did make the camera. And, at my request he made needed IMPROVEMENTS to the camera. Any hoaxer with a brain in his head would have refused to do so because taking SRS photos greatly complicates the hoaxing.

I was not the only one to try to "set him up." The MUFON team that gave Ed the sealed Nimslo camera in February, 1988, did NOT tell him that the camera could "measure" distances and hence could distinguish between a small model 10 or so feet away and a large object hundreds of feet away. He was told that, because the camera had four lenses, it would create more copies of each picture for analysis by more photo experts. In other words, he was led to believe that there was some value in having four negatives of each picture instead of just one. There was no such advantage.

Whereas Ed may have responded reluctantly to some of my requests, because they impact on his time (and money), the fact is that he has always complied. The bottom line is that Ed has done far more work "above and beyond the call of duty" to provide verifiable proof of his photos and videos than anyone else IN THE WORLD, so far as I know

Science, Logic, and the UFO Debate:

<http://www.primenet.com/~bdzeiler/index.html>

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

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](#).